

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Seventh Meeting, Monday, 19 April 2004, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor William A. Harper
2. Approval of Minutes of 22 March 2004
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 03-9](#)
Change to University Regulations 2003-2004 For Action
Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
9. [University Senate Document 03-10](#)
Nominees for University Senate Standing Committees For Action
Professor Charles E. Kline
10. [University Senate Report 03-1](#)
Report on Due Date for Grades and
Scheduling of Final Exams For Information
Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
11. [University Senate Report 03-2](#)
Proposed changes to the Primary Promotion
Committees For Information
Professor William J. Zinsmeister
12. [University Senate Report 03-3](#)
Report from the Athletic Affairs Committee For Information
Professor Robert E. Montgomery
13. New Business
14. Memorial Resolutions
15. Adjournment

Note: The annual reports of the chairs of the Educational Policy Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Resources Policy Committee and the Student Affairs Committee will be found in [Appendix D](#).

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Seventh Meeting, Monday, 19 April 2004, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *William A. Harper (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Kristine J. Anderson, Alan M. Beck, Evelyn Blackwood, J. Stuart Bolton, Mark D. Bowman, Shorna R. Broussard, Joseph W. Camp, Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Patrick E. Connolly, Susan Conners, John J. Contreni, Sharon DeVaney, Harold G. Donnelly, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Charlotte A. Erdmann, Wendy S. Flory, Wanda S. Fox, Eric S. Furgason, Richard F. Ghiselli, April J. Ginther, L. Tony Hawkins, R. Neal Houze, Charles E. Kline, Daniel J. Kovenock, Christine M. Ladisch, Morris Levy, Howard Mancing, Sally Mason, William L. McBride, James D. McGlothlin, David R. McMillin, C.L. Miller, Cary A. Mitchell, Robert E. Montgomery, Matthew E. Morgan (PSG), P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Rab Mukerjea, Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, David E. Nichols, Robert E. Novak, Daryl L. Orth, Richard C. Penney, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Kenneth R. Robinson, Thomas B. Robinson, George E. Rogers, Alysa C. Rollock, John R. Rousselle, John A. Sautter, Dan E. Schendel, Richard Schweickert, Timothy L. Skvarenina, Glenn G. Sparks, Terry S. Stewart, Jeffrey J. Stuart, A. Charlene Sullivan, Mihaela Vorvoreanu (PGSG), Mary Alice Webb, H. Lee Weith, Clarence W. Wilkerson, G. Thomas Wilson, Yuehwern Yih, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Absent: *President Martin C. Jischke, Professors Lonnie D. Bentley, Richard E. Blanton, George M. Bodner, James R. Bottum, Thomas H. Brush, Kenneth P. Burns, John M. Connor, Terry L. Davidson, Otto C. Doering III, Peter C. Doerschuk, Linda M. Duttlinger, David W. Frantz, David R. Gaskell, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Lawrence T. Glickman, John G. Graveel, Mark A. Green, Bruce Hamaker, Christoph M. Hoffmann, Wei Hong, Steven D. Johnson, Will H. Jordan, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Thomas Kuczek, C. S. George Lee, James M. Longuski, Wallace B. Morrison, David C. Parrish, J. Paul Robinson, F. Robert Sabol, Farshid Sadeghi, K.E. Schwingendorf, Deb Sheets, David L. Stanley, Bernard Y. Tao, Phillip J. VanFossen, Jacqueline Walcott-McQuigg, Whitney Walton, Bruce Watkins, Sirje Laurel Weldon, Donna L. Whitten, Steven E. Widmer, and Lisa X. Xu.*

Guests: *Carol Baird, Rod Bertolet, Dirk Hilt, Maria M. Levy, Andrew Luescher, John Norberg, Charise Pettit, Amy Raley, Patrice Rankine, and Aaron Schnur.*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the Senate, Professor William A. Harper at 2:35 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of March 2004 were approved as distributed.
3. The proposed agenda was presented to the Senate. It was noted that a report from the Athletic Affairs Committee (University Senate Report 03-3) would be presented for information and was not on the agenda. It was moved and seconded to amend the agenda and add the Report as Item 12 of the agenda with each succeeding item renumbered accordingly. The amendment passed on a voice vote. It was then moved and seconded to accept the amended agenda. On a voice vote, the agenda was accepted as amended.
4. President Martin C. Jischke was not present at the meeting. In his stead, Provost Sally Frost Mason presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A). Following her remarks she responded to questions from the floor.

5. Professor William A. Harper presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).
6. Professor Harper mentioned that the Resume of Items under Consideration were available and invited questions from the floor. There were no questions.
7. At question time it was reported that no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor. No questions were forthcoming.
8. Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina presented, for action, University Senate Document 03-9, *Change to University Regulations, 2003-2004*. The motion was seconded and during the discussion period, Professor Skvarenina noted that two minor editorial changes had been made since the document was presented at the March Senate Meeting. Professor Skvarenina moved that the document be amended with these two changes. The motion to amend was seconded and passed on a voice vote. The vote on the main motion was called and it passed by unanimous voice vote.
9. Professor Charles E. Kline presented, for action, University Senate Document 03-10, *Nominees for the University Senate Standing Committees*. For the two vacancies on the Educational Policy Committee, he proposed Professors Carol Baird (3) and James Greenan (3); for the four vacancies on the Faculty Affairs Committee, he proposed Professors Janusz Duzinkiewicz (3), C. S. George Lee (2), Mark Morgan (3), and Vicki Killion (3); for the eight vacancies on the Student Affairs Committee, he proposed Professors Mark Bowman (3), Wendy Flory (3), John Graveel (3), Andrew Luescher (3), Patrice Rankine (3), George Rogers (2), G. Thomas Wilson (3), and Michael Zoltowski (3); finally, for the five vacancies on the University Resources Policy Committee, he proposed Professors Yan Chen (3), Sharon DeVaney (2), Morris Levy (2), Sean McDeavitt, (3), and Robert Sabol (3); where in each case the number in parentheses following the name represents years of service. The motion was seconded and with no additional nominations coming from the floor, the aforementioned were elected by acclamation.
10. Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina presented, for information, University Senate Report 03-1, *Report on Due Date for Grades and Scheduling of Final Exams*. He briefly described the report and answered questions from the floor.
11. Professor William J. Zinsmeister presented, for information, University Senate Report 03-2, *Proposed Changes to the Primary Promotion Committees*. He described the report and took questions from the floor. In response to one question, Professor Zinsmeister stated that at least one open forum would be held at the beginning of the fall semester to solicit input from the faculty on this important matter. Further discussion occurred and Senate members made several suggestions for clarifying the report. Professor Zinsmeister will take the suggestions to the Faculty Affairs Committee for further consideration.
12. Professor Robert Montgomery presented, for information, University Senate Report 03-3, *Report from the Athletic Affairs Committee*. Professor Montgomery summarized the report and responded to questions from the floor.
13. There was no new business.

14. There were no memorial resolutions.
15. The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

REMARKS BY PROVOST SALLY MASON

The President sends his regrets. He is in Washington, D.C. meeting with the other AAU Presidents and I am sure they are engaged pretty heavily right now in the business of what the AAU Presidents do in Washington, D.C.

I wanted to spend just a few minutes this afternoon having great appreciation for the opportunity to talk with you today as we move in to the last several weeks of the spring semester. This is usually one of the most exciting times of the year. It is also the busiest. So, without holding you for too long today, I want to try to briefly bring you up-to-date on some of our progress on the academic front with a brief version of what I presented last week at the President's Forum. I am also going to give you an overview on some of our initiatives in diversity which I did for the Board of Trustees on April 9th. And then finally, I want to say just a few words about some issues that are particularly relevant to the senate.

One of the first big jobs I had to address when I arrived at Purdue was recruiting and hiring new people. It's a process that continues, it seems like it goes on and on and on. And in good ways. Thanks to our strategic plans and investments we are having great success in finding top people to lead our schools and programs. Here you see a few of our newest editions since last year. George Hynd, many of you know, joined us from the University of Georgia last summer as our new Dean of Education. George, as a brand new dean, faced immediate trial by fire and exercised not only superb leadership but unflagging energy as he recently steered the school through its NCATE accreditation review. My congratulations to George and to all of his colleagues for a difficult job that was very, very well done. In the middle of this year, in January we were joined by Riall Nolan who is our new dean of International Programs. Riall joined us from the University of Cincinnati with a long and impressive track record of dealing with all things international. Our newest dean, announced just last week, is Dr. James Mullins from MIT. Jim will be joining us this summer bringing his great experience at MIT to Purdue and returning to his native Hoosier roots. Finally I am also very pleased that after a lengthy search, we have a new Vice President for Research. His name is Dr. Fawwaz Ulaby and he comes to us from the University of Michigan. At Michigan Dr. Ulaby is the R. Jamison and Betty Williams Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in addition to also currently being their Vice President for Research. He has been a member of the National Academy of Engineering since 1995. Dr. Ulaby represents the very best in his field. He has distinguished himself with the very highest honors in his profession. He has been equally successful in his research administration career, since he has been serving as Michigan's Vice President for Research since January 1999. We are very excited, to say the least, about bringing all of these very, very fine people to Purdue.

I also want to thank the Senate personally for its unanimous support and approval of the University Honors Program. This is a very important and exciting moment for Purdue and our students. Our hope is that this program will create a vibrant academic community for students with exceptional potential. We hope it will encourage faculty to experiment with course design. And we further hope that Purdue's university-wide Honors Program will work collaboratively with honors programs that exist in several Purdue schools and perhaps serve as a catalyst for other schools to develop such programs. We envision this opportunity to be one that will allow us to better recruit the best and brightest freshman to Purdue. Which is why, with help from the

schools, we hope that honors opportunities will develop across the entire University beyond just the freshman year. We are in the final throes of a search for a director for this program. In fact this should wrap up in the very, very near future. And the new director will then be responsible for creating the opportunities for students and faculty to work together in this program. Your leadership has been key in helping us to shape these programs at these very early stages, and I thank you all.

We are also using a \$3.5 million grant from the Lilly Endowment to help Indiana retain more University graduates and to foster high-tech startup companies across the state. This initiative is called the Purdue Opportunity for Indiana Program. It's administered through our Office of Engagement. Its primary goals are:

- First — to provide Purdue students with internships at high-tech Indiana companies,
- second — to subsidize teams of interns,
- third — to increase the number of startup companies through business planning competitions,
- fourth — to provide grants for startup companies,
- fifth — to support entrepreneurship training workshops,
- sixth — to provide statewide access to Purdue's entrepreneurial support programs, and
- finally — to assist Indiana communities in recruiting startup companies to their regions.

The grant funding will be provided over a period of three years and we are excited about getting this activity started up.

Now as many of you are aware, earlier this month I joined —

- President Jischke,
- Our Legal Counsel, Tony Benton,
- Vice President for Student Services Tom Robinson,
- Vice President for Human Relations Alysa Rollock,
- Executive Vice President and Treasurer Ken Burns and
- Director of Intercollegiate Athletics Morgan Burke —

all of us in a special report to the Board of Trustees and the topic was diversity. The report lasted about two hours. I promise I won't do the full two hours this afternoon. We are in the process however of getting this report up on a website, so that if you wanted to see the full content of all of the powerpoints that were presented during that two hours it will be available to anyone who is interested. I believe it was one of the most in-depth presentations the board has ever received. And overall, I believe the report shows that we are making some progress in areas of diversity. But it also shows we have a lot of work to do in meeting the standards of our peers and in meeting our own goals. I'd like to give you a few highlights of some of the things that I talked about in the report that I gave.

We are working to increase the diversity of our faculty and staff. In fact, we are in a unique period in Purdue's history. A large number of faculty are due to retire in the not so distant future. We are also in the enviable position of attempting to add 300 new faculty positions through the Strategic Plan. We have the opportunity to change the face of our University by focusing on diversity in these hires. Purdue is moving forward with some success with this initiative. In fact our Strategic Plans have resulted in the additions of 90 new faculty positions on the West Lafayette campus. Next fall we plan to add 56 more positions bringing the total to 146. This is nearly halfway to the goal of adding 300 new faculty. Now not all of these positions

have been filled yet. I believe we would probably make progress faster if no one would retire or leave for a little while. In fact including new faculty searches and replacing people who retire or leave for other reasons, if you include all of the things that are going on right now – we currently have 163 open searches that are in progress for faculty. This challenge, and in fact the challenge that we all face, is making certain that with all of this activity that we don't lose our energy and enthusiasm for putting our very best efforts into this process. We are searching for the very best faculty we can bring to Purdue to teach our students and contribute to our research efforts. And given the early results that the deans are starting to share with me for this year, I have very good reason to believe that next year at this time I'll be able to share even more good news about new faculty at Purdue.

Now the first step toward achieving faculty diversity is recruitment. A process that is ongoing and continual as I just mentioned. Beginning in 2001-2002, which was my first year here, we began to keep track of some figures and what I wanted to share today was to show you that in 2001-2002, as we looked at the total number of faculty hires that was made I was pleased to see that fifty percent of our new faculty hires were women and minorities. This past academic year those numbers are up to 63 percent. That's an impressive number and I was very pleased to see that trend. But we still have a long way to go before the faces of our faculty actually reflect the diversity of our State of Indiana, let alone our great nation. We also know from peer review that overall we are about 3 percent below the average for minority and female faculty when we compare ourselves against those with whom we would like to be compared. Now what this kind of hiring activity tells us, however, is that Purdue will be moving closer and closer to the average in the years ahead. So we are moving in the right direction. Now as we gave the report to the trustees we also tried to lay out objectives and to also designate responsibility. Our objective is to continue the progress that is already under way in the recruitment of top faculty women and minorities. To help us accomplish this, we are working to clarify the expectations of the search process that brings faculty into our tenure system. We are also closely monitoring the selection of finalists and hires. It is certainly my responsibility as Provost to make certain that this takes place. It is also the responsibility of the deans and the department heads and frankly the faculty as well. In the end we all have to be accountable for the results.

Now one measure of how well we have recruited can be determined by faculty movement through the ranks; something else that we just recently started paying close attention to. Fortunately we are experiencing some good success in minority retention and promotion. Eighty-eight percent of minority faculty at Purdue who were nominated for promotion in 2003 were in fact successful. One hundred percent considered for promotion to full professor were promoted in that same year. Similarly, minority faculty contract renewal before tenure has also increased. In 2003, our numbers hit 100 percent. That is an increase of about 7 percent in just over two years. By contrast, in 2003, only 73 percent of women at all ranks considered for promotion successfully moved ahead, and this was 9 percentage points behind men who we successfully promoted. Although the number of female faculty receiving contract renewal before tenure has increased in recent years, we clearly have more work to do in this area. In particular, at this point, we need to assess the reasons for contract non-renewal and to monitor more closely the progression of female faculty through the ranks. Our objective is to achieve promotion rates and contract renewal rates for women and minorities that are no different than those for all faculty. The actions that we are taking to accomplish this include increasing our attention on mentorship and guidance for faculty development, and working more regularly to clarify our promotion criteria. The responsibility for seeing that this is accomplished once again lies with me, with the deans, with the department heads, and of course with the senate as well.

We are also making progress with diversity in the curriculum. But our objective again is to do even better. In fact, our objective is to increase the number of undergraduate courses that offer diversity components. Our second objective is to increase the undergraduate enrollment in these courses. All of our schools are being encouraged to develop courses with diversity components or to steer their students toward at least one existing course. The faculty, the department heads, the deans and the provost are all responsible for action that will hopefully help us eventually accomplish our curricular objectives. We also have a number of innovative experiments under way focused on diversity in the curriculum. For example, our Schools of Consumer and Family Sciences, Education, and Liberal Arts, and the Diversity Resource Office are sponsoring a Diversity in the Classroom Project. This program helps faculty members incorporate diversity into their coursework. It also helps faculty deal with diversity issues. Our School of Nursing is affiliated with the Family Health Clinic of Carroll County. This clinical site enhances faculty and student experiences with a very culturally diverse population. Engineering Projects in Community Service otherwise known as EPICS has a number of projects also focused on diversity. An example is the Team Projects Laboratory with Computer Science in which students are learning that different people perceive space differently.

Our objective in so many of our activities is to celebrate diversity. The Black Cultural Center and the Latino Cultural Center on the West Lafayette campus are focal points for the celebration of cultures, history and traditions. They are places where students can go for support, for mentorship and for friendship. These centers provide programs ranging from lectures to entertainment. They are places where all our students can learn about these rich traditions and where all people are welcome.

An activity, of which I am especially proud, is the ongoing multicultural and gender workshops for faculty and staff that focus on issues of diversity. I can't claim that this is an original idea of mine. In fact let me begin by saying that our College of Engineering is to be commended for starting a series of workshops designed to enhance our understanding of diversity in the academic setting a number of years ago. This was done under the leadership of Dick Schwartz. This model of 2 ½ day workshops where faculty, staff and students are immersed in learning about diversity and learning about themselves has been expanded first to include the schools of Science and Agriculture with Engineering and then this spring to include Management, Technology, and Veterinary Medicine as well. We are encouraging all faculty and staff to participate in these workshops. There are two types, multicultural, which are the direct product of the original diversity workshops, and gender workshops, which we have only done two of so far but which have indicated that we need to do more in the future.

These sessions are coordinated and facilitated by outside consultants and having been through one as a participant last fall, I can tell you that you will learn a lot about Purdue, a lot about diversity, and a lot about yourself as a person. I would encourage everyone in this room to think seriously about participating in one of these. I have committed to expanding these workshops across the entire University and in order to help with this our Dean of Science has been kind enough to allow me to coop some of his Diversity Director's time. Barbara Clark is now on part-time special assignment with my office to help coordinate campus-wide participation in these events and we hope to work with the Diversity coordinators from each of the schools to make Purdue an even better place for our minority and women students, faculty and staff.

We are also seeking, receiving and using grant money to promote diversity across campus. A Lilly Endowment five-year \$5 million grant supported new and existing efforts to keep students in school and to help them graduate within a six-year period including our very successful and our ever-expanding Learning Communities and Supplemental Instruction. More recently the

National Science Foundation has awarded a \$5 million Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation Grant to Purdue West Lafayette, IU-Bloomington, IUPUI, Ball State, and Purdue Calumet in partnership.

We are using these funds to double the number of degrees conferred among underrepresented groups by the year 2008. An ambitious goal; but one we think that is attainable. Purdue also has two grants from the Lumina Foundation for Education including one for \$100,000 to support Multicultural Learning Communities.

Now finally I would like to talk with you about a proposed new initiative just very briefly. We know from experience now that large multi-year, multi-investigator research programs in particular require full-time, senior-level people. Many of our successful peer institutions have met these needs through the use of Research Professors. A proposal for the creation of non-tenure track faculty designated as research professors will be making its way to the Senate probably next fall. These are positions that would be funded largely by soft money from grants. And I look forward to having more discussions with all of you in greater detail next year.

And then finally I would be remiss if I didn't extend my personal thanks to Bill Harper for his outstanding leadership on the senate this past year, it's certainly not an easy job. It's tremendously time consuming; I have seen how much time and effort he has put in to it. And I will tell you that Bill will be leaving office having devoted significant time and energy toward improving conditions for faculty at Purdue. The recommendations from the report on post-tenure review and faculty development I believe will provide a framework for a number of future initiatives, some of which you have even heard a little bit about today. Some of those recommendations as I mentioned are already being acted upon. And I think Bill and many of you in the senate are to be commended for your efforts in that regard. Bill you have done an outstanding job in this position and I think we all are deeply appreciative of what you have accomplished. I want to thank you very, very much. I am going to stop at this point and ask if there any questions.

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR WILLIAM HARPER

In my final brief report to the Senate, I wish to express my gratitude to all of you for the work you have done this academic year. Our committees have been active and productive. Thank you all so much for caring about your elected responsibilities to work on behalf of your constituents.

Special thanks should go to Joe Camp, our freshman Secretary of Faculties and to Jane Morris, our administrative assistant, who together both managed to keep their faculties intact during this year of transition after Sol Gartenhaus' retirement from the Senate.

Looking back on our work this year, some may think that we haven't accomplished very much, especially if we are measured exclusively by the University Senate's activity in actual voted-on legislation.

In particular, and after our March meeting, it may indeed seem that we have spent more voting-time electing ourselves to important committees, posts, and positions than producing action documents—sort of like James Thurber's observation when he was once asked why people bother to go to college. He thought that we go to college in order to earn enough money to send our children to college, who then in turn set about to earn enough money to send their children to college, who in turn

But, assessing our performance this year depends on one's perspective about what really counts. Personally, I am convinced that something far more important has gone on this year than what kinds of documents and reports we have produced. In other words, what we can count this year is far less significant than the fact that with regard to our role in shared governance of Purdue University, increasingly we are finding that we ourselves count.

Let me explain. As most of you know, your Senate leaders are involved in a number of different forums on a regular basis throughout the academic year. We regularly attend and address the meetings of the Board of Trustees. We meet with the President twice a month, once in an Advisory meeting and once in Steering. Your Senate Chair meets with the Provost once a month. In addition to these regular meetings, we are invited to any number of university functions and ad hoc meetings.

Based on my year-long experience in these various forums, I believe that our University Senate is on the brink of playing a much bigger role in helping govern this great university.

And this is because our Trustees and our University administrative leaders sincerely want to hear from us; they seek our council, they ask for our opinions and ideas; and they are financially supporting our efforts to stimulate faculty voice through our surveys and focus groups—most recently, for example, by funding our faculty website project.

In my opinion, we count today perhaps more than ever before. Our University Senate is now genuinely expected to be the voice of the faculty. There is nothing *pro forma* about it. There is simply no other body authorized to speak on behalf of the faculty. And there is no other collective faculty body to which our higher administration turns for advice on matters of mutual importance.

As you might imagine, it is fairly routine for your Senate leaders to be asked in various meetings and forums: “What’s the faculty view on this?”

But this question isn’t a new question just put to our Senate leadership this year. This has always been the question we are most asked. We expect to be asked this question. Why else are we participating in these meetings if we are not expected to provide feedback on faculty views?

As an aside, by the way, since we have collected credible survey information in the last 3 years about faculty views and opinions, it is a bit easier to answer this kind of question when asked, even though as you all know there is no “faculty view” per se on anything.

But even more telling this year is the number of crucial times we have also been asked different kinds of questions by our Trustees and our higher up administrative leaders.

We have been asked, “What can the faculty do about this or that matter?” We have been asked, “How can the faculty help fix this or that situation?” Or—even more remarkably—we are asked, “How can we help the faculty do an even better job than they already do?”

In other words, we are ever more frequently being asked to not only weigh in on finding problems, but we are being asked more and more frequently to help find good solutions too.

This is a healthy sign at Purdue University as far as I am concerned. It implies that it still may be possible to perpetuate something of the age-old idea of a university being a community of scholars. As you all well know, this has become increasingly difficult in an age when most all colleges and universities are becoming more and more corporate-like in their structure and functions.

In electing Bill McBride and Tim Skvarenina you have chosen two competent and thoughtful leaders who will continue to represent you well. Bill has participated in all of the forums and meetings I participated in. And he has witnessed the extent to which our University administrative leaders are turning to the faculty for creative and constructive leadership.

Tim has functioned as a dependable and hard working chair of the Educational Policy Committee and has thereby also witnessed first hand the increasing expectations of the Senate’s role in governance.

Consequently, both Bill and Tim are already well prepared for leading us into what I think will be an exciting and energetic 2004-2005 academic year.

For my part, I hope to return to working as a Senator on facilitating faculty voice at Purdue by way of my service on our Informetrics Committee.

Thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to represent you this year. I am counting on you to help your new Senate leaders carry on. But most of all, I am counting on you all to continue to speak up and to be counted.

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. 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

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>

ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

**University Senate Educational Policy Committee
Annual Report
2003-2004**

The committee convened for eight meetings during the academic year. Two documents and one report were presented to the Senate:

University Senate Document, 03-5, Resolution Supporting the Creation of a University Undergraduate Honors Program

University Senate Document, 03-9, Change to University Regulations 2003-2004 (adds a miscellaneous regulation concerning commercial sale or bartering of class notes)

University Senate Report 03-1, Report on Due Date for Grades and Scheduling of Final Exams

Summary of other issues discussed follows:

Renaming of Schools of Engineering to College of Engineering

The Academic Organization Committee (AOC) and the EPC were asked to comment upon a request by Dean Katehi to change the name of the Schools of Engineering to the College of Engineering. The AOC had little to say about the issue. The EPC prepared a report, which was sent to the Senate Chair, that outlined some concerns that this might start a series of name-change requests. Since there are costs associated with a name change, such as University Publications, webpages, admissions forms, etc., the EPC recommended that all of the schools be given an opportunity to request a name change if desired and to pursue them at one time.

Revision of Honors Convocations Procedures

The Superior Students Committee (SSC) and the EPC were asked to comment on a proposal by Joe Bennett to modify the University Honors Convocation. Several SSC members indicated they agreed with Joe Bennett's proposal. The EPC did as well, with one addition. Members of the EPC noted that the parents of students really like getting a letter from the President congratulating them on their child's performance. The EPC recommends that such a Presidential letter continue being sent to parents, even though they will no longer be invited to a University Convocation.

Closing Courses to Non-majors

At the request of Professor Terry Stewart the EPC considered the trend towards an increased number of courses offered with restricted enrollment. Discussion followed regarding the situation. It was determined that often this is an issue tied to resource limitations. Deb Sheets suggested that an article in the scheduling deputies' newsletter covering available reservation designations might help alleviate some of the concern. The Committee members saw no need for further action.

University home for students who haven't qualified for entry into a school of engineering

Professor Montgomery of Freshman Engineering asked the EPC to consider a problem that has occurred in Freshman Engineering (FE). The policy of the Schools of Engineering is that no student may stay in FE beyond five semesters. During that time, they must qualify for entry into one of the Engineering Schools, which requires at least a 2.0 GPA in a particular set of courses. Last year two students completed their fifth semester in FE, but only had a 1.98 GPA in the required set of courses. He asked if the EPC could find a home in the University for such students. The issue was discussed and the general feeling was that this is an issue for FE. The advisors need to strongly encourage such students to CODO to a school that will accept them.

Issue of students that never show up for a course:

Professor Montgomery of Freshman Engineering reported a problem he has encountered with students enrolling in a course but never showing up for any sessions (lecture or lab). He asked the EPC to consider whether a University Policy should be developed to deal with such students (e.g., allowing an instructor to drop a no-show student). There was considerable discussion concerning visas and financial aid. The EPC will consider this further next year.

At this point, no one has been elected chair for 2004-2005. The current chair will be working to find a candidate for chair of the EPC.

Tim Skvarenina
Chair, Educational Policy Committee, 2003-2004

University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Annual Report 2003-2004

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) met 8 times during the 2003-2004 academic year. This report is a summary of the business brought before the FAC.

Grade appeals: Following proposed changes to the timing of the initiating a grade appeal made by Professor Bodner at the end of the 2003 academic year, the FAC prepared a document to be presented to the Senate. It was assumed that the proposed changes would be quickly approved by the Senate. Unfortunately, as the chair (Zinsmeister) began to prepare the document for submission to the Senate it became apparent that there were a number of problems concerning access and availability of grade appeal procedures to both student and faculty. Although application of grade appeal procedures, as mandated by University Senate Document 73-14, should be implemented uniformly across the campus, it was discovered that the implementation of the procedures varied greatly between schools. It was clear that dissemination of the procedures to chairs of campus grade appeal committees, and student councilors also varied considerably. As a consequence, there is considerable confusion about procedures concerning grade appeals.

During the January Senate meeting, proposed changes in the initiation and timing of grade appeals were brought up for discussion. There was considerable discussion concerning the

proposed changes and the Senate suggested that the FAC revisit the question of the timing of the initiation of appeals. Following the Senate meeting, FAC decided that since the Grade Appeal process and procedures had not been reviewed since the mid-1970's, to ask the Provost to establish an ad hoc committee to review procedures and to recommend solutions to streamlining the process and enhance dissemination of grade procedures to faculty, students and councilors. The ad hoc committee, chaired by Margaret Rowe is now in the process of reviewing the grade appeal procedures and will report to the FAC during the spring of 2005.

Tenure and Promotion Process: The FAC began a review of the current tenure and promotion process and discovered that the promotion process varied widely across campus. It was decided that there should be some degree of campus-wide uniformity in the promotion process. At the same time, it was recognized that cultural differences exist between departments and schools and that these cultural differences should be respected. Initially FAC considered proposing a number of procedural changes that should be standardized campus-wide, such a number of letters of recommendation. Rather proposing a number of changes at one time, it was decided that a more effective approach would be to view this as a long term process and to focus on proposing individual items to the Senate for consideration

The first item we decided was changing the composition of the Primary Committee and allow tenured associate professors to participate in discussion and voting for tenure of untenured associate professors. A FAC survey of our peer institution revealed that Purdue University was the only institution that still restricts the membership to the primary committee to full professors. It was felt that allowing tenured associate professors to participate in the process would increase communication within departments, demystify the promotion process, and increase diversity of the primary committees. A Faculty Forum will be held to discuss the issue during the second week of September. Following the forum, FAC will submit our proposal for discussion during the October Senate meeting.

Post-tenure Review: The Provost staff is developing a framework for post-tenure review. The Provost will bring recommended priorities list to the FAC for discussion. There are about 75 process items, which can be collapsed into approximately five or six items to be discussed. One problem that was discussed was the method of dissemination of information about post-tenure review to the faculty. It was proposed that information for post-tenure review could be posted on the Senate web site when the process is completed during the fall of 2004.

Research Track Faculty Positions: The need and importance of establishing a Research Track positions for non-tenure track faculty became abundantly clear from two communications to the FAC reporting the loss of important members of several research groups during the past year. The Provost expressed great concern about the absence of research track faculty positions and effect on keeping high quality researchers at Purdue University. The Provost provided the FAC with a draft of a document describing Research Tenure Track positions. The FAC is in the process of reviewing the document. It is anticipated that the document will be submitted to the Senate next fall for discussion.

Human Relations Initiative: V.P. Rollock presented a copy of a report she presented to the Presidents Forum and invited the FAC for comments. V.P. Rollock also presented a confidential report to the FAC describing proposed procedures for responding to discrimination and

harassment and explained key points in the document. The eventual incorporation of the document into the present procedures will clarify information in several key areas and streamline the process in other areas dealing with discrimination and harassment.

William J. Zinsmeister
Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, 2003 – 2004

**Resources Policy Committee
Annual Report
2003 – 2004**

One of the major goals of the Resources Policy Committee (RPC) was to better understand the larger picture of the resources issue facing the university. To that end, the committee met with University personnel that could help it gain this broad perspective. This group included:

- Ken Burns,- EVP & Treasurer, presented Purdue's Long Range Plan
- Cheryl Altinkemer - Senior Director of Development, gave an overview of the organization and work of the Development Office
- Kevin Green - Director of State Relations, talked about the university's effort to gain resources from the state.

The committee also met with people that could explain some of the larger resource concerns facing Purdue.

- Brent Bowditch - Assistant Director Human Resource Services, explained the current situation regarding healthcare expenses for Purdue employees.
- Jim Bottum - VP of Information Technology, explained the current state of information technology and ITAP the organization responsible for that area.

Various specific issues were also discussed.

- Use of skateboard and inline skates on campus. Ben Harris, Student member of the committee, presented the issue from the user perspective. The committee voices support for the activity while acknowledging the damage that has been done by some participants. We suggested that the students contact the people at the Co-Rec to find a place for people to exercise in this way. We also acknowledged the West Lafayette and Lafayette need to address the problem.
- Building a childcare facility for Purdue staff and students. An ad hoc committee worked on this issue this year. The original thought was to convert Burtfield School, which was had available by the city of West Lafayette, into a childcare facility, The location, size and layout was deemed to be excellent for this purpose. However, after several month of study that the cost of rehabbing the building is too high. Thus the new plan is to build a facility on the west side of campus.

- A requirement for a fund for the aesthetic enhancement of new buildings is under study. Thomas Eismin, Chairperson of the Visual Art Committee, presented the issue to the RPC. The Visual Art Committee is expected to make a recommendation in 2004-05.
- Smoking on Campus Dr. Julie Novak, Associate Dean of the Schools of Pharmacy, Nursing and Health Sciences; Hernando Perez, Graduate student and Coordinator of the SmokeFree Purdue Project ; Tammy Loew, Alcohol Risk Reduction Coordinator,. Addressed the RPC regarding smoking on campus. It was noted that about 28% of Purdue students smoke despite years of anti-smoking information. This group has a goal of reducing smoking on campus and reducing the impact of smoking on non-smokers. They have made some proposals that can be handled administratively however the RPC will address the issue again in 2004-05.
- Controlling the impact of CODOs on academic departments. Some Purdue departments have large numbers of students that CODO from other departments. (CODO - Change of Degree Objective,, students change major from a department in one School to a department in another.) In the Fall of 2003, the number of CODOs joining some departments increased dramatically, putting a real or potential strain on the resources of some of these units. Although the meeting the needs of students that change their academic goals is important, it is also important that the needs of students already in the department be met. Therefore, Provost Mason intends to allow department to establish reasonable criteria for controlling the number of CODOing students.

The RPC also heard from committees that report to it.

- Staff Appeals Board for Traffic Regulations :

Prof. Katherine Markee

- Architectural and Landscape Design and Planning Committee : Prof. Carol

Boushey

- Visual Arts : Prof. Tom Eismin

John Rousselle, Assoc Prof. in Department of Hospitality & Tourism Management
Chair, University Resource Policy Committee, 2002-2003

**University Senate Student Affairs Committee
Annual Report
2003-2004**

The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) met six times during the 2003-2004 academic year. One document from the SAC was submitted to the University Senate. Document 03-01 was the annual report on the status of student athletes, presented each year by the SAC liaison to the Athletic Affairs Committee (AAC).

During the year the SAC heard about student affairs at Purdue from the Vice-President for Student Services, reviewed the ONE PURDUE SYSTEM, and discussed academic integrity, exam proctoring, the Student Bill of Rights, student conduct code, grade appeals, student athletic issues and the use of copy-righted materials. Three years ago the SAC began discussing an academic integrity initiative on campus. Part of the plan of work was to develop an audio-visual on the topic. Mark Bannatyne and Olivia Wood, former members of SAC, along with a graduate student group from the School of Technology took the initiative in developing the video. They worked with representatives from ODOS and Boiler Gold Rush. In 2003 the video project was presented to SAC by the student group and was well received. This video, once completed, will be used at Boiler Gold Rush. The Student Bill of Rights was completed by SAC and the Purdue Student Government in 2003-2004. It was approved by Tom Robinson and endorsed by the Provost. Tony Hawkins will include the revised Student Bill of Rights in official University documents and publications to be printed this summer. A presentation by Marne Helgesen on the exam proctor pool initiative was presented to SAC in the fall. A letter written to Provost Mason by SAC detailed their endorsement of the proctor pool program. Provost Mason approved the initiative and Marne Helgesen is coordinating the exam proctor pool from her office.

The SAC agenda also included reports and resultant discussions of a number of additional concerns related to the welfare of students on campus. These included, but were not limited to: the student conduct code, student parking, student traffic around the Stewart Center Mall, use of university computers for downloading music and quality of academic advising.

In 2004-2005, the SAC will be chaired by Terry Davidson and the AAC liaison will be John Graveel. A liaison to PSG will be selected in the fall. Caitlin Baird, undergraduate representative to SAC, reported that student fees, smoking near entrances of buildings, and the prohibition of student organization monies for the purchase of tobacco products will be topics for SAC next year.

John G. Graveel
Chair, Student Affairs Committee, 2003-2004

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 1/26/04
03-5	Change to University Grade Appeals System	Faculty Affairs Committee	
*03-6	Nominees for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 3/22/04
*03-7	Nominees for the University Senate Steering and Nominating Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 3/22/04
*03-8	Nominees for Faculty Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 3/22/04
*03-9	Change to University Regulations	University Educational Policy Committee	Approved 4/19/04
*03-10	Nominees for University Senate Standing Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 4/19/04

***Approved**

SENATE REPORTS	TITLE	ORIGIN
03-1	Report on Due Date for Grades and Scheduling of Final Exams	Educational Policy Committee
03-2	Proposed changes to the Primary Promotion Committees	Faculty Affairs Committee
03-3	Athletic Affairs Committee Report to the University Senate, Spring 2003-04	Athletic Affairs Committee

To: The University Senate
From: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
Subject: Change to University Regulations 2003-2004
References: Academic Regulations and Procedures Part 5, Section V
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

Proposed

H. All Students are subject to the University policy on intellectual property, Executive Memorandum B-10, *as amended from time to time*.

I. Use of Copyrighted Materials

All members of the Purdue University community are responsible for complying with the United States Copyright Law and with Purdue University's Executive Memorandum B-53, *as amended from time to time*, which governs the use of copyrighted works for educational and research purposes.

Copyright is a federal law that protects creative works such as Web sites, CD's, DVD's, audio and visual works, computer programs, books, and journals. Copyright allows authors to control the use of their works for a limited period of time. Authors or the owners of the copyrighted work have exclusive rights to the work. It is their decision as to whether the work can be copied and/or distributed. Violating the copyright owner's rights is considered copyright infringement and may be subject to legal action.

Works are protected for a limited period of time but once that time period has expired, the work becomes part of the public domain. The public can then freely use the works without paying royalties or obtaining permission from the copyright holder.

Works created on or after January 1, 1978, are protected for a term of the life of the author plus 70 years. If the work is a product of a corporate author, then the protection is for the shorter of 95 years from *first* publication or 120 years from creation. Works that were published prior to 1923 no longer have copyright protection and are in the public domain. Any work created or published from 1923 to the present time should be considered still protected by the copyright law.

There are exemptions to the copyright law that allow use of a work without seeking permission. One of

the most utilized exemptions in higher education is the fair use exemption. This exemption is a four factor test that weighs whether the use of a work is

Present

H. All Students are subject to the University policy on intellectual property, Executive Memorandum B-10.

I. Use of Copyrighted Materials

All members of the Purdue University community are responsible for complying with the United States Copyright Law and with Purdue University's Executive Memorandum B-53, which governs the use of copyrighted works for educational and research purposes.

Copyright is a federal law that protects creative works such as Web sites, CD's, DVD's, audio and visual works, computer programs, books, and journals. Copyright allows authors to control the use of their works for a limited period of time. Authors or the owners of the copyrighted work have exclusive rights to the work. It is their decision as to whether the work can be copied and/or distributed. Violating the copyright owner's rights is considered copyright infringement and may be subject to legal action.

Works are protected for a limited period of time but once that time period has expired, the work becomes part of the public domain. The public can then freely use the works without paying royalties or obtaining permission from the copyright holder.

Works created on or after January 1, 1978, are protected for a term of the life of the author plus 70 years. If the work is a product of a corporate author, then the protection is for the shorter of 95 years from publication or 120 years from creation. Works that were published prior to 1923 no longer have copyright protection and are in the public domain. Any work created or published from 1923 to the present time should be considered still protected by the copyright law.

There are exemptions to the copyright law that allow use of a work without seeking permission. One of the most utilized exemptions in higher education is the fair use exemption. This exemption is a four factor test that weighs whether the use of a

fair under certain circumstances. If the use is not fair and no other exemption is applicable to the specific use of the work, then permission from the copyright holder must be granted before the work can be used

For further information on the copyright law, please visit the University Copyright Office's Web site at www.lib.purdue.edu/uco

J. Commercial Note Taking in Classes

As used in this paragraph, the term "instructor" is defined as the individual who authored the material being presented as part of the course.

Among the materials that may be protected by copyright law are the lectures, notes, and other material presented in class or as part of the course. Always assume the materials presented by an instructor are protected by copyright unless the instructor has stated otherwise. Students enrolled in, and authorized visitors to, Purdue University courses are permitted to take notes, which they may use for individual/group study or for other non-commercial purposes reasonably arising from enrollment in the course or the University generally.

Notes taken in class are, however, generally considered to be "derivative works" of the instructor's presentations and materials, and they are thus subject to the instructor's copyright in such presentations and materials. No individual is permitted to sell or otherwise barter notes, either to other students or to any commercial concern, for a course without the express written permission of the course instructor. To obtain permission to sell or barter notes, the individual wishing to sell or barter the notes must be registered in the course or must be an approved visitor to the class. Course instructors may choose to grant or not grant such permission at their own discretion, and may require a review of the notes prior to their being sold or bartered. If they do grant such permission, they may revoke it at any time, if they so choose.

work is fair under certain circumstances. If the use is not fair and no other exemption is applicable to the specific use of the work, then permission from the copyright holder must be granted before the work can be used.

For further information on the copyright law, please visit the University Copyright Office's Web site at www.lib.purdue.edu/uco.

Rationale for Change: Some faculty have requested that the University have a policy concerning paid note-taking in courses. The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) met with a representative from the law firm that represents the University, who provided some suggestions for such a policy. The committee determined that the appropriate place for such a policy would be in the miscellaneous conduct regulations in Part 5, Section V. The attorney recommended minor additions to paragraphs H and I, which are included in the proposed version above.

Following discussion with the attorney, the EPC drafted proposed paragraph “J,” which attempts to emphasize the rights of both students and faculty with respect to the use of materials presented in a course. A draft of the policy was sent to the Student Affairs Committee and to the Director, University Copyright Office. The Student Affairs Committee did not take exception to the document. The Director of the Copyright Office suggested some changes that are included in the proposed version above.

Approving:

Kristine Anderson
Patrick Connolly
Richard Ghiselli
Tony Hawkins
Christine Ladisch
Chris Leasure (for Deb Sheets)
Richard Penney
Kenneth Robinson
Richard Schweickert
Tim Skvarenina

Absent:

Eric Furgason
James Longuski
Rahim Sewani
Steven Widmer

Approving by email:

George Bodner
Will Jordan
S. Laurel Weldon
Bogdan Golodan

19 April 2004

TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for University Senate Standing Committees
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slates of nominees for service on the University Senate Standing Committees listed below. The faculty members elected are to serve for the period shown within the parentheses following each name.

A. Educational Policy Committee

For the two vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees is Professors:

Carol Baird	(3)	Nursing
James Greenan	(3)	Education

B. Faculty Affairs Committee

For the four vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees is Professors:

Janusz Duzinkiewicz	(3)	Social Sciences
C.S. George Lee	(2)	ECE
Mark Morgan	(3)	Food Science
Vicki Killion	(3)	Libraries

C. Student Affairs Committee

For the eight vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees is Professors:

Mark Bowman	(3)	Civil Engineering
Wendy Flory	(3)	English
John Graveel	(3)	Agronomy
Andrew Luescher	(3)	VCS
Patrice Rankine	(3)	FLL
George Rogers	(2)	Industrial Technology
G. Thomas Wilson	(3)	Pharmacy Practice
Michael Zoltowski	(3)	ECE

D. University Resources Policy Committee

For the five vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees is Professors:

Yan Chen	(3)	Mechanical Engineering
Sharon DeVaney	(2)	CFS
Morris Levy	(2)	Biological Sciences
Sean McDeavitt	(3)	Nuclear Engineering
Robert Sabol	(3)	VPA

Present and Approving:

Natalie J. Carroll
Linda M. Duttlinger
Bruce R. Hamaker
Charles E. Kline
J. Paul Robinson
Glenn G. Sparks
Whitney Walton

Absent:

Christoph M. Hoffmann
Craig L. Miller

TO: University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Report on Due Date for Grades and Scheduling of Final Exams
DATE: March 29, 2004

Following publication of the fall 2003 final exam schedule, the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) received several requests for rescheduling of Saturday exams and for a review of the grade-reporting deadline. Specifically, a number of faculty members expressed concern that Saturday exams make it very difficult to turn in grades by 5:00 pm on Tuesday. This is especially a concern for those who teach large enrollment courses and those who administer written exams that cannot be computer graded. Thus, the EPC considered the exam scheduling procedures and the feasibility of allowing additional time to deliver grades to the registrar. Unfortunately, the Committee found it could not recommend extending the deadline at this time. This report gives some background concerning commencement schedules, the exam scheduling process, and the grade-reporting deadline.

Commencement Schedule

The schedule for commencements is specified in the University Regulations (Part 2, Section 1, Paragraph A. 5.):

“Commencement will be held as follows: First Semester: first Sunday following the end of the first semester; Second Semester: next subsequent weekend after the end of the second semester; Summer Session: first Sunday following the end of the last summer module.”

Until May 2003, spring commencements were held on Saturday and Sunday (2 each day). However, beginning in 2004, the May commencements will be held on Friday evening, Saturday morning and afternoon, and Sunday morning. The Summer Commencement was changed to Saturday beginning in 2002. The Commencement Committee and the Administration made these changes without input from the EPC.

Final Exam Scheduling

A separate finals week of eight days, with four exam periods per day for a total of 32 exam periods, was established in 1967. The 1967 fall semester enrollment was 22,506. In 1972, the calendar was rearranged to finish the fall semester prior to the Christmas/New Year holidays. Finals week was reduced to six days (Monday through Saturday), with five periods per day; however, the fifth period (7-9 pm) is not used on Saturday. Thus, there are effectively 29 exam periods. This system is still used today. The 1972 fall enrollment was 26,204, while the fall 2003 enrollment was 38,847.

With almost a 50% increase in students in 31 years, it is obvious there are more final exams to schedule, and class sizes are generally larger. This means that faculty members have more exams to grade in the same amount of time. Many faculty members feel that essay or problem type questions are necessary on their final exam to adequately assess student learning and the burden of grading them in as little as 72 hours can be substantial.

Scheduling of final exams involves a linear programming optimization. The primary objective is to reduce the number of student conflicts (two exams at the same time or more than two exams in one day.) Per previous Senate legislation, the exam schedule is published in the fourth week of the semester. No attempt is made to avoid conflicts for instructors or assignment of two exams to an instructor on any given day, including Saturday. In fact, Space Management and Scheduling does not always have an accurate list of instructor assignments by the time the exam schedule is generated. Attempts are made to avoid having a given course repeatedly assigned to sessions late in the week, but that is not always successful due to the other constraints.

One job of the EPC Chair is to select a final exam schedule. For the Spring 2004 semester, the selected run has 10,418 exams scheduled on Saturday vs. the run with minimum conflicts, which had 13,552 Saturday exams. The cost of this was an additional 11 students with direct exam conflicts and 178 more students with more than two exams scheduled in one day. It also resulted in one course final being scheduled on Saturday for the third consecutive semester.

Grade Reporting Deadline

When the final exam schedule was modified in 1972, the grade-reporting deadline was established as 5:00 pm on the second working day following the end of the semester. It has remained there despite the increased workload on the faculty.

A major factor in maintaining the deadline is the desire to have diplomas in the folders at the May commencements. With grades due by Tuesday evening, the registrar staff is required to enter grades Tuesday night. Audit packages are then prepared and sent to the departments for verification that graduation requirements have been met. Because of the antiquated software system used for academic records, all grade entry (even for those courses that submit grades electronically), preparation of audit packages, and conducting of audits must be done manually.

The EPC considered moving the grade-reporting deadline to Wednesday at noon. With the old schedule for May Commencements, that would still allow completion of required actions in time for graduation. However, according to the Registrar's Staff, the Friday evening Commencement makes it virtually impossible to have diplomas in the folders if grades are not reported by Tuesday evening. Thus, the EPC concluded it could not change the grade-reporting deadline.

Academic Records Software

As mentioned above, the academic records software is antiquated. It drives our operating methods and limits the ability of the University to adopt changes such as the plus-minus grade system that was approved in 1998. The University Senate adopted a resolution in 1991 encouraging the creation of a new records system. A new system, TRAX, was begun and then canceled in favor of pursuing a commercial Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software package. The ERP system will have financial, human resources, and academic modules, with parallel development of all three modules scheduled to begin in July 2005. The academic portion is scheduled to begin coming online in August 2007 and be completed by August 2008. Once complete, the ERP system should allow electronic reporting of grades and on-line graduation audits, which will shorten the time required to prepare for graduation.

Conclusion

It is not feasible to extend the grade-reporting deadline until new academic system software is in place, unless the requirement to hand out diplomas at the May graduation is removed or the May Friday evening Commencement is moved to Saturday or Sunday. The University Senate should be involved in setting requirements for the ERP student module.

Approving:

Kristine Anderson
Patrick Connolly
Eric Furgason
Richard Ghiselli
Bogdan Golodan (student)
Tony Hawkins (advisor)
Christine Ladisch (advisor)
Kenneth Robinson
Richard Schweickert
Deb Sheets (advisor)
Tim Skvarenina
S. Laurel Weldon

Absent:

George Bodner
James Longuski
Richard Penney
Rahim Sewani (student)
Steven Widmer

Approving by email:

Will Jordan

TO: The University Senate
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee
SUBJECT: Proposed changes to the Primary Promotion Committees

Slide 1

**Proposed Changes to Academic
Procedure Manual:**

**Composition of the Primary
Committee**

1

Slide 2

Academic Procedure Manual p N-75

Original Text:

During the first semester of each academic year, the head of each school, division, or department shall convene the primary committee, **which is to consist of all tenured full professors** in the respective administrative unit. The department head shall act as chair of the primary committee.

In departments with fewer than five tenured full professors, including the department head, additional tenured full professors to meet this minimum number shall be appointed by the chair of the area committee (usually the dean) to which the primary committee reports, following consultation with the appropriate department head. **Tenured associate professors may be added to the primary committee by the tenured full professors to discuss and to vote upon promotions up to and including the associate professor level.** Clinical/professional faculty at the professor level will sit with the committee in review of documents of clinical/professional faculty being considered for promotion.

2

Proposed Changes:

Prior to the start of the first semester of each academic year, the head of each school, division, or department shall convene the primary committee, which is to consist of all tenured full professors **and all tenured associate professors** in the respective administrative unit. **Tenured associate professors discuss and vote upon promotions up to and including the associate professor level.** The department head shall act as chair of the primary committee.

In case of promotions to full professor where there are departments with fewer than five tenured full professors, including the department head, **in order to meet this minimum number**, additional tenured full professors shall be appointed by the chair of the area committee (usually the dean) to which the primary committee reports, following consultation with the appropriate department head. Clinical/professional faculty at the professor level will sit with the committee in review of documents of clinical/professional faculty being considered for promotion.

3

Benefits of Associate Participation

Allowing associate professors to participate on the primary committee will:

- Help to demystify the process and make it more inclusive.
- Enhance communication between and within faculties.
- Improve the fairness and openness of the process.
- Create a more diverse primary committee.
- Bring us in line with our peer institutions and other well-respected universities in the U.S.
- Benefit Purdue by making it easier to hire and retain the best possible faculty.

4

Slide 5

**Current departments which allow tenured
associate professors full or partial
participation on the primary committee**

- **Full participation**
Philosophy (since the mid 1970's)
- **Partial participation**
School of Management
Computer Technology (in the past)

5

Slide 6

**Departments including tenured associate
professor on primary committee**

- **Earth and Atmospheric Sciences (beginning spring
2004)**
- **History (beginning fall 2004)**

6

TO: The University Senate
FROM: Athletic Affairs Committee
SUBJECT: Athletic Affairs Committee Report to the University Senate, Spring 2003-04
REFERENCES: University Senate Document 90-31, 22 April 1991
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Information

Purdue University's commitment to the academic and social well being of its student-athletes is focused through the activities of the Athletic Affairs Committee (AAC) and Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA). This report will cover the two regular semesters in the year that has passed since the last report from the AAC: the Spring Semester of 2002-03 and the Fall Semester of 2003-04.

ACADEMIC STATUS OF STUDENT-ATHLETES

During the subject semesters, undergraduate enrollment at Purdue University totaled:

	Spring '02-03	Fall '03-04
Men:	16,682	17,951
Women:	<u>11,798</u>	<u>12,505</u>
Total:	28,480	30,456

Of these enrollments, student-athletes totaled:

Men:	244	264
Women:	<u>163</u>	<u>184</u>
Total:	407	448

One of the primary goals of ICA is to assist all student-athletes in achieving their full scholastic potential. This goal is being accomplished by ICA ensuring that ongoing support and services dedicated to academic excellence are freely available to all student-athletes. The Intercollegiate Athletics strategic planning document containing Vision, Mission, and Goals statements is appended hereto as Appendix 1. That portion of the Goals statement related specifically to academics states: "Student-athletes will be at or above the all-campus grade point average. Graduation rates will be at or above the all-campus average."

Specific objectives related to these goals include achievement of the stated performance levels for both the semester and the cumulative GPAs each semester. Details of the academic performance of student-athletes during the subject semesters, as compared to the corresponding university wide averages, is shown in the table below, including GPAs and other relevant statistics. It is noteworthy that the Fall '03-04 semester was the 13th consecutive semester in which the cumulative GPA of Purdue's student-athletes exceeded the all-campus cumulative GPA.

Student-Athlete Academic Information		
Academic Performance Measures:	Spring '02-03	Fall '03-04
<u>Cumulative GPA</u>		
Student-athletes	2.94	2.92
All-campus	2.92	2.90
<u>Semester GPA</u>		
Student-athletes	2.88	2.84
All-campus	2.87	2.84
<u>Achievement of Semester GPA of 3.0 or higher</u>		
Student-athletes	52.6% (214)	50.4% (226)
All-campus	53.1%	51.6%
<u>Achievement of Academic Honors</u>		
Student-athletes	30.5% (124)	25.9% (116)
Dean's List and Semester Honors	(64)	(71)
Semester Honors only	(53)	(38)
Dean's List only	(7)	(7)
All-campus	26.0%	25.4%
<u>Achievement of perfect 4.0 Semester GPA</u>		
Student-athletes	9.6% (39)	8.7% (39)
All-campus	9.8%	9.3%
<u>Placement on probation</u>		
Student-athletes	9.3% (38)	7.6% (34)
All-campus	7.3%	8.3%
<u>Drops from the University</u>		
Student-athletes	0.2% (1)	1.1% (5)
All-campus	2.1%	1.6%

In support of its goal to achieve above average GPAs, ICA also wishes to promote the importance of its athletes bringing their academic careers to a successful conclusion by ensuring that every student has the best opportunity to graduate. To this end, the goal set by ICA as stated above is to achieve and maintain graduation rates for all student-athletes that are greater than, or equal to, the graduation rates for all Purdue students.

According to NCAA reporting requirements, for a student-athlete to be counted as a graduate in a cohort, he or she must graduate from the institution of initial enrollment (Purdue) within six years of original entry. The most recent cohort to have completed the six-year reporting period is that for 1996-97. For that cohort, 61% percent of student-athletes (men 56%, women 68%) graduated within the six-year reporting period. 64% of all Purdue students (men 62%, women 65%) graduated in the same time frame.

The 61% graduation rate for the Purdue student-athletes is below the 63% graduation rate for student-athletes in all Division 1A Schools. It should be noted, however, that the drop in the graduation rate from the previous year was primarily associated with transfer activity that occurred when a new football coach was hired in 1997. Without that activity the graduation rate would have been closer to 70%. Preliminary information on the 1997-98 cohort bears this out – their graduation rate is 81%, with some still enrolled and expected to graduate! The Purdue graduation rates are greater than the rates for Division 1A Schools in baseball, football, men's other, and women's basketball; they are lower for men's and women's track and for women's other. Reporting of the men's graduation rate in basketball was suppressed due to FERPA regulations on small sample sizes.

A related objective of ICA for student-athletes is that the 4-year moving average graduation rate for student-athletes exceeds that of the overall student body. The measure, which is less sensitive to short-term fluctuations than the yearly rates, is the average of the graduation rates for the four most recently completed 6-year cohorts, in this case the 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96, and 1996-97 cohorts. This moving average was 68% for student-athletes and 63% for the student body.

Note: In accordance with Federal reporting requirements which are adopted by the NCAA, student-athletes who transfer out are still in Purdue's figures; however, a transfer in does not count in Purdue's figures.

Appendix 2 summarizes the statistical report (data received from the Office of the Registrar), and compares the graduation rates for student-athletes to the rates for all Purdue students who entered the University in the academic year 1996-1997 and to the rates for NCAA Division 1A schools.

Note: Figures showing the distribution of student-athletes among the Schools of Purdue University during the Fall 2003 semester appear in Appendix 6.

FACULTY OVERSIGHT OF ATHLETICS

Faculty oversight of ICA continues to be exercised through the AAC. The membership of the AAC, listed at the end of this report, continues to include representation from faculty, an appointed liaison from the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate, alumni, citizens from the local community, Purdue University students, and ICA. The AAC has a charge to study, review and approve changes in rules and regulations affecting intercollegiate athletics programs, and to formulate positions with regard to legislation pending before the NCAA. The AAC also discusses current NCAA changes to regulations and proposals on diverse topics that will affect the status of both university sports programs and the eligibility of student-athletes.

Appendix 5 contains the minimum core-curriculum requirements for initial eligibility under a 13 core course rule, a 14 core course rule, and a 16 core course rule. The 13 core course rule applied to all student-athletes who first entered college prior to August 1, 2003. Student-athletes first entering college on or after August 1, 2003 but before August 1, 2005 may meet initial-eligibility requirements under either the 13 core course rule or the 14 core course rule, while those student-athletes entering college on or after August 1, 2005 must meet the 14 core course rule. The 16 core course rule takes effect for those student-athletes entering college on or after August 1, 2008. Initial-eligibility standards for full and partial qualifiers are listed in Appendix 3 for student-athletes entering under the 13 core course rule. The initial-eligibility standards corresponding to the 14 and 16 core course rules are shown in Appendix 4. Note that computer science is being eliminated as an acceptable core-course area for students first entering any college or university on or after August 1, 2005.

Monthly meetings of the AAC are held at which members hear reports and participate in discussions pertinent to their mandate. Coaches from all sports are regularly invited to speak to the AAC on the academic status of the student-athletes and individual teams. Topics dealt with this year also included updates on the Intercollegiate Athletics Department Strategic Plan and NCAA Academic Reform Initiatives.

The members of the AAC are very impressed with the efforts that the professional staff and coaches at Purdue University make on a continual basis to emphasize the importance of academic achievement to the athletes in their charge. It is the opinion of all members of this committee that the coaches and their staff as presently constituted at Purdue University expend an effort to assist their athletes in all aspects of their academic and social growth well beyond that which would normally be expected of them. Indeed, they are to be commended for the work they are doing both on and off the field of sport.

HIGHLIGHTS OF OUR SPORTS TEAMS IN 2003:

Certainly, we prefer that our athletic teams excel athletically as well as academically. From the Intercollegiate Athletics Strategic Planning document, again, we have the following Goals statement regarding athletics: "All sports will place in the upper half of the Big Ten and will be ranked in the top 25 nationally. When we are performing at these levels on a consistent basis, we will be competing for championships in the Big Ten and nationally." Following is a selection of highlights from each sport in which Purdue competes at the varsity level, covering the year elapsed since the previous report.

Sports in which both Men and Women Compete

Swimming & Diving: Both the men's and women's teams placed sixth at the Big Ten Championships. The women's team was sparked by the performances of sophomore diver Carrie McCambridge, who won all three conference diving titles. During the women's championship meet, the Boilermakers recorded six varsity records, four freshman records and 16 NCAA provisional cuts, while claiming eight top-eight finalists and 14 consolation finalists.

The men's team claimed two individual champions at its Big Ten Championship meet, as junior Louis Paul won his second consecutive 200-yard individual medley title and sophomore Giordan Pogioli won his first 200-yard breaststroke title.

Swimmers Louis Paul, Giordan Pogioli, Tamas Bessenyei and Tracy Duchac participated in the NCAA Championships in March, as well as divers Carrie McCambridge, Amanda Miller and J. R. Hillis. Pogioli earned All-America honors, while McCambridge earned Honorable Mention All-America honors.

Basketball: The men's basketball team finished at 17-14 overall and was ranked as high as 19th this season in the national polls. The Boilermakers played in the NIT postseason tournament. Senior Kenneth Lowe was named Big Ten Defensive Player of the year for the second-straight season.

The women's basketball team finished the regular season with a record of 27-3 and a Big Ten Tournament Championship title. Senior Shereka Wright was named the tournament's most outstanding player. Wright led the Big Ten Conference in scoring with a 21.4 average. She received first team All-Big Ten honors. Katie Gearlds received Big Ten Freshman of the Year honors, while Senior Erika Valek earned All-Big Ten honorable mention, and freshman Erin Lawless received Big Ten All-Freshman Team honors. The Boilermakers secured their 11th straight NCAA bid and a number two seed in the tournament.

Tennis: The 2002-03 women's tennis team finished 13-12 after making the program's third NCAA Championships appearance. Head coach Mat landolo shared Big Ten Coach of the Year honors following the Boilermakers' fourth-place finish in the league standings. Purdue currently is 6-6 in 2004, with one of its wins coming against No. 17 Illinois in the conference opener.

The 2002-03 men's tennis team finished 13-8, and placed fourth in the Big Ten. Two Boilermakers received All-Big Ten honors. Purdue is currently 5-6 in 2004.

Golf: The women's golf team competed in the NCAA Championships for the fourth consecutive year and hosted the NCAA Championships, in which they finished 12th.

The men's golf team advanced to the NCAA Regional Championships, and this season Purdue will host the 2004 NCAA Central Regional Championships at the Kampen Course.

Track and Field: During the 2003 outdoor season, the men's team finished runner-up at the Big Ten Championships, while the women placed eighth. Big Ten titles were won by Jacques Reeves, Kenneth Baxter, Jamar Green and Prentice Stovall; Shanna Carter finished second in the heptathlon. The men's team tied for 32nd place at the NCAA Outdoor Championships, as All-America titles were earned by Baxter in the 200-meter dash, McBride in the hammer throw and Mulabegovic in the shot put

At the Big Ten Indoor Championships, the men placed fifth and the women 10th. Highlighting both team's efforts at the conference championships was the work of their throwers. Senior Scott Hecht placed third in the shot put and weight throw, while teammates Keith McBride and Nedzad Mulabegovic earned runner-up honors in the weight throw and shot put, respectively. At the women's meet, Tiffany Britten placed fourth in the shot put and Courtney Magnuson finished sixth in the weight throw.

Purdue was represented by four student-athletes at the NCAA Indoor Championships: sprinter Kenneth Baxter, and throwers Hecht, McBride and Mulabegovic. Despite bringing only a handful of competitors, the Boilermakers finished an amazing sixth place in the competition, with all four competitors earning All-America honors, Hecht in two events.

Cross Country: The Purdue cross country teams each finished 10th at the 2003 Big Ten Championships in East Lansing. Junior co-captain Kara Lahey was the top finisher for the women, placing 25th. The men were paced by senior Kyle Orender with a 15th-place showing. Prior to the start of the season, head coach Mike Poehlein announced his plans to retire at the end of the school year, hanging up his running shoes after 31 years of service to Purdue. Head coach

Lissa Olson, who is expecting twins in early April, will resign her position to rejoin her husband, who is now a coach with the Detroit Lions.

Women's Sports

Soccer: The soccer team enjoyed one of its finest seasons ever, finishing with a win-loss record of 14-6-3 and No. 24 national ranking. For a second consecutive year, the Boilermakers secured a berth in the NCAA Tournament but lost to eventual national champion North Carolina in the third round. Against the Big Ten, the Boilermakers finished third at 6-2-2, a record that includes a 3-1 win over soccer powerhouse, Penn State.

Softball: The Boilermakers ended the 2003 regular season with a 34-27 record, having achieved the fifth consecutive 30-win season at Purdue. As of 3/20/04, the 2004 team is 15-9 overall.

Volleyball: The volleyball team finished 14-17 overall, 7-13 in the Big Ten for 8th place, marking the best conference finish for the team since the 2001 campaign. This was the first season under head coach Dave Shondell.

Men's Sports

Football: The 2003 Purdue football team finished with a 9-4 overall record after losing a thrilling 34-27 overtime decision to Georgia in the Capital One Bowl on New Year's Day. The Boilermakers were 6-2 in the Big Ten, good for a second-place tie with Ohio State. Purdue is one of 11 schools in the country (two in the Big Ten) to play in a bowl game each of the last seven seasons.

Baseball: The Purdue nine finished the 2003 season with a record of 29-26, 13-18 in the Big Ten. The Boilermakers finished seventh in the conference, one spot out of the Big Ten Tournament. After the completion of the season, two Boilermakers were selected in the Major League Draft, as junior pitcher Dustin Glant was taken by the Arizona Diamondbacks in the seventh round and senior second baseman Nick McIntyre was selected in the 20th round by the Detroit Tigers. As of 3/20/04, the 2004 team is 4-8 overall.

Wrestling: The Boilermaker grapplers established a program record by winning 18 duals during the 2003-04 season, finishing with a record of 18-6. At the 2004 Big Ten Championships, Purdue placed sixth, the highest finish during head coach Jessie Reyes' 12 years at the helm. Senior 174-pounder Ryan Lange won the Big Ten title, becoming the first Boilermaker to win two conference championships since Bob Marshall won titles in 1960, 1961, and 1962. Purdue qualified seven wrestlers to the NCAA Championships, where they finished in 27th place. Lange garnered a fifth place finish, earning All-America honors. His 130 career wins is the most in Purdue wrestling history.

2003-2004 ATHLETIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

George P. McCabe Jr. (*Committee Chair, Professor of Statistics*)
Roger L. Blalock (*Associate Athletic Director for Sports*)
Jeffrey T. Bolin (*Professor of Biological Sciences, Faculty Athletic Representative*)
Morgan J. Burke (*Athletic Director*)
Nancy L. Cross (*Senior Women's Administrator Associate A.D. for Marketing & Development*)
Robert L. Holloway (*Alumni Representative*)
Edward G. Howat (*Assistant Athletic Director for Student Services*)
John A. Knot, M.D. (*Alumni Representative*)
Holly L. Mason (*Professor of Pharmacy Administration and Pharmacy Practice and Associate Dean of Pharmacy*)
Robert E. Montgomery (*Student Affairs Liaison, Associate Professor of Engineering*)
Scott E. Priebe (*Student Representative*)
Thomas J. Reiter (*ex-officio, Compliance Director*)
Thomas B. Robinson (*Presidential Liaison, Vice President for Student Services*)
Christie L. Sahley (*Associate Professor of Biological Sciences and Asst. Dean of Science, Faculty Athletic Representative*)
Dianne Sautter (*Community Representative*)
Lindsay M. Schoettmer (*Student Representative*)
Thomas J. Templin (*Professor and Head, Department of Health and Kinesiology*)
Glenn F. Tompkins (*Senior Associate Athletic Director for Business*)
Charles W. White (*Assistant Professor, Computer Graphics Technology*)
Olivia Bennett Wood (*Associate Professor & Director Didactic Program in Dietetics, Foods & Nutrition*)

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
VISION

A nationally prominent athletic organization that is excellent in all respects and a member of the “25/75 Club.”

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
MISSION

Our collective aspirations will be to achieve national success – both athletically and academically – and by so doing engage and inspire all constituencies to support the broader University pursuit of preeminence.

To allow student-athletes to meet or exceed their expectations in every aspect of their experience at Purdue University and to provide the resources for coaches and staff to develop winning programs.

This will be accomplished in an environment that recognizes the value of diversity and adheres to the highest standards of integrity, work ethic and teamwork.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
GOALS

Athletic

All sports will place in the upper half of the Big Ten and will be ranked in the top 25 nationally. When we are performing at these levels on a consistent basis, we will be competing for championships in the Big Ten and nationally.

Academic

Student-athletes will be at or above the all-campus grade point average. Graduation rates will be at or above the all-campus average.

Fiscal

Marketing, Promotion, and Development plans will be designed and implemented to generate a source of revenue. These monies, along with all other funds available to the department, will be allocated and managed to ensure that we have the resources for scholarships, quality academic support services and comprehensive, excellent facilities.

Equity

Provide quality participation opportunities that recognize and support gender and ethnic equity for all student-athletes in an atmosphere that fosters diversity in all constituencies.

Image

All actions, whether proactive or reactive, will create, maintain and project an image of excellence.

STUDENT-ATHLETE GRADUATION RATES*

Graduation Rates for Freshmen Entering in 1996-1997**

	Purdue	NCAA Division 1A
All Students	64%	63%
Student-Athletes	61%	63%
Men	62%	56%
Women	65%	72%
Women's Basketball	75%	66%
Women's Track	57%	70%
Women's Other Sports	71%	73%
Men's Basketball	***%	42%
Men's Track	57%	60%
Men's Football	57%	54%
Men's Baseball	67%	46%
Men's Other Sports	67%	66%

* To be counted as a graduate, the student must graduate within six years from the institution of original enrollment.

** Above averages based on 76 graduating Purdue student-athletes and 7,646 graduating student-athletes in Division 1A schools.

*** No percentage given in NCAA statistics; sample size is less than or equal to 5, & FERPA regulations require that these data be suppressed.

DIVISION I QUALIFIER INDEX
(to be used with 13 core courses)

Core GPA	ACT* sum of scores	SAT** on or after 4/1/95
2.500 & above	68	820
2.475	69	830
2.450	70	840-850
2.425	70	860
2.400	71	860
2.375	72	870
2.350	73	880
2.325	74	890
2.300	75	900
2.275	76	910
2.250	77	920
2.225	78	930
2.200	79	940
2.175	80	950
2.150	80	960
2.125	81	960
2.100	82	970
2.075	83	980
2.050	84	990
2.025	85	1000
2.000	86	1010

PARTIAL QUALIFIER INDEX
(to be used with 13 core courses)

Core GPA	ACT* sum of scores	SAT** on or after 4/1/95
2.750 & above	59	720
2.725	59	730
2.700	60	730
2.675	61	740-750
2.650	62	760
2.625	63	770
2.600	64	780
2.575	65	790
2.550	66	800
2.525	67	810

* Previously, ACT score was calculated by averaging four scores. New standards are based on sum of scores.

** For SAT tests taken on or after April 1, 1995.

CORE GPA/Test Score Index
(to be used with 14 or 16 core courses)

Core GPA	SAT	ACT
3.550 & above	400	37
3.525	410	38
3.500	420	39
3.475	430	40
3.450	440	41
3.425	450	41
3.400	460	42
3.375	470	42
3.350	480	43
3.325	490	44
3.300	500	44
3.275	510	45
3.250	520	46
3.225	530	46
3.200	540	47
3.175	550	47
3.150	560	48
3.125	570	49
3.100	580	49
3.075	590	50
3.050	600	50
3.025	610	51
3.000	620	52
2.975	630	52
2.950	640	53
2.925	650	53
2.900	660	54
2.875	670	55
2.850	680	56
2.825	690	56
2.800	700	57
2.775	710	58
2.750	720	59
2.725	730	59
2.700	730	60
2.675	740-750	61
2.650	760	62
2.625	770	63
2.600	780	64
2.575	790	65
2.550	800	66
2.525	810	67
2.500	820	68
2.475	830	69
2.450	840-850	70
2.425	860	70
2.400	860	71
2.375	870	72
2.350	880	73
2.325	890	74
2.300	900	75
2.275	910	76
2.250	920	77
2.225	930	78
2.200	940	79
2.175	950	80
2.150	960	80
2.125	960	81
2.100	970	82
2.075	980	83
2.050	990	84
2.025	1000	85
2.000	1010	86

**MINIMUM CORE-CURRICULUM AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR INITIAL ELIGIBILITY – DIVISION 1**

Courses	Effective Aug. 1, 1996 13 courses	Effective Aug. 1, 2005* 14 courses	Effective Aug. 1, 2008 16 courses
English	4 years	4 years	4 years
Mathematics	2 years (Algebra I or higher)	2 years (Algebra I or higher)	3 years (Algebra I or higher)
Natural/Physical Science	2 years (1 year of lab if offered by high school)	2 years (1 year of lab if offered by high school)	2 years (1 year of lab if offered by high school)
Additional English, math or natural/physical science	1 year	1 year	1 year
Social Science	2 years	2 years	2 years
Additional academic courses in any of the above areas or foreign language, philosophy, non-doctrinal religion, or computer science**	2 years	3 years	4 years
Core curriculum grade-point average/test score initial-eligibility index	See sliding scale, Appendix 3	See sliding scale, Appendix 4	See sliding scale, Appendix 4

* Students first entering college on or after August 1, 2003 but before August 1, 2005 may meet initial-eligibility requirements under either the 13 core course rule or the 14 core course rule. Students entering college on or after August 1, 2005 must meet the new 14 core course rule.

** Computer science is being eliminated as an acceptable core-course area for students first entering any college or university on or after August 1, 2005.

NUMBER OF STUDENT-ATHLETES BY SCHOOL**Fall 2003**

<u>School</u>	<u># of Student-Athletes</u>
Agriculture	20
Consumer & Family Sciences	28
Education	12
Engineering:	
Fresh-E	18
AAE	2
ABE	0
CE	2
CEM	1
CHE	4
ECE	0
IDE	1
IE	6
ME	9
MSE	0
Health Sciences	18
Liberal Arts	226
Management	76
Nursing	5
Pharmacy & Pharmacal Sciences	6
Science	22
Technology:	
AT	5
BCM	6
CPT	4
EET	3
IT	5
MET	5
OLS	24
CGT	7
CMT	1
Graduate School	3
Undergraduate Studies Program	5