

## UNIVERSITY SENATE

First Meeting, Monday, 13 September 2004, 2:30 p.m.  
Room 302, Stewart Center

### AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor William L. McBride
2. Approval of Minutes of 19 April 2004
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. [Remarks by the President](#) President Martin C. Jischke
5. [Report of the Chairperson](#) Professor William L. McBride
6. [Resume of Items Under Consideration](#)  
by Various Standing Committees For Information  
Professor Herbert L. Weith
7. Question Time
8. [University Senate Document 04-1](#)  
Nominees for University Censure and Dismissal  
Procedures Committee For Action  
Professor Charles E. Kline
9. [University Senate Document 04-2](#)  
Proposed changes to the University Senate Bylaws For Discussion  
Professor William L. McBride
10. [University Senate Document 04-3](#)  
Proposed change to the University Senate Bylaws For Discussion  
Professor William L. McBride
11. [International Student and Institutional Challenges  
in the Post 9-11 World](#) For Information  
Professor Michael Brzezinski
12. New Business
13. Memorial Resolutions
14. Adjournment

## UNIVERSITY SENATE

First Meeting, Monday, 13 September 2004, 2:30 p.m.  
Room 302, Stewart Center

**Present:** *President Martin C. Jischke, William L. McBride (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Brian A. Alenskis, Kristine J. Anderson, Carol L. Baird, Thomas Bauman, Alan M. Beck, Rodney J. Bertolet, Evelyn Blackwood, JennieMarie Blankert, Richard E. Blanton, George M. Bodner, James R. Bottum, Mark D. Bowman, Shorna R. Broussard, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, John M. Connor, Susan E. Conners, Patrick E. Connolly, John J. Contreni, Terry L. Davidson, Sharon DeVaney, Otto C. Doering III, Harold G. Donnelly, Linda M. Duttlinger, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Richard O. Fanjoy, Wendy S. Flory, Greg N. Frederickson, Eric S. Furgason, Richard F. Ghiselli, April J. Ginther, Alten Grandt, John G. Graveel, James P. Greenan, Bruce Hamaker, William A. Harper, Nathan W. Harter, L. Tony Hawkins, R. Neal Houze, Steven D. Johnson, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Charles E. Kline, Daniel J. Kovenock, Christine M. Ladisch, C. S. George Lee, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, David R. McMillin, Cary A. Mitchell, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Rab Mukerjea, Hisao Nakanishi, Robert E. Novak, Michael R. Oliver, Daryl L. Orth, Frank V. Paladino, Richard C. Penney, Barry Pittendrigh, Patrice D. Rankine, J. Paul Robinson, George E. Rogers, Alysa C. Rollock, John R. Rousselle, Robert Sabol, Dan E. Schendel, Aaron Schnur, Richard Schweickert, Keith E. Schwingendorf, Deb Sheets, Timothy L. Skvarenina, Glenn G. Sparks, David L. Stanley, Terry S. Stewart, A. Charlene Sullivan, Bernard Y. Tao, Alain S. Togbe, Phillip J. VanFossen, Ralph Webb, H. Lee Weith, Sirje Laurel Weldon, Clarence W. Wilkerson, David J. Williams, G. Thomas Wilson, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

**Absent:** *Professors Lonnie D. Bentley, J. Stuart Bolton, Yan Chen, David R. Gaskell, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Mark A. Green, Vickie J. Killion, Thomas Kuczek, Sally Mason, Sean McDeavitt, Mark Morgan, Cindy H. Nakatsu, David E. Nichols, Morgan R. Olsen, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Kenneth R. Robinson, Thomas B. Robinson, William T. Robinson, Farshid Sadeghi, John A. Sautter, Marcia C. Stephenson, Jacqueline Walcott-McQuigg, Whitney Walton, Yuehwern Yih and Michael Zoltowski.*

**Guests:** *Tonya Brown, Abby Gustus and Amy Raley.*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor William McBride at 2:30 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 19 April 2004 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
4. President Martin C. Jischke presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A). There were no questions from the floor.
5. Professor William L. McBride presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).
6. Professor H. Lee Weith, the chair of the Steering Committee presented, for information, the Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees. Professor Weith invited the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Professor Zinsmeister, to rise and describe the upcoming faculty forum on tenure and promotion. Professor Zinsmeister announced that the open forum will be held Thursday 16 September 2004 at 3 p.m. and encouraged his colleagues to attend and pass the word to their fellow faculty members.

7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor. No questions were forthcoming.
8. Professor Charles E. Kline presented, for action, University Senate Document 04-1, Nominees for the University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee. He placed into nomination the following: for the 4 vacancies for regular members of the committee he nominated Professors Purna Das (1) of Physics/North Central Campus, Clint Rusk (1) of YDAE, Mary Carole Pistole (2) of Educational Studies, and Lyle L. Lloyd (2) of Educational Studies; for one vacancy for an alternate member of the committee he nominated Professor K. R. Johnson (2) of the Library/North Central Campus. The persons elected are to serve the period of years shown following each name. Professor Kline moved acceptance of the document. This motion was seconded and approved by a voice vote without dissent.
9. The chair, Professor McBride, introduced Document 04-2, *Changes to University Senate Bylaws*. Professor McBride provided the rationale for each proposed change. In essence, the change in part 3.40 *Sergeant at Arms* will legitimize the current practice of the Senate in which the administrative assistant to the Secretary of Faculties serves in this role. The change to part 5.11 (b) (1) *Duties and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee* eliminates the requirement to ask Vice Presidents to submit annual reports to the Senate. In reality, this has not been done for some time. However, Vice Presidents and others may still be asked to address the Senate on issues of importance to the faculty.

Following a brief discussion, Professor Weith moved suspension of the rules so that Document 04-2 could be voted on during the current meeting. The move was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote. After suspension of the rules, Professor Weith made a motion to approve Document 04-2. This motion was seconded and also passed unanimously by voice vote. The changes in the Senate Bylaws will now be implemented.

10. Professor McBride introduced, for discussion, Document 04-3, *Change to University Senate Bylaws*. Professor McBride provided the rationale for the proposed change in part 3.20 *Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate*. The rationale is below.

“While there are disadvantages, of course, to restricting the choice of future nominees, who after this year would be chosen vice chairperson with the right of succession to chairperson, to those having at least two more years in their Senate terms, it must be remembered (1) that many first-year senators will most likely, if the past is any guide, be repeaters as senators, not “first-termers,” and hence have plenty of experience and be well qualified already; and (2) that the various schools will have (or **should** have!) reported the names of their electees **to** the Senate by the time of this election **in** the Senate, and so any current Senator in his or her third year who has been elected again would also be eligible. (Only second-year senators would not.)

The main advantage of the change is to me very obvious: to guarantee that a new chairperson will already have had the experience gained from having served as vice chairperson during the previous year. This is the way many, many organizations do it, and I think it is time for us to do it (as a formal practice and not just something that sometimes occurs) as well, carrying out Bill Harper’s wishes along these lines. Another advantage is to eliminate the great personal

awkwardness that has almost always accompanied the carrying out of our current arrangement, when the annual election has actually been held.

As far as the substitution of “at least two” for “three” nominees in paragraph (b) is concerned, this was suggested to me as a way of making the Nominating Committee’s task easier in the future. It would remain the case, of course, that nominations could be made from the floor.”

A brief discussion followed during which the suggestion was made, by Professor Schendel, that the document be modified by way of a friendly amendment that would permit all sitting Senators, together with those elected to the Senate for the following year, to be eligible for nomination. Other friendly suggestions were made and Professor Weith moved that the document be returned to committee so that the suggestions could be included in the document. This motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote.

11. The chair introduced Professor Michael Brzezinski, Director, Office of International Students and Scholars, who addressed the senate on International Student and Institutional Change in a Post 9-11 World. Following the presentation Professor Brzezinski answered several questions from the floor.
12. There was no new business.
13. There were no memorial resolutions.
14. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**REMARKS BY PRESIDENT MARTIN C. JISCHKE**

Thank you very much. Good afternoon to all of you. And a belated welcome back to the University and welcome back to the University Senate. I hope you all had a productive, enjoyable, wonderful summer and that your school year is off to a very, very good start. I am certainly ready to get started on what might be the most exciting year we have had since I arrived at Purdue.

We have just admitted another record-setting freshman class. We are very pleased with both the quality and number of applications for admission. We have actually received a record-setting number of applications. This year we had 24,003 freshman applicants, which is up a thousand over a year ago. This includes an increase of 440 from Indiana residents. This fall we enrolled 461 more freshman students than last year for a total of 7,128. This larger freshman class was to offset a relevantly large graduating class. The actual total enrollment for the University is down ever so slightly. The average entering freshman student had a 3.4 high school grade point average and 53 percent of the new students had at least a 3.5 grade point average. The average SAT score of an incoming freshman is almost exactly what it has been for the past two years, in this case 1149. That is 15 points higher than three years ago. By the full range of measures, this may be the best prepared incoming freshman class that we have had in some time. Purdue because of these growing applications is becoming a more selective University. I hope, in particular, that you are seeing this in the classroom in that you teach.

These freshman students not only arrive with the needed academic skills, but two-thirds also took part in our voluntary week long Boiler Gold Rush orientation program. This is a truly excellent program that has become a national model. It helps these new students become more acclimated, it helps them with networking, familiarity with the campus, and helps them build friendships. It is guided by volunteer upper classmen, nearly 400 upper classmen come back to participate in BGR. It is, to a large extent, a social occasion. But all the programs pack powerful, practical messages that prepare these newcomers for success. All of this is designed to lead to better grades and ultimately to a stronger likelihood of success and graduation.

Our target number of freshman students this fall was 6,925. We actually came in 3 percent above that. Our target undergraduate enrollment was 30,751. We came in at 30,747. We missed by four! Out of almost 31,000 students it is 0.01 percent. This is amazing, quite remarkable and terrific. Enrollment at our professional programs is up. We enrolled 900 in the fall of 2003. A year ago this year, our goal was 896 but we actually enrolled 924 students in these programs. We have experienced a slight decline in our graduate programs. Last year we enrolled an all-time high of 7,096, this year our target was 7,100. We actually have 6,982 graduate students on campus — down slightly over 100. The number of new graduate students is about the same as last year, but more students have completed advanced degrees and graduated, bringing the total number down. In addition, fewer employer-funded students sought admission to the Graduate School. Our strategic plan calls for increasing the size of our graduate program. This is very important to support a growing research mission and a growing faculty base. To accomplish this, we are at work now across the campus evaluating our efforts at recruitment and trying to lay foundations so that we can resume the growth of our graduate enrollment.

International enrollment has been impacted, we think, by the time involved in obtaining visas and other concerns. This also impacts our graduate school. The number of new international

students enrolled is about the same as last year, but the overall total is down 136 to 1,943 undergraduates and 2,978 graduate and professional students. Some of the decrease is due to last year's large graduating undergraduate class. But also, in addition, we believe many prospective international students interested in studying here in the United States are concerned about a lengthy student visa application process. Many of these individuals are fearful that they will not be able to secure a visa in a timely fashion, so some choose to study elsewhere. We also believe that other countries in the world have become more aggressive in the recruitment of international students, so the competition for these most talented young people is notching up. I believe Mike Brzezinski was going to be talking about that later. We believe though, none the less, that we continue to enroll more international students than any other public university in the nation. We continue to make, happily, gains in undergraduate diversity. The number of African Americans on campus this fall is up 2.4 percent to a 1,058. We have 1,547 Asian-Americans, that's up 5.3 percent. There are 746 Hispanics on campus – an increase of 4.6 percent. We have 137 Native Americans enrolled, up 11.4 percent. If you add this all up, undergraduate ethnic groups have increased by 4.5 percent. Another bright spot for diversity is that 3,069 women joined the freshman class that is up 334 from a year ago. On our other campuses, a growth in credit hours reflects an increase in the number of traditional students that are applying at Calumet, North Central, Fort Wayne, IUPUI and the Statewide Technology Program. In Fort Wayne, IPFW is showing record credit hour enrollment with the addition of its first 580-bed residence hall. This year, headcount and credit hours total 11,810 and 120,114 respectively at Fort Wayne. Those are up a bit from last year.

Another dynamic is that Purdue last year began what we call a collaborative admission policy process. A student who is academically qualified but can not be admitted and accommodated here in West Lafayette is offered admission to Purdue's other campuses across the state. Through this collaborative admissions process, 1,919 people – just under 2000 – who otherwise might not have been accommodated at West Lafayette are getting the opportunity to study at one of Purdue's other campuses. We are doing all we can to accommodate our Indiana students who meet Purdue standards. Our campus totals this fall are:

- Purdue Calumet – 9,222 that compares to 9,129 a year ago
- Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis – Purdue programs 4,205 enrolled this year is down slightly from 4,264 a year ago
- Purdue North Central – 3,441 versus 3,469 a year ago
- Statewide Technology is up one – 824 FTE students compared to 823 a year ago

I want to publicly offer congratulations to Doug Christiansen and all those who work in admissions and enrollment management in bringing these students to us. I think they do an absolutely incredible job of keeping our enrollment management numbers on target and at the same time sustaining the quality and diversity of our student body.

We are also making considerable progress on our strategic plans for the Campaign for Purdue. You may recall, I hope you recall, that the campaign goal is to raise \$1.3 billion by the year 2007; June 30<sup>th</sup> 2007 to be precise. We are making great progress. After four years in this campaign, we have now raised \$980 million; that is 75 percent of our goal. As you know one of our strategic plan goals is to increase the size of the faculty here in West Lafayette by 300 and increase the time they spend in the classroom and thereby reduce our reliance on graduate teaching assistants. As of this fall, we have added 146 positions. In 2005-2006 we plan to add 54 more faculty, bringing us to 200, closer to our goal.

We continue progressing with Discovery Park. Right now in Discovery Park under construction are our \$58 million Birck Nanotechnology Center, a \$15 million Bindley Bioscience Center, and

a \$25 million biomedical engineering building. Our \$7 million Burton D. Morgan Center for Entrepreneurship to help move these discoveries into the marketplace is finished and open. It is a quite attractive building. You may want to take a look at it. It is a place for meetings and gatherings. The nanoscience and bioscience buildings should be ready in 2005, a little less than a year from now. The biomedical engineering building will be open in 2006. We will break ground on a \$10 million e-Enterprise Center this fall. We have added two more centers to this exciting area – a Center for Advanced Manufacturing and a Discovery Learning Center that we are about to begin designing a new facility for. Overall our plans call for investments of more than three-quarters of a billion dollars in new and upgraded facilities. Our strategic plans include 40 buildings. In addition to everything I have mentioned in Discovery Park, this fall we will dedicate a new \$20 million addition to Chemical Engineering, now named Forney Hall. We will also dedicate the \$16 million new Dauch Alumni Center. We will break ground this fall on a new \$20 million Computer Science Building. And we believe we have completed fund raising for a \$47.7 million multipurpose engineering building at the corner of Northwestern and Stadium avenues. You have no doubt noticed that the temporary barracks at Northwestern and Stadium are gone. For the record, those temporary barracks were there for 56 years! I do not know how long it takes for something to be standing on the Purdue Campus before it is to be considered permanent. But it's apparently a very long time and longer than 56 years. I can promise you that the temporary barracks are not temporarily gone. Their removal is quite permanent. The site will be used for the new multi purpose engineering facility. The fine arts classes that were held there have been moved to the new \$42 million Visual and Performing Arts Building which I am told is quite an achievement and a wonderful place in which to learn and teach.

As we work on these strategic plans we are also working with our governor and the General Assembly on our needs for the coming biennium. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education met in this building last Friday to hear brief summaries of the various budget requests from public institutions including from Purdue. One of our major initiatives before the General Assembly this coming year is the area of repair and maintenance, or what we call R&R for repair and rehabilitation. Purdue has over 400 buildings across more than 18,000 acres on four campuses and quite a number of agricultural and research properties literally all across the state. This represents a capital investment whose value easily exceeds \$4 billion. Protecting this investment is our top, highest capital priority. Over the last four years, Purdue has received from the state about \$2 million in so called R&R repair and rehabilitation funds. This is a dramatic reduction from a long standing formula that called for the state to invest \$60 million over the same period. So rather than receiving \$60 million we receive two. Unfortunately during the past ten years, our state has been able to fully fund the repair and rehabilitation formula only once. As a consequence, it will not surprise you, we are beginning to develop a backlog of deferred maintenance. It is estimated currently at just over \$116 million. In deferred renewal, this is not in the nature of fixing roofs and tuck pointing buildings, but upgrading facilities to meet their current use. That is estimated at an additional \$293 million. You add those two together and that is over \$400 million – very sizeable. We think it is very important that the state maintain the investment it has in this physical plant by fully funding Repair and Rehabilitation and infrastructure as part of the next biennium budget.

I want to make one brief comment that I hope at some meeting there will be an opportunity for a more expansive presentation, but we are also concerned about the infrastructure of our software. Particularly the software that is used to carry out the basic management functions of the University such as our accounting systems, our human resource systems, and the student information system. We have been working very hard – including the Provost Sally Mason, the Executive Vice President and Treasurer Ken Burns, and soon to be Morgan Olsen who will be here on October 11<sup>th</sup>, Jim Bottum and others – on what we call an ERP project. ERP stands for Enterprise Resource Planning and it's a term of art to describe these major software

systems that we use to carry out the work of the University. We have systems that involve software that is easily 30 if not 40 years old and the systems are becoming increasingly brittle and unstable. Unstable meaning that if you make a small adjustment in one area of the software, it has unintended consequences in other areas of the software. Unstable meaning that those unintended consequences swamp it and pretty soon it is out of control. We become increasingly reluctant to modify this software, and in addition if that were not enough, those who originally sold us the software are either not in business any more or no longer support the software. And finally, there are features we would like to have in that software – one example being plus-minus grading that we simply cannot do. This is a massive undertaking. We estimate it will take 4-5 years, tens of millions of dollars, and we are working very, very hard to be very careful and deliberate in the planning of the development of the software. It will ultimately affect all of us and certainly members of the faculty in terms of their access to student records and the kinds of information that you use as part of your work in helping our students learn and grow. We have made a couple of very basic decisions already on the nature of our approach; one of them is the decision to build a single instance package. That means the entire Purdue system will operate by the same software. We will not have a different student information system in West Lafayette than we do at Calumet, in North Central than we do at Fort Wayne. That means some adjustments for all of us. And second we are adopting, in the vernacular of this business, the plain vanilla approach. What that means is that once a vendor is selected, we are going to try not to modify that software at all if we can possibly avoid it. The reasons for this are pretty fundamental. One of them is cost. It costs a lot of money to adapt that software but worse it costs a lot in the long run because the company that sold it to you will not support your variant of it. And so for cost reasons and also to assure that we capture the efficiencies we think that are in this new software, we are adopting the so-called plain vanilla approach. Now today's plain vanilla is a lot more multi-flavored than the plain vanilla of 3 or 4 years ago that was being sold around the country. But this is a very, very major undertaking for the University. We are structuring an approach that will allow for a lot of communication and involvement by people who are affected; it will be lead by the Executive Vice President and Treasurer and the Provost as the two administrative leaders of this effort. There will be steering committees and there will be opportunities for people from the senate or their representatives to be involved. I will be making, along with Morgan Olsen and others, presentations to the Board in November laying out our strategy. I bring this to you more in the nature of a "get ready" – we are planning this – we are committed to doing it; but to let you know that this is coming.

Finally, let me take an opportunity to thank all of you for all that you are doing and through you all of your colleagues. We are making amazing progress here at Purdue. It is a very exciting time at our University. Reaching these goals that we have laid out is not easy work, it is a lot of work, but I believe one of the reasons we are succeeding is the remarkable quality and commitment of our faculty and staff. I – – but I think I speak for everybody who cares about Purdue, our Board of Trustees, and the people of Indiana – – deeply appreciate your commitment to Purdue and your commitment to our students. And I for one am looking forward to working with all of you this coming year. Thank you very much. Thank you.

## **REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR WILLIAM L. MCBRIDE**

I would like to begin by recognizing and welcoming all the new members of the Senate, some of whom are returning after previous stints, and some of whom are truly new, that is, first-time members. I would like to call special attention to three new members – Jennie Blankert, the President of the newly-formed Purdue Graduate Student Association, about which more later; Aaron Schnur, the new President of the Purdue Student Association; and Prof. Frank Paladino of the Biology Department at IPFW, who is the first Senator from the Fort Wayne campus to participate in the Senate for some years.

As President Jischke has indicated and I would like to repeat, we are off to a good start in a number of ways.

I am especially pleased to have the Purdue Faculty website online as of the beginning of this academic year. I just happen to be here for its debut, but it is the product of a lot of past work by Professor Camp, the Secretary of Faculties, by my predecessor as Senate Chairperson, Professor Harper; and by a number of others. As I have indicated on the website itself, we consider this to be a work in progress, with much left to do. In connection with this, we would greatly appreciate receiving feedback concerning possible improvements through the website's interactive "suggestions" section.

The website, which as I hope everyone now knows is [www.purdue.edu/faculty](http://www.purdue.edu/faculty), has a feature involving a monthly questionnaire that has already elicited considerable interest. (By the way, in response to some who have wondered about this, this questionnaire has a feature built into it that prevents multiple votes by the same individual.) We decided to have our first question concern the possibility, which has recently been resurrected after having lain relatively dormant for ten years or more, of establishing a faculty club on our West Lafayette campus. The response thus far among those who have chosen to answer this question has been overwhelmingly positive.

On the issue of a faculty club, an *ad hoc*, voluntary committee has now been formed, consisting of Professors Camp, Bernard Tao, and J. Paul Robinson. They hope to meet soon and then to work in co-operation with Provost Mason with a view to exploring options. There are at present no guarantees that we will have a club at all, much less very soon, but we intend to work on the issue as hard as possible, because it is obviously of great importance to many colleagues.

For those who are new to the Senate (or, for that matter, to the Purdue University faculty, when the minutes of this meeting are distributed), one of the principal roles of the Chairperson's report is to convey some of the highlights of the most recent Board of Trustees meeting, whenever one has taken place since the last Senate meeting. Since the Board of Trustees did hold a stated meeting on June 4, I shall now proceed briefly to review it and make a few comments about it, while at the same time noting that full details are available on the website [www.purdue.edu/bot](http://www.purdue.edu/bot) .

Once each year, the Board of Trustees meets at a Purdue site other than West Lafayette. Its early summer meeting last year was at IUPUI; this year it was at Fort Wayne. That campus (which I myself had not visited in some time, since the days when it was less autonomous than now and the only humanities department under Purdue's jurisdiction there was my department, philosophy), is growing enormously, really flourishing. There has been and is considerable new

construction, one of the most noteworthy parts of which is the first campus residence halls, which I was told are quite plush.

The first major actions at the Trustees' meeting, then, were the appointments of Dr. Fawwaz Ulaby as Vice President for Research, an appointment from which, sadly, he soon thereafter withdrew for personal reasons; of James Mullins as Dean of Libraries; and of John Contreni, who had been Acting Dean of the Graduate School, as Dean.

Next came the appointments of James Nairne as Distinguished Professor of Psychological Sciences and of John Barron as Loeb Professor of Economics. It is worth pointing out from time to time that the Purdue Trustees' custom of inviting those who are going to be elevated to Distinguished and to certain Named Professorships to come to the meeting and have an exchange with them, which as I understand it is rather unique among universities of our size, is one in which the members of the Board take genuine pleasure, as they often remark.

There followed reports from Morgan Burke, Director of Athletics, with special emphasis on our student athletes' academic achievements; from Vice President for Advancement Murray Blackwelder on the rather spectacular progress of the Campaign for Purdue, and from Vice Provost Don Gentry on engagement. Our outgoing Senate Chairperson Professor Bill Harper then gave his farewell address to the Trustees. Aaron Schnur, the new President of the Purdue Student Government, spoke next. The final reports of the morning highlighted achievements on the Fort Wayne campus. They were presented by IPFW Chancellor Michael Wartell; by the Speaker of the Purdue Faculty of IPFW Professor Elaine Blackmore, the Chair of the Psychology Department there; and by Christopher Yahne, the Student Government President

The Trustees next approved the creation of an Associate of Science degree in applied biotechnologies and of a Bachelor of Science degree in Biotechnology at our IUPUI School of Science, and of an MFA degree, now generally recognized as the terminal degree in Art and Design, to replace the M.A. degree in those fields here in West Lafayette.

The Golf Training Center was named in honor of Tom Spurgeon, and various contracts for construction and improvements were let, beginning with a contract to build a Biomedical Engineering Building.

Recent gifts to the University of more than \$1,000,000 by Mr. William & Mrs. R. Jean Beard and by Pfizer, Inc. were noted gratefully.

It then came time for official good-byes, filled with appropriate encomiums for all their contributions, as Emeritus status was conferred on retiring Vice Provost Don Gentry and on retiring Executive Vice-President and Treasurer Ken Burns.

Finally, there was one more good-bye: Trustee Wayne Townsend announced that he had requested the Governor not to reappoint him after fifteen years' service on the Board (and many years before that with the Indiana General Assembly). There were many statements of tribute from other Board members.

Subsequently, in an interesting and unusual development, the Governor announced the appointment of Wayne Townsend's son, Mark, as his replacement.

On Aug. 19, I represented the Senate at a very pleasant, informal meeting of undergraduate student leaders, organized by Dean of Students Tony Hawkins and his office, at Camp Tecumseh in Brookston.

I have a few additional announcements. First, formal recognition has been given to the Purdue Graduate Student Government as a separate organization. The Purdue Student Government has endorsed this development. Henceforth, then, there will be two separate student government organizations instead of just one. The Senate is not required to take any action on this, because article 2b4 of our bylaws, on membership, simply stipulates that whoever is appointed representative by whatever graduate student association has been recognized by the Graduate Council shall be a (non-voting) member of the Senate; that individual will henceforth be the President of the PGSG. But I do want to acknowledge and welcome this new arrangement.

We require a second Senator, in addition to Professor Cindy Nakatsu, who has already offered her services, to volunteer to be a member of the Volunteer Benefits Advisory Committee (VBAC), working on staff benefits.

The special Faculty Forum, postponed from spring, concerning proposed changes in the composition of Primary Committees will be held later this week, on the afternoon of September 16, as Professor William Zinsmeister will announce under agenda item #6.

Finally, I should mention that the next Senate meeting will include reports by both Provost Mason, especially concerning ERP but also other issues of major importance to the faculty this year, and by Brent Bowditch, who will be talking about the forthcoming changes in the structure and costs of medical benefits, as well as some of the achievements of his office in terms of medical cost reductions. I expect it to be a fairly long meeting, but a very interesting one. Meanwhile, I am very happy that Michael Brzezinski will be speaking today on an issue that has been and remains of particular concern to me – as it should to everyone at Purdue, given the importance of international students and post-Doctoral fellows for us – namely, the additional difficulties in terms of time, cost, and uncertainty that potential newcomers to this group are experiencing due to changes in Federal policies and procedures.

As President Jischke has remarked, we are living through very exciting times here; I agree completely. But I also note that these same times are in certain respects very “interesting,” in the sense that living through interesting times is sometimes said to be a curse. May we continue this year to be more blessed than cursed!

## Appendix C

13 September 2004

TO: University Senate  
FROM: Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson, Steering Committee  
SUBJECT: Resume of Items Under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

### STEERING COMMITTEE

Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson  
weith@purdue.edu

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is the organization and distribution of the agenda for each meeting of the University Senate. This committee also receives communications from any faculty member or group of members and directs such communications to appropriate committees or officers for attention.

### ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William L. McBride, Chairperson of the Senate  
wmcbride@purdue.edu

The responsibility of the University Senate Advisory Committee is to advise the President and/or Board of Trustees on any matter of concern to the faculty.

### NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Charles E. Kline, Chairperson  
chuck@purdue.edu

The major task of the Nominating Committee comes in the spring in making nominations for senate and University committees. Nominations are made at other times to fill vacancies as they occur.

### EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

George M. Bodner, Chairperson  
gmbodner@purdue.edu

1. University policy on commercial note-taking in class
2. Final exam scheduling
3. Reporting date for course grades

### FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

William J. Zinsmeister, Chairperson  
wjzins@purdue.edu

1. Grade Appeals Process
2. Committee on Informetrics
3. Follow-up on faculty development review
4. Tenure Promotion Process

### STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Terry L. Davidson, Chairperson  
davidson@psych.purdue.edu

1. Review of the Student Bill of Rights
2. Follow-up concerning the Student Conduct Code
3. Follow-up concerning the OnePurdue system
4. Follow-up with Student Services Office concerning the proposed Disciplinary Process
5. Currently examining the proposed Exam Proctoring system

### UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

John R. Rousselle, Chairperson  
rousselj@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budget process
  2. Review of Faculty Committees
- Vice Chair of the Senate, Timothy L. Skvarenina, [tskvaren@purdue.edu](mailto:tskvaren@purdue.edu)  
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr.  
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

**CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION**

<b>SENATE DOCUMENT</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>ORIGIN</b>	<b>SENATE</b>
*04-1	Nominees for University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 9/13/04
*04-2	Proposed changes to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor William L. McBride	Approved 9/13/04
04-3	Proposed change to the University Senate bylaws	Professor William L. McBride	For Discussion 9/13/04

\*Approved

13 September 2004

TO: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee  
SUBJECT: Nominees for University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee  
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate, Executive Memorandum B-48  
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees for service on the University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee. The persons elected are to serve the period of years shown following each name.

A. For the 4 vacancies for regular members it proposes Professors:

Purna Das	1	Physics
Clint Rusk	1	YDAE
Mary Carole Pistole	2	Educational Studies
Lyle L. Lloyd	2	Educational Studies

B. As an alternate member it proposes Professor:

K.R. Johnson	2	Library/North Central
--------------	---	-----------------------

Approving:

Natalie J. Carroll  
Linda M. Duttlinger  
Gabriele F. Giuliani  
Charles E. Kline  
Patrice D. Rankine

Absent:

Bruce R. Hamaker  
J. Paul Robinson  
Glenn G. Sparks  
Whitney Walton (on sabbatical)  
S. Laurel Weldon

**To:** The University Senate  
**From:** Professor William L. McBride  
**Subject:** Changes to University Senate Bylaws  
**References:** University Senate Bylaws; University Senate Documents 77-7  
and 77-15  
**Disposition:** University Senate for Discussion

**Proposed**

*3.40 Sergeant at Arms*

The sergeant at arms shall be designated each year by the president from among the members of the faculty who are not members of the senate, *or from among members of the university staff*, for a term beginning on June 1.

*5.11 (b) (1) Duties and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee*

The Steering Committee may invite vice presidents, or others judged to possess information of special concern to the senate, to report annually on matters of general interest within their areas of responsibility, at which time members of the senate shall have the opportunity to put questions, whether or not related to the report.

**Present**

*3.40 Sergeant at Arms*

The sergeant at arms shall be designated each year by the president from among the members of the faculty who are not members of the senate, for a term beginning on June 1.

*5.11 (b) (1) Duties and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee*

The Steering Committee may invite vice presidents, or others judged to possess information of special concern to the senate, to report annually on matters of general interest within their areas of responsibility, at which time members of the senate shall have the opportunity to put questions, whether or not related to the report. Those vice presidents not so invited shall be asked to submit annually brief written reports which will be included in the senate minutes.†

## **Rationales for Change:**

### *3.40 Sergeant at Arms*

We are not currently, nor have we for many years been, in compliance with this bylaw as it now reads. It might be easiest to leave open as a future possibility that a faculty member might some day be the sergeant at arms, while legitimizing current practice, according to which the administrative assistant to the Secretary of Faculties exercises this function.

### *5.11 (b) (1) Duties and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee*

We have not done this for a long time, and there are now probably too many vice presidents to expect compliance if we were to try to enforce it. It has been suggested that in the future we should draw up a list of vice presidents from whom we would like to get such reports, and request them, but not have it as a presumed mandate (“shall be asked”) in our bylaws.

**To:** The University Senate  
**From:** Professor William L. McBride  
**Subject:** Change to University Senate Bylaws  
**References:** University Senate Bylaws; University Senate Documents 76-2, 89-16,  
90-9, 90-15  
**Disposition:** University Senate for Discussion

**Proposed**

3.20 *Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate*

- (a) The chairperson and the vice chairperson shall each serve for a term of one year beginning June 1. *Beginning with the academic year 2005-06, the vice chairperson shall succeed the chairperson. Election of both during the academic year 2004-05, and of the vice chairperson in subsequent years, shall be elected by secret ballot at the regular March meeting of the University Senate.*
- (b) At the regular February meeting of the University Senate *during the academic year 2004-05 the* Nominating Committee shall nominate *at least two* members of the University Senate for the offices of chairperson *and vice chairperson, and for the office of vice chairperson in subsequent years.* Additional nominations shall be accepted from the floor at any time before the election. Nominees must be elected, continuing senators, *with two years remaining in their senate terms for nominees in years subsequent to the academic year 2004-05.* Brief resumes of the academic, administrative, and senate service of each nominee shall be distributed at the time of nomination.

**Present**

3.20 *Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate*

- a) The chairperson and the vice chairperson shall each serve for a term of one year beginning June 1 and may succeed himself/herself or one another. They shall be elected by secret ballot at the regular March meeting of the University Senate.
- b) At the regular February meeting of the University Senate the Nominating Committee shall nominate three members of the University Senate for the office of chairperson. Additional nominations shall be accepted from the floor at any time before the election. Nominees must be elected, continuing senators. Brief resumes of the academic, administrative, and senate service of each nominee shall be distributed at the time of nomination.
- c) To be elected chairperson, a candidate must receive a majority of the votes cast. If no candidate receives a majority on the first ballot, a second vote shall be taken to choose between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes on the first ballot. The vice chairperson shall be chosen from the remaining candidates (and any nominated specifically by the Nominating Committee or from the floor) by the same electoral process.

- c) To be elected chairperson *during the academic year 2004-05, and to be elected vice chairperson in subsequent years*, a candidate must receive a majority of the votes cast. If no candidate receives a majority on the first ballot, a second vote shall be taken to choose between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes on the first ballot. *During the academic year 2004-05, the vice chairperson shall be chosen from the remaining candidates (and any nominated specifically by the Nominating Committee or from the floor) by the same electoral process, subject to the condition that he or she have two years remaining in his or her senate term.*

## **Rationales for Change:**

### *3.20 Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate*

While there are disadvantages, of course, to restricting the choice of future nominees, who after this year would be chosen vice chairperson with the right of succession to chairperson, to those having at least two more years in their Senate terms, it must be remembered (1) that many first-year senators will most likely, if the past is any guide, be repeaters as senators, not “first-termers,” and hence have plenty of experience and be well qualified already; and (2) that the various schools will have (or **should** have!) reported the names of their electees **to** the Senate by the time of this election **in** the Senate, and so any current Senator in his or her third year who has been elected again would also be eligible. (Only second-year senators would not.)

The main advantage of the change is to me very obvious: to guarantee that a new chairperson will already have had the experience gained from having served as vice chairperson during the previous year. This is the way many, many organizations do it, and I think it is time for us to do it (as a formal practice and not just something that sometimes occurs) as well, carrying out Bill Harper’s wishes along these lines. Another advantage is to eliminate the great personal awkwardness that has almost always accompanied the carrying out of our current arrangement, when the annual election has actually been held.

As far as the substitution of “at least two” for “three” nominees in paragraph (b) is concerned, this was suggested to me as a way of making the Nominating Committee’s task easier in the future. It would remain the case, of course, that nominations could be made from the floor.

**Presentation**  
**by**  
**Michael A. Brzezinski, Ed.D.**  
**Director, International Students and Scholars**  
**Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Studies**

**Institutional and International Student Challenges**  
**in the Post 9-11 Era**

**Regulatory Results of 9-11**

Approximately 40 regulatory changes in 18 months following

9/11 jump-started the international student tracking database, SEVIS

- SEVIS affects when, how, and how often data is reported
- It is an unfunded mandate
- It affects some student perceptions of us. We have the role of service provider as well as the role of monitor for the government; the latter relationship has always existed, but it is far more extensive now.
- Dept. of Homeland Security (DHS) SEVIS fee of \$100 went into effect this month, September 1<sup>st</sup>

**Visa Delays**

1. Security and Background Checks (Security Advisory Opinions or SAOs).
  - in 2002, 60 days or more
  - in 2004, 30 - 60 days
  - Who is affected?
  
2. Technology Alert List (TAL)
  - examples - Nuclear Technology, Navigation and Guidance Control, Chemical and Biotechnology Engineering, Materials Technology, Information Security
  - Who is affected?

**Overseas Reactions to US Government's Response**

Strong perceptions exist abroad that the US is no longer friendly toward international students. This perception, coupled with visa delays and the very aggressive recruitment efforts of the UK, Australia and New Zealand has impacted the flow of international students to the US, including Purdue.

## **Direct Consequences to Purdue University**

Decreasing number of applications + similar number of offers of admission + decreasing yield rates = declining enrollment of new students from abroad.

Current international student enrollment is 4,921, highest among US public institutions. Of most concern is the significant decline in the number of new international graduate students in 2003 and 2004.

## **How do we (Purdue) combat these consequences?**

### Advocacy

1. SAOs and TAL are here to stay. We cannot make them “go away.” We have seen some improvements in visa application processing times.
2. We need to advocate for further improvements in the visa application process and simultaneously encourage the Department of State to actively promote the flow of student talent to our country.
3. We must continue to advocate for these issues in conjunction with NASULGC, AAU, NAFSA, as well as on our own.

### Internal Issues for Graduate Committees/Individual Faculty Members

1. We need to encourage students to apply for admission to graduate programs earlier.
2. We need to process applications in a timely, efficient manner and to make admission decisions earlier.
3. We need to make TA/RA/fellowship award decisions earlier.
4. We need to begin to actively recruit international graduate students. International Programs, in conjunction with The Graduate School, is developing possible strategies to share with academic schools and departments in the near future.