

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Third Meeting, Monday, 17 November 2003, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor William A. Harper
2. Approval of Minutes of 20 October 2003
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. Remarks by the President President Martin C. Jischke
5. [Report of the Chairperson](#) Professor William A. Harper
6. [Resume of Items Under Consideration](#)
by Various Standing Committees For Information
Professor Herbert L. Weith
7. Question Time
8. [University Senate Document 03-3](#)
Reapportionment of the University Senate For Discussion
Professor Herbert L. Weith
9. [University Senate Document 03-4](#)
Resolution Supporting the Creation of a University
Undergraduate Honors Program For Discussion
Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
10. New Business
11. [Memorial Resolutions](#)
12. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Third Meeting, 17 November 2003, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *William A. Harper (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Kristine J. Anderson, Evelyn Blackwood, George M. Bodner, Mark D. Bowman, Shorna R. Broussard, Thomas H. Brush, Kenneth P. Burns, Joseph W. Camp, Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Sharon DeVaney, Harold G. Donnelly, Linda M. Duttlinger, Charlotte A. Erdmann, Wendy S. Flory, Eric S. Furgason, Richard F. Ghiselli, April J. Ginther, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Lawrence T. Glickman, John G. Graveel, Bruce Hamaker, L. Tony Hawkins, Christoph M. Hoffmann, R. Neal Houze, Steven D. Johnson, Will H. Jordan, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Charles E. Kline, Daniel J. Kovenock, Joy Garton Krueger, Christine M. Ladisch, C. S. George Lee, Morris Levy, Howard Mancing, William L. McBride, James D. McGlothlin, Robert E. Montgomery, Matthew E. Morgan (PSG), P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Wallace B. Morrison, Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, David E. Nichols, Daryl L. Orth, David C. Parrish, Richard C. Penney, J. Paul Robinson, George E. Rogers, John R. Rousselle, F. Robert Sabol, John A. Sautter, Dan E. Schendel, Richard Schweickert, K.E. Schwingendorf, Timothy L. Skvarenina, Glenn G. Sparks, Terry S. Stewart, A. Charlene Sullivan, Phillip J. VanFossen, Bruce Watkins, H. Lee Weith, Sirje Laurel Weldon, Clarence W. Wilkerson, G. Thomas Wilson, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Absent: *President Martin C. Jischke, Professors Alan M. Beck, Lonnie D. Bentley, Richard E. Blanton, J. Stuart Bolton, James R. Bottum, Patrick E. Connolly, John M. Connor, Susan Conners, John J. Contreni, Terry L. Davidson, Otto C. Doering III, Peter C. Doerschuk, Wanda S. Fox, David W. Frantz, David R. Gaskell, Mark A. Green, Wei Hong, Thomas Kuczek, James M. Longuski, Sally Mason, David R. McMillin, Craig L. Miller, Cary A. Mitchell, Rab Mukerjea, Robert E. Novak, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Kenneth R. Robinson, Thomas B. Robinson, Alysa C. Rollock, Farshid Sadeghi, David L. Stanley, Jeffrey J. Stuart, Bernard Y. Tao, Mihaela Vorvoreanu (PGSG), Jacqueline Walcott-McQuigg, Whitney Walton, Mary Alice Webb, Donna L. Whitten, Steven E. Widmer, Lisa X. Xu, and Yuehwern Yih.*

Guests: *Amanda Anthony, Solomon Gartenhaus, Amy Raley, Margaret Rowe, and Jerry Sheehan.*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor William A. Harper at 2:30 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 20 October 2003 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
4. The President was not in attendance and no remarks were available.
5. Professor William A. Harper presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix A).
6. Professor Harper mentioned that the Resume of Items under Consideration (see Appendix B) were available and invited questions from the floor. There were no questions from the senators.

7. At question time it was reported that no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor.

Following this invitation, Professor Terry Stewart rose and expressed a concern about the closing of classes to nonmajors and the impact this has had on their choices for elective courses. Professor Stewart has anecdotal information suggesting a trend that schools are limiting their courses to their majors or to students for whom the courses are required. Professor Stewart asked if the leadership of the Senate or the Educational Policy Committee could take up this issue and determine if it is a real trend or merely the appearance of a trend.

The Registrar, Joy Garton-Krueger, rose and commented that the Course Availability Committee exists to handle these issues. Every associate dean or their representative sits on the committee as does Vice Provost Rowe. The committee meets monthly and faculty input is sought by this committee. Registrar Garton-Krueger encouraged Professor Stewart and others who have concerns to express these to this committee through their representative. Further discussion occurred. The consensus of the senate suggested that restrictions have occurred and a combination of insufficient space and not enough faculty played at least some role in these restrictions. However, it is not clear that a trend exists.

Professor Harper stated that he would bring the issue to the Steering Committee, which would refer it to the Educational Policy Committee.

Professor Clarence Wilkerson rose and asked how we would know when the 300 new faculty members had been hired. These are the new faculty members called for in the Strategic Plan.

Professor Harper offered to take the question to the Senate Advisory Committee or the Steering Committee. President Jischke is a member of both of these committees and the question can be brought to him in one or both of these venues.

8. Professor H. Lee Weith, chairperson of the Steering Committee, presented for discussion, University Senate Document 03-3, *Reapportionment of the University Senate 2004-2005*. Professor Weith explained that the bylaws of the Senate call for the Senate to reapportion itself at least once each year and this document responds to this requirement. Professor Weith noted that there were no changes in reapportionment from last year.

So that the Senate could act on the document at this time, Professor Weith moved to suspend the rules. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously in a voice vote. He then moved to adopt University Senate Document 03-3. The motion was seconded and, following a brief discussion, was approved in a voice vote without dissent.

9. Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina presented University Senate Document 03-4, *Establishing a University Undergraduate Honors Program*, to the senate for Discussion. Professor Skvarenina provided a brief history of the current honors programs that exist within the schools of Agriculture, Engineering, Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, and Science. He explained that the honors program currently under consideration would not replace, but would supplement and work in conjunction with the existing honors programs. Professor Skvarenina described that a task force led by Vice Provost Rowe recommended that the Educational Policy Committee consider the establishment of a University Honors Program. University Senate Document 03-4 is the result of the

committee's effort and requests that President Jischke give high priority to establishing a University Honors Program. The document was unanimously endorsed by the Educational Policy Committee.

Following Professor Skvarenina's presentation, numerous questions were asked and a vigorous discussion took place. The first question was "What models were followed?" Vice Provost Rowe responded that the programs at many benchmark institutions were considered, and the Chancellor's Scholars Program (Campus Honors Program) at the University of Illinois was the model adopted by the task force.

Many additional questions about the program were brought to the floor and Vice Provost Rowe, Professor Skvarenina, Professor Harper, and other senators answered these questions.

After the discussion, Professor Skvarenina moved suspension of the rules so that the document could be voted on at this meeting. The motion was seconded and a brief discussion followed. After this discussion, a voice vote was taken, but proved inconclusive. The chair called for a revote and asked that senators in favor of the motion stand and be counted. After those in favor were seated those opposed were asked to stand and be counted. Twenty-two senators voted in favor of the motion and 27 senators voted in opposition. Therefore, the motion to suspend the rules was defeated.

Further discussion took place and several senators expressed concern about the lack of details and information available to the Senate. The consensus of the senators was that a University Honors Program should be established, but that more details were needed before a vote could be taken on the document.

Professor Harper suggested that any additional information or documents that might aid the Senate in its consideration of the issue be brought to the Senate leadership prior to the January meeting.

10. There was no new business.
11. The chair reported that three memorial resolutions had been received for Harold Taylor Christensen, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Susan Kontos, Professor of Child Development and Family Studies, Cheryl Z. Oreovicz, Professor of English/American Studies. At the chair's invitation the senators rose and remained standing for a period of silence out of respect for their departed colleagues. The resolutions are attached to these minutes and copies will be sent to the next of kin.
12. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR WILLIAM HARPER

I would like to focus my report this afternoon on my impressions of two recent meetings I attended, both within a week of one another, and both oddly reinforcing an observation I would like to share with you today. The meetings were the Committee on Institutional Cooperation's annual meeting of faculty representatives, and our recent Board of Trustees meeting.

As most of you are already aware, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation is an academic consortium of the Big Ten Universities, plus the University of Chicago—making it a collaboration of twelve universities. In existence since 1958, the CIC has provided a mechanism to allow these historically quite independent universities to accomplish collectively projects that they might individually find to be far more daunting. For example, their strategic priorities include expanding access to learning opportunities whereby scholars from CIC institutions can share their research resources and work together in graduate student training in unique scholarly areas like American Indian Studies. Or, and another example, the CIC acts as a hub for coordinating study abroad programs so that one university's unmatched study abroad opportunities can be used by students from other CIC institutions. Their Traveling Scholar program, now 40 years old, enables doctoral level students to take advantage of specialized courses, unique library collections, and unusual laboratories at any other CIC university without change in registration or increase in tuition. This sharing of information and resources cuts across many other areas of mutual interest, including library purchases and university press publishing, diversity and equity human resource issues, leveraging of investments in educational technologies, and higher education leadership programs.

One group that meets under the CIC banner is the faculty leaders of the 12 universities. We met on the campus of Ohio State University. The purpose of these annual meetings is to share information with one another regarding faculty issues and concerns that might have mutual relevance. This year there were a number of topics up for discussion, including: the faculty role in university governance; the implications of the Patriot Act on the ability of our institutions to recruit the best graduate students from around the world; the role of faculty in helping slow the gradual erosion of public funding of public universities; and the changing composition of the faculty where non-tenure track positions are in some universities beginning to be equal to or to even out-number its tenure-track faculty.

But what stuck in my mind on returning to campus from these meetings wasn't so much the nature of the issues—however important they are—but the nature of the governance at so many of the other Big Ten universities. It's worth pointing out that in my opinion from the point of view of faculty participation in governance, we are doing quite well at Purdue. I need not get into particulars or re-describe to you our own system, but it was clear that while some of our CIC friends do this better than others with regard to faculty participation in governance issues, it seemed to me that we are doing this much better than most.

You can get the general drift of the governance state of affairs by the nature of the expressed concerns by many of the faculty leaders from other CIC universities:

- There was expressed concern that the administration is connected to the trustees in a way faculty leaders are not, so the administration can thwart the faculty by taking

negative assessments of faculty initiatives to trustees, or that the administration can threaten to influence the trustees and use the threat to forestall faculty initiatives.

- There was the expressed concern that already formed policies appear from the administration with the claim that especially timely action is needed, leaving faculty in the position of ratifying a *fait accompli*.
- There was the expressed concern that existing faculty governance structures were dead ends and mostly just lead to internal squabbling rather than decisive action.
- And there was the expressed concern that when it comes to governance, faculty are by nature weak and don't want to make waves, that we allow ourselves to be pushed around, and that this is mostly because by nature and as personalities administrators are really charming.

When I began sharing a summary of the structure of our governance with our CIC friends, and when I was able to point with pride to our 2001 Faculty Survey and our recent focus group project—both with over 50% faculty participation, I could see that as a faculty we have made considerable progress insofar as our internal communication among faculty members is concerned. Furthermore, when I outlined the way we are able to interact regularly—even weekly—with our administrative leadership on issues of mutual concern, we appear to be doing much better in this regard than so many other institutions when it comes to communication between faculty and our administrators.

I don't want to exaggerate how well we appear to be doing, for as our focus group project will soon be reporting, we have a number of important issues that need to be taken care of especially with regard to faculty development. But from all appearances, what we have at Purdue is a system that goes beyond problem finding and towards solution finding.

The other meeting I attended was the November 7th meeting of the Board of Trustees. Just in case you weren't aware of this, the Chair of the University Senate makes a report to the Trustees at every meeting. They listen, and they ask questions. To a one, they care about our faculty and how we are doing. And, by the way, at no time have I been asked before these meetings what I am going to talk about, and I certainly am not asked to submit the text of my comments prior to the meetings. When compared with our other institutions, even if their faculty representatives ever get the chance attend Trustee or Regent meetings, it is rare that faculty are heard. And if they are heard, their text has to be approved in advance of the meeting.

So overall, at least from where I sit, and whether by comparing us to other Big Ten universities, or by the congenial nature of our on-campus activities, our faculty has a fairly comfortable and maybe even enviable position of participating regularly in the variety of important discussions regarding the present and the future of Purdue University.

This concludes my report. Thank you.

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 A. Harper, Chairperson of the Senate
wharper@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

Timothy L. Skvarenina, Chairperson
tskvaren@purdue.edu

1. University policy on commercial note-taking in class
2. University Honors Program
3. Final exam scheduling
4. 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

John G. Graveel, Chairperson
jgraveel@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, William L. McBride, wmcbride@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr.
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION

SENATE DOCUMENT	TITLE	ORIGIN	SENATE
*03-1	Nominees for Senate Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 9/8/03
*03-2	Nominees for Senate Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 10/20/03
*03-3	Reapportionment of the University Senate 2004-05	University Senate Steering Committee	Approved 11/17/03
03-4	Establishing a University Undergraduate Honors Program	University Educational Policy Committee	

*Approved

TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Reapportionment of the University Senate 2004-05
REFERENCES: University Senate Document 90-5, University Code D 3.00: Bylaws of the University Senate, Items 2.00 and 2.01
DISPOSITION: Faculty Units

Section D 3.00 of the University Code, and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred members. Eight of these are specified in items 1 through 8 below. This leaves ninety-two to be apportioned among the faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two senators. There are 1978 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette and North Central campuses. When this number is divided by ninety-two the result is 21.5. To qualify for more than two senators, therefore, a faculty unit should have fifty-four or more voting faculty members. Since no faculty unit can have fewer than two senators, the Libraries qualifies for two senators. The remaining units have a total of 1944 voting faculty members with ninety senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The number 1944 divided by 90 equals 21.600. The apportionment of senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 21.600. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 14.583; Consumer and Family Sciences, 2.870; Education, 2.731; Engineering, 13.056; Liberal Arts, 17.593; Management, 3.935; North Central, 3.981; Pharmacy, Nursing and Health Sciences, 4.769; Science, 13.241; Technology, 9.352; and Veterinary Medicine, 3.889.

Number Voting Fac. Members October 2, 2002	Number of Senators 2003-2004	Number Voting Fac. Members October 21, 2003	Number of Senators 2004- 2005
--	------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

Areas Represented

1. President		1		1
2. Chief Academic Officer		1		1
3. Chief Fiscal Officer		1		1
4. Calumet Campus		1		1
5. Fort Wayne Campus		1		1
6. IUPUI Campus		1		1
7. Undergraduate Student		1		1
8. Graduate Student		1		1
9. Faculty Units				
<i>Agriculture</i>	303	14	315	14
<i>Consumer & Family Sci</i>	59	3	62	3
<i>Education</i>	57	3	59	3
<i>Engineering</i>	268	13	282	13
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	387	18	380	18
<i>Libraries</i>	36	2	34	2
<i>Management</i>	82	4	85	4
<i>North Central</i>	86	4	86	4
<i>Pharm, Nurs & Health Sci</i>	102	5	103	5
<i>Science</i>	285	13	286	13
<i>Technology</i>	197	9	202	9
<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	79	4	84	4
	<u>1941</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>100</u>

Approving:

Joseph W. Camp
 John M. Connor
 William A. Harper
 William L. McBride
 David L. Stanley
 H. Lee Weith

Absent:

Gabriele F. Giuliani
 Martin C. Jischke
 Cindy H. Nakatsu
 Bernard Y. Tao
 Clarence W. Wilkerson
 Lisa X. Xu

To: The University Senate
From: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
Subject: Establishing a University Undergraduate Honors Program
References: None
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

Proposed Action: Establish a University Undergraduate Honors Program

WHEREAS: The Purdue University Strategic Plan aims to improve the academic quality of the undergraduate student population and

WHEREAS: Many of our peer institutions have University Honors programs and

WHEREAS: An Honors Task Force of eighteen members drawn from all of Purdue's schools, as well as representatives from Libraries and International Programs, has recommended a University Honors Program that would

- Attract students with exceptional potential who will thrive in a nurturing and demanding academic community;
- Beckon imaginative and enthusiastic faculty from across the university to a great adventure in learning;
- Collaborate with existing school honors programs in Agriculture, Engineering, Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, and Science; students can participate in programs at the university, the school, and the departmental level and

WHEREAS: Twenty-six honors courses have been taught with a total enrollment of about 450 students under the Lilly Retention Initiative.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The University Senate recommends to President Martin C. Jischke that high priority be given to establishing a University Honors Program (UHP) for undergraduate students. The University Senate recommends the honors program be a university-wide program whose students may be enrolled in any undergraduate curriculum.

The UHP should be developed and administered by a Faculty Director, with the advice of a Faculty Curriculum Committee and Faculty Mentors and appropriate administrative support.

University Honors Students who successfully complete the honors program, as certified by the Director of the UHP, will receive a University Honors Diploma upon graduation and recognition at their commencement ceremonies.

The University Senate Educational Policy Committee shall evaluate the program every two years.

Approving:

Kristine Anderson
George M. Bodner
Patrick Connolly
Eric S. Furgason
Richard F. Ghiselli
Will H. Jordan
Joy Garton Krueger
Christine Ladisch
Kenneth Robinson
Richard F. Schweickert
Timothy L. Skvarenina
Jamie Spaccarotelli
Steve Widmer

Absent:

Bogdan Gologan
L. Tony Hawkins
James Longuski
Richard Penney
Rahim Sewani
S. Laurel Weldon

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
Harold Taylor Christensen
1909 – 2003

Harold Christensen's long and full life came to a close at home on August 30. He was born in Preston, Idaho and raised in Rexburg, Idaho, the second of seven sons. As a young man, he was a Latter-day Saint missionary in New Zealand for four years. He was educated at Ricks College, Brigham Young University, and the University of Wisconsin.

Harold came to Purdue University in 1947 to establish a department of sociology. At that time the University did not have a separate department but offered a few courses in the Division of Education and Applied Psychology, precursors of the School of Education and the Department of Psychological Sciences. Under Harold's leadership, course offerings were expanded, faculty members added, degree programs developed, and the department established as an administrative unit in 1953. Today, sociology at Purdue is taught by more than 30 faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

During his tenure at Purdue, Harold served as a visiting scholar at Brigham Young University, the University of Copenhagen, the University of Hawaii, and the University of California at Irvine. A conservative man in his personal life, Harold exerted a liberal influence on campus, exalting intellectual curiosity and reason. Despite the public opposition of a Purdue trustee, Harold brought Alfred Kinsey to campus to lecture on human sexuality. Margaret Mead presented an early feminist critique of American society. As Christensen's guest, William F. Ogburn spent a semester on campus challenging engineers to think of the social consequences of technological development. As one of the leaders of his generation of sociologists, Harold strove to put the discipline of sociology on scientific footing, developing the record-linkage technique, a method of quantitative analysis that helped overcome some of the limitations of interviews and questionnaires in obtaining valid information for study of such then delicate issues as premarital conception and child spacing. He was also a pioneer in cross-cultural research on marriage and family and one of the first scientists to document the sexual revolution in the U.S. and Scandinavia.

He authored six books and countless professional papers and articles. His edited book, *The Handbook of Marriage and the Family* (1964), was a monumental effort to draw together the theories and methodologies of the young field. This volume was so successful that it was published in several languages and has been continued in subsequent editions by his colleagues. Harold edited the *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, then called *Marriage and Family Living*, from 1957- 60. He was an active member of the National Council on Family Relations in its developmental period, serving as its 18th President in 1960. In 1967-69, he was a director of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, and served as its vice president in 1968-69. For his outstanding contributions to the field of marriage and the family, Harold was awarded the third Ernest Watson Burgess Research Award from the National Council on Family Relations in 1967. Purdue University granted him an honorary doctorate in 1993 for his pioneering work in sociology. Harold and Alice, his wife of 68 years, spent the past 27 years in retirement in La Jolla, California where they were both active at the Institute of Continued Learning at the University of California at San Diego. Harold had a profound influence on a generation of students and colleagues. He will be remembered as a gentle man of intelligence and unwavering integrity.

Robert L. Eichhorn
Carolyn C. Perrucci
Robert Perrucci

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
Susan Kontos
November 16, 1949 – September 12, 2003

Professor Susan Kontos died September 12, 2003 following a valiant nine year struggle with cancer. She will be sadly missed-- remembered by colleagues and students as a superb and dedicated scholar, a good friend, a devoted mother, and an enthusiastic world citizen.

For more than 20 years, Susan was among the most productive researchers investigating young children's development in the context of early education and care. She served on faculties at the University of Northern Colorado, Penn State University, and most recently, Purdue University for 17 years. Susan's detailed and rigorous observational studies of children and teachers influenced thinking about practice and quality in programs for young children. She was tirelessly devoted to improving the lives of teachers, children, and families, through scientific study and advocacy. Her many contributions included the landmark study of Quality in Family Child Care and Relative Care (1995; Teachers College Press) and numerous research articles on topics including early childhood classroom environments, inclusion, teacher-child interaction, and teacher preparation. She held editorships for Early Childhood Research Quarterly, Young Children (Research in Review), and the Child and Youth Care Forum, and served on other editorial boards.

She was a leader in the field of early intervention in Indiana, co-chairing the Higher Education Council for Early Intervention from 1988 - 1994 and serving on the Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers since 1987. She received the Hoosier Early Childhood Lifetime Achievement Award from the Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children in 2000.

Susan was a devoted teacher and mentor for graduate and undergraduate students, receiving the Mary Matthews Outstanding Teaching Award in the School of Consumer and Family Sciences in 1996. She was an enthusiastic traveler, often in the company of her daughter Wynne, and she shared her love of the international experience with Purdue students by co-directing the first summer study abroad program specifically designed for CDFS students, in Glasgow, Scotland during the summer of 2002.

CDFS faculty, staff, and students share with many others a great sense of loss for our friend and colleague Susan.

Rich Ghiselli

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
Cheryl Z. Oreovicz
February 23, 1943 – May 19, 2003

Cheryl Oreovicz was born on February 23, 1943 in Wilksburg, Pennsylvania. She earned her bachelor's and master's degrees from Bucknell University in 1966 and 1967, respectively, after which she taught for two years at Gettysburg College. In 1972, she earned her Ph.D. from Pennsylvania State University, with a specialty in early American literature. During her time there, Cheryl also served as the chief editorial assistant for linguistics for the *MLA International Bibliography*, and from 1973 to 1978 served as editor and major contributor to "Americana Abstracts" for *Seventeenth-Century News*.

In 1974, Cheryl accepted a position in the Department of English at Purdue University, specializing in American Studies and women and minority writers. From then until her death in 2003, she taught over 100 classes, many unique courses for the American Studies Program, such as courses on American Conservatism, on the James Family, on Antebellum Women's Literary Culture, and Pragmatism and Feminism. She also served on over 100 master's and Ph.D. committees, and from 1993 to 1997, served as Director of Graduate Studies, during which time she helped to usher in a major revamping of the graduate program. She wrote on alchemy, an abiding intellectual interest, and on a variety of figures in early American literature, among them Charles Brockden Brown, Edward Taylor, and especially Mercy Otis Warren, whom she called "my Mercy," on whose biography she was working at the time of her death.

Cheryl enjoyed many things-teaching, walking, especially oceanside walks, singing, and mystery novels. Even more she loved vibrant conversation and sharing ideas and strong opinions. All of us benefitted from that conversation.

She died at home on May 19, 2003 after a brief illness. She is survived by a sister, her husband, Frank (whom she married in 1971), and two children, a son and a daughter.

Clayton Lein