UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 30 January 2017, 2:30 p.m.
Deans Auditorium, Pfendler Hall

AGENDA

1. Call to order  Professor David A. Sanders
2. Approval of Minutes of 21 November 2016
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. Remarks of the Senate Chair  Professor David A. Sanders
5. Remarks of the President  President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.
6. Question Time
7. Résumé of Items Under Consideration  For Information  Professor Gerald E. Shively
   by Various Standing Committees
8. Senate Document 16-05 Course Evaluation Resolution  For Discussion  Professor Levon Esters
9. Presentation by the Director of the Black Cultural Center  For Information  Director Renee Thomas
10. Presentation by the Treasurer  For Information  Treasurer William Sullivan
11. Update on the Funds Management Project  For Information  Assistant Provost for Finance and Administration Connie Lapinskas
12. New Business
13. Memorial Resolutions
14. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 30 January 2017, 2:30 p.m.  
Deans Auditorium, Pfendler Hall


Guests: Valerie O’Brien (Marketing & Media), Mark Masters (IPFW), Janusz Duzinkiewicz (PNC), Joan Fulton (Diversity & Inclusion, PWL), Deepika Agarwal (College of PHARM), Emily Doan (PHARM), Denny Darrow (HR), Spencer Deery (Public Affairs), Renee Thomas (BCC), Jason Fish (ITaP-TLT), Dan Carpenter (Student Success), Chris Kulesza (PGSG), Brent Drake (OIRAE), Chantal L. Bristol (CIE), Jason Harris (HSCI), Andy Freed (EASCI).

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson David Sanders.

2. The minutes of the 21 November 2016 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

3. The Agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Professor Sanders presented the remarks of the Chairperson (see Appendix A).

5. President Daniels presented the remarks of the President (see Appendix B).

6. Question Time

   - Professor Kristina Bross asked the following question: “I want to thank you, President Daniels, for your clear critique of President Trump’s ban on immigration. I note that other presidents, including President Schlissel of the University of Michigan, have made additional statements. What further plans to support our international students does Purdue have?” President Daniels said that he shares her concerns and he has talked to the leaders at other universities who have the same concerns, such as the University of Michigan. The Purdue University Administration is trying to determine if any of our students or faculty have been affected by the executive order. Purdue University administrators also want to be supportive if this order moves forward.

   - Professor Laurel Weldon thanked President Daniels for his statement on the immigration issue. She stressed the importance of freedom of movement of people
and ideas because prejudice and discrimination negatively affect the free flow of information. President Daniels said that most of us wish that the incident had not happened, but there will be a lot of learning and this will be on display. He noted that human interest anecdotes go directly to your (Professor Weldon’s) concern about innovation and flow of information. He also mentioned that companies are expressing concerns about the impacts of the executive order on them.

- Professor Evelyn Blackwood said that a letter is circulating in the College of Liberal Arts (see Appendix C) that addresses concerns around the immigration issue. The letter recommends that we refuse to provide the names of students and other information to the Trump Administration. President Daniels stated that Purdue University has no plans, at present, to give out names and has received no requests for names.

7. Professor Gerald Shively, Chair of the Steering Committee, presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix D). The Chairs or designees of the Senate standing committees briefly described the current activities of their respective committees. Professor Natalie Carroll, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, provided a list of the current volunteers for the various Faculty Committees (see Appendix E).

8. Professor Levon Esters, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), introduced, for Discussion, Senate Document 16-05, Resolution on Student Evaluations. Professor Esters was joined at the podium by Professors Linda Prokopy and Steve Landry. They introduced the document to the Senate and explained its rationale. They also presented a PowerPoint in support of the resolution (Appendix F). Professor Stuart Bolton, a member of the FAC, supports the document, but was out-of-town and did not have the opportunity to vote at the FAC meeting. Professor Prokopy noted that the document attempts to remove two questions from the mandatory requirements of the current student evaluation question set (“overall, I would rate this instructor as” and “overall, I would rate this course as” will no longer be mandatory university questions.). She said this is our chance to do something about the changes that should occur. Previous Senate efforts have failed. No suitable replacement has been made as it will need to be worked on, over time. This is not an attempt to get rid of student voice. If the resolution was made stronger, it might be voted against, again. Student response rates have nothing to do with this resolution. This is a West Lafayette-centric resolution, but at least Purdue Northwest (PNW) believes this will have an impact in a trickle-down fashion. When this was discussed with them, the College Deans were not in favor of the wording, but Agriculture Dean Jay Akridge made the proposal that the Provost Office provide alternatives for the two questions by January 2019. Professor Jorge Rodriguez congratulated Professor Prokopy and all those who worked on this as it is much more reasonable than the previous resolution brought before the Senate. He suggested that some faculty will be unhappy with removal of the two questions and the numbers they provide. He disagrees that the two numbers do not provide the information. This is especially the case at a STEM university such as Purdue. He suggested a change in the wording from “are not” to “may not be” in the Whereas statements. He caution the body that it is not only the Deans who will be unhappy about taking away the number system. A statement from PGSG was read by PGSG External Vice President Chris Kulesza (see Appendix G). The PGSG voted unanimously against removing these two questions. Professor Rusty Jones chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) said his committee considered the document and there were 3 votes for, 4 votes against and 6 abstentions. The SAC members were concerned that there is
no replacement at this time. In addition, the SAC wants campus-wide consistency. Steve Landry reiterated that this resolution does not remove the numbers, the numbers can still be collected, but would no longer be mandatory. Units can keep their numbers, if they so choose. Biases have been demonstrated and we had a Senate presentation on this topic at the February 2016 Senate meeting (link to February 2016 Senate Minutes). Professor Landry has not seen anything that says there are no biases. In Engineering, the way the numbers are reported are mathematically inaccurate. The Center for Instructional Excellence (CIE) Director Chantal Levesque-Bristol stated that the CIE has been working in collaboration with Professors Prokopy and Landry and the FAC on this issue. According to Directory Levesque-Bristol, there are inaccuracies and biases in the current student evaluation surveys. There are demonstrated gender differences. Professor Weldon did not understand why her colleagues will not support a stronger statement in the resolution based on the data that show that a 0.5 point lower results are obtained, on average, for female professors and professors of color. She wanted a stronger statement, but will support the existing resolution. Professor Ralph Kaufmann, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), said that he supports the document and the EPC members support it. He reiterated the statements of support that have been recorded above. He emphasized that this is a starting point, even if it is not what everyone would like. The EPC members like the proposed two-year process and deadline of January 2019, with the Provost Office, for a revised system. As a mathematician, he recognizes that there is not necessarily any difference between a score of 3.7 and a score of 3.6, but students really want to express their personal opinions of the instructor. Professor Cheryl Cooky noted that she gets high marks already and would be above 5 with the male-associated 0.5 point bump. She wondered why the focus was on these two questions not more generally for the current system and questions. She does find the student evaluations important and they help her improve her teaching. How can we look at this at the more global level related to Promotion and Tenure? She, too, would like a stronger document. Professor Landry said that many alternative versions were considered during the years this has been discussed. There is no common wisdom, so they are taking this measured approach. Professors Prokopy and Landry agree that student evaluation are very important. Again, this is a first step to get the process started. Professor Alberto Rodriguez thanked them for the work. He agrees with Professor Weldon that it could be stronger, but it is a good place to start. He made a suggestion for a change to the document. Specifically, in the third "Be it Resolved" paragraph add "as well as to gather feedback" between "expectations" and "with respect". Professor Charles Ross favors the document and wondered if the effect of this will be to eliminate those numbers from the Form 36? He suggested that outliers can influence (skew) the results. Professor Landry stated that he does not like the numbers for summative evaluations. Linda-Professor Prokopy emphasized that the numbers are not required on Form 36. It is Professor Prokopy’s hope that the Provost Office will show the Colleges that the numbers are meaningless. In the Deans' meeting it was suggested that faculty members have not been denied promotion based on these numbers, but many women leave Purdue University, pre-tenure. Professor Kip Williams is in favor, but there is bias. However, if we do not use the numbers, there is more chance for bias in the qualitative information and results. Professor Weldon said she is very comfortable with numbers as a statistician, but said that the overall global questions introduce the most bias while more concrete questions have better validity. Professor Landry stated that this is not meant to be an attack on quantitative indicators. Professor Sanders mentioned his long-time interest in revising the student evaluation instrument and the comments heard at this meeting reflect his beliefs. A previously introduced Senate document was intended to make the evaluations formative rather than summative and to be a useful instrument to improve teaching. In response to a question, CIE Director
Levesque-Bristol said that there are, on average, >50% response results from the students. The response percentages do vary around this average. Professor Sanders reminded the Senate that a previous Senate Document, 97-9, already exists, and it is a useful document to consider. Another change was suggested for paragraph one to include “Beginning in fall 2018.” Providing a year to adjust to a new system will be helpful for all stakeholders.

9. An update and historical perspective on the Black Cultural Center (BCC) were provided by BCC Director Renee Thomas (see Appendix H). A movie that documents the struggles and successes of black students at Purdue University can be found at this link: Black Purdue Documentary. In addition, a short YouTube video about the BCC can be found at this link: Purdue Black Cultural Center.

10. Treasurer William Sullivan gave a presentation on University Finances, Endowment Performance and Business Process Re-engineering (see Appendix I). Following the presentation he entertained questions from the Senate floor.
   • Professor Prokopy expressed her dismay at Purdue’s unwillingness to follow through on the FLSA pay raises for other staff members besides post-doctoral staff following the judicial stay of the executive order. Treasurer Sullivan said that the administration is looking at other classes of employees and will consider these for future pay decisions. The pay raise mandate was placed on Purdue University by the federal government and would have been very costly to the University. We can now step back and determine if adjustments are needed for those individuals whose pay is inequitable.
   • Professor Sanders noted that post-doctoral staff are included in the figures that show an increase in the number of faculty and instructors. Chief Data Officer Brent Drake commented that the information about Purdue University is provided by the IPEDS and post-doctoral staff are included in the denominator. Professor Weldon thanked Treasurer Sullivan for the presentation and said that one reason our tuition income has not declined is due to the increase in student numbers. This can be good, but everything we do is expensive and it is hard to tell if the additional faculty members are adequate to handle the increased number of students. She asked: Is the revenue sufficient to handle the increases? Treasurer Sullivan said this was a good question and we are trying to bring all of these things back into balance. At some point in time, tuition will have to be increased. It is not clear what the balancing point will be. Purdue University is also trying to develop new revenue streams.
   • Professor Richard Cosier commented about an apparent negative cash flow shown for one of the fiscal years in the presentation. He asked about the value of the cumulative surplus and if it is sufficient to cover the financial needs. Treasurer Sullivan said that the endowment fund did lose money in 2015. Our current net position is $4.4 billion with $1.79 billion in operating cash.
   • Professor Weldon asked about the continuation of the tuition freeze. We already know that it has been approved for next year, beyond that, it is an open question. It will be continually reviewed and will depend on the issues shown in the President’s presentation (see Appendix B). Professor Kaufmann noted that Treasurer Sullivan did not mention what the faculty and administration are doing as their contribution to the financial issues. Treasurer Sullivan stated that faculty numbers are up while administrative numbers are down about 150 people. Raises have been 3.5% and 2.5%, on average, for the last two years, but this year’s figures have not been determined.
   • Professor Mark Thom said the figures looked good, but he does not see the figures
associated with infrastructure funds. He said he has been told by the administration that he needs to provide matching funds to get a leaking roof repaired on a building he teaches in. Treasurer Sullivan said that he should not have been told that he had to provide matching funds. Purdue University puts $60 million per year in the R&R and is at the high end of what academic institutions spend on R&R. Purdue University spends about $250 million per year on capital projects. He suggested that Professor Thom contact him with his specific concern about the leaky roof.

- Professor Sanders mentioned the historical contribution from the University units of $20 million during the last decade. Treasurer Sullivan said that this was before his time at Purdue. In particular, the 2014 fiscal year was a focus of former Treasurer Al Diaz and President Daniels and administrative funds were transferred to the student affordability initiative. Professor Alan Friedman noted that ITaP contributed $5 million to the total.

11. Assistant Vice Provost for Finance and Administration Connie Lapinskas updated the Senate on the Funds Management Process initiative (see Appendix J). Associate Dean of the Graduate School Linda Mason asked Vice Provost Lapinskas: What proportion of the startup funds for beginning professors are spent in the first year and over succeeding years. VP Lapinskas said they are spent at the following percentages: 40%, 30%, 10%, 10% with any remaining funds spent in the final year. Professor Weldon thanks VP Lapinskas for her efforts on this project.

12. Two Memorial Resolutions had been received for James Douglas, Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Computational Mathematics, and Darrell Leep, Professor Emeritus of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences. To honor their departed colleague, the Senate members stood for a moment of silence.

13. Having no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
To: The University Senate

From: University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Subject: Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness at Purdue University

Disposition: University Senate for Discussion

WHEREAS: University Senate Document 97-9 (Revised) indicates that “learning outcomes are important and should be evaluated;” and

WHEREAS: The use of the group medians of the students’ responses to the questions “overall, I would rate this instructor as” and “overall, I would rate this course as” are the current “common items” being used primarily, if not exclusively, for summative evaluations of faculty members, i.e., for promotion and tenure decisions; and

WHEREAS: It has been documented that student responses to this question are not accurate measures of student achievement of learning outcomes; and

WHEREAS: Research on student evaluations of teaching is indicating that the requirements in the “common items” section of University Senate Document 97-9 (revised) result in summative evaluation systems that are biased, easily manipulated, and inaccurate;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Starting with the fall, 2017 semester, the questions “overall, I would rate this instructor as” and “overall, I would rate this course as” will no longer be mandatory university questions. Moreover, academic units are strongly encouraged not to use student responses to these questions for summative evaluation purposes, i.e. for promotion and tenure decisions.

For tenure-track faculty members that started at Purdue prior to fall, 2017, academic units should come to a mutual agreement on what will be used for their summative evaluations in support of the promotion and tenure process.

We request that the Provost’s office meet with Deans, individual promotion committees, and School/Department heads to describe the University’s expectations with respect to the use of summative course evaluation scores on the Promotion and Tenure Document.

Appropriate University groups should review all methods in use for summative evaluations as soon as possible initially, and then on a routine basis not to exceed an interval of 4 years. The review should include a report on best practices across the University and a comparison to methods used or proposed elsewhere for summative evaluations. These reports should be submitted and reviewed by appropriate personnel with the Provost’s office and by appropriate University Senate committees, and disseminated to primary and area committees.
Respectfully submitted by

Levon T. Esters

Voted For:
Linda S. Prokopy
Steven Landry
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh
Elizabeth A. Strickland
Evelyn Blackwood
Peter Dunn
Peter Hollenbeck
Ming-Ming Chiu
Bob Lucht
Vanessa Quinn
Paul Wenthold

Voted Against:

Did Not Vote/Abstained:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SENATE DOCUMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>TITLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ORIGIN</strong></th>
<th><strong>SENATE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-13</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-13 Student Affairs Committee English Language Support Resolution</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee Professor Russell Jones</td>
<td>*Approved 19 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-19 Resolution on Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention</td>
<td>Professors Alberto Rodriguez</td>
<td>*Approved 19 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>Senate Document 16-01 Resolution on Immigrants, International Students &amp; Scholars and Visitors to Purdue University</td>
<td>Equity and Diversity Committee Professor Linda Prokopy and Professor Feng-Song Wang</td>
<td>*Approved 12 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-2</td>
<td>Senate Document 16-01 Bylaws Revision Section 5.30</td>
<td>Equity and Diversity Committee Professor Heather Servaty-Seib</td>
<td>*Approved 21 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-3</td>
<td>Reapportionment of the Senate</td>
<td>Steering Committee Professor Gerald Shively</td>
<td>*Approved 21 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-4</td>
<td>University Senate Resolution on IPFW Program Restructuring</td>
<td>Senate Chair – Professor David Sanders</td>
<td>*Approved 21 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-05</td>
<td>Senate Document 16-05 Course Evaluation Resolution</td>
<td>Professor Levon Esters Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>*For Discussion 30 January 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colleagues,

Welcome to the first meeting of the Purdue University Senate of 2017! I have never had so many people ask me to address so many issues at one Senate meeting.

The leadership has endeavored to make the Senate a more robust and effective organization. We have a more active Committee structure, and I have instituted regular meetings of the Chairs of the Standing Committees. I have been engaged in meeting with each of the Deans of the Colleges and have regular and highly cordial discussions with the Provost and the President to discuss the concerns of the Senate and the faculty, although I have not yet had a private meeting with President Daniels this calendar year. I believe that there is an enhanced appreciation of the value of shared governance.

I will begin with one example. At our November meeting we passed Document 16-04 expressing our concern about a breach of the principles of shared governance with respect to IPFW. Our intervention has been recognized as effecting concrete changes as well as promoting an environment where more effective shared governance will be the rule at IPFW in the future. The IPFW Senate passed a resolution that included the following text:

WHEREAS, the Purdue Faculty Senate has passed a resolution supporting the rights of IPFW faculty; and
WHEREAS, Purdue Senate Chair David Sanders visited IPFW over the course of two days to learn more about the current crisis and to become better informed about faculty concerns; BE IT RESOLVED, that on behalf of all IPFW faculty, the Senate express its thanks and appreciation to all those who have advocated for the rights of the faculty, and who have defended the highest principles of university shared governance and academic due process.

I also received a letter from which I will quote.

Dear Dr. Sanders,

I am writing to you to thank you for leading the efforts of the Purdue Faculty Senate to advocate on behalf of IPFW faculty. As a result of these efforts, which included the November Purdue Senate resolution and your visit to our campus, we were able to successfully advocate for the reinstatement of the Women’s Studies program at IPFW, which I have directed here for the past seven years.

While the reinstatement of Women’s Studies is merely a small victory and while major issues with due process and shared governance remain on this campus, there is now the possibility of reaching a mutually beneficial resolution to the crisis as a result of your efforts and the efforts of others advocating for the right of IPFW faculty to have a predominant voice in any major decisions involving the curriculum and academic programs.
President Daniels has also acknowledged that the earlier process was flawed and has committed to fuller faculty participation in critical decisions at IPFW in the future.

As most of you are aware I have advocated for a reform of our teaching effectiveness evaluation process. We have a governing document (97-9), which lays out a holistic process. Unfortunately the only part of the document that has been widely implemented is highly defective. We have a resolution on this issue today.

The Senate recently cosponsored a well-attended forum on academic integrity. It is ultimately up to the faculty to take measures that reduce opportunities for students to infringe on academic honesty and to report infringements that do occur. It is unfair to both the honest students and sends the wrong message to the less honest students if we do not do so. Along with a committee that is investigating this issue, we also have ongoing committees studying academic rigor and academic excellence.

I have been asked by faculty, students, and alumni to address the 2017 Annual Letter to the People of Purdue from Mitch Daniels. I will do so with the objective of introducing some topics for thought, and therefore I will only be able to discuss a few points. President Daniels begins his discussion of higher education with the citation of a number of opinion poll results for which he has provided references. Unfortunately I read the references. Even more unfortunate was the fact that President Daniels or the individual assigned to obtain the information has
repeatedly misread the data. If anyone is interested I can supply the facts. My objective now is not to engage in an argument but to indicate that matters are not as dire as one might have been led to believe.

President Daniels has mentioned the expansion of massive open online course or MOOC enrollments. I see most MOOCs as nothing more than VTs, video textbooks. This comparison leads me to two concepts. If our large classes (and we are being pushed into teaching larger classes) are no better than a video textbook, then they deserve to be replaced. I know that many of the best teachers among my colleagues teach large classes, but just standing in front of a large room and lecturing is really not sufficient. Second, as instructors we need to be engaged in more effective deployment of the textbooks that we do assign to our students, and it is my intention to organize a forum and materials that provide best practices in this field.

The mention by President Daniels of the titles of courses that others might mock was of especial concern to some of my colleagues. In a time when the faculty is being urged to be more effective marketers in order to increase class size it seems counterproductive to be attacking what might be successful advertising strategies. I could imagine that “Witchcraft and Possession” might be a literature course where *Macbeth*, the writings of Nathaniel Hawthorne, and *The Crucible* are discussed or an anthropology course on how witchcraft rituals and attitudes towards witchcraft of different cultures have evolved over time.
I would like to congratulate the Senate and the Equity and Diversity Committee on their prescience in passing Document 16-01 Value of Immigrants and International Students, Scholars, and Visitors to Purdue and Community in October of last year. I would also like to applaud President Daniels recent forceful and unequivocal statement on the Executive Order concerning immigration. I have advocated for more effective faculty governance structures at every level of the University organization. In this context I would like to acknowledge the recent statement of the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Senate on Working For A Climate Free Of All Forms Of Discrimination.

Others from our University have made their stances on the nominee for Secretary of Education known. As much as it pains me to be questioning the appropriateness of the inclusion of a woman in a cabinet that is stunningly and overwhelming Caucasian and male I believe I represent the positions of many when I state that the nominee for Secretary of Education is unqualified and should not be confirmed.

An especial concern is her stated noncommittal attitude towards an effective tool that the previous administration has generated concerning predatory for-profit colleges. I have referred to for-profit colleges as a carbuncle on the body of higher education. A major portion of the “student-debt crisis” and the crisis of confidence in higher education is a result of the notoriety of the failures of for-profit colleges to provide meaningful
education and of the lack of employment success of students. It has been suggested that I am obsessed with for-profit colleges and am unfamiliar with the underlying statistics on student debt or success. It is true that there are other challenges including the reluctance of state legislatures to fund adequately their state institutions of higher learning. Nevertheless, to say that an educator who is concerned about for-profit colleges is unduly obsessed is equivalent to saying that a cancer researcher who focuses on tobacco smoking or a climate researcher who focuses on anthropogenic greenhouse gas generation is unduly obsessed.

I do not have time to discuss all of the matters that have been suggested as topics today. I believe that others are likely to express their opinions on them at the meeting today, and I encourage them to do so. I will conclude with just a few words.

The forces of unreason, untruth, and intolerance have been unleashed and provided with a powerful and ear-piercing voice that opposes everything for which we in education stand. It has been suggested that we compromise with those forces or maintain our silence. I reject those approaches. We must redouble our efforts to advocate for our values including insisting on the importance of education as a positive good independent of its economic benefits.
INDIANA HIGHER ED FUNDING 2008-2016

Annual Operating Appropriations

- Up ≈$250M (16%)

Per Student:

- Only 3 states (all energy rich) did not decline
- Indiana had the smallest decline of non-energy states
- 7th smallest overall

Sources: CBPP, Grapevine
DECLINING SHARE

Purdue WL operating appropriations as a percent of all appropriations

System-wide declined from 27% to 25%
FY2017 vs ICHE FY2019 Recommendation
Change in Operating Appropriation

 CHE RECOMMENDATION ONLY. ACTUAL FUNDING WILL BE DIFFERENT
PERFORMANCE FUNDING 101

4 metrics apply to all campuses:
1. Overall degree completion
2. At-risk degree completion
3. High-impact degree completion
4. On-time graduation rate

Regional Campuses Only
5. Student persistence
6. Remediation Success
PERFORMANCE FUNDING 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiana students only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed pie: Can improve and still lose $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares: 3-year averages of 2 time periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\approx 7+$ year lag between enrollment &amp; payoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purdue will receive no $ for the record-breaking 2016 freshman class until **July 2023**

*Assuming 4-year grad rate*
MORE STEM

% OF GRADUATES IN STEM


41%  42%  45%  45%  47%  50%  52%

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
WL APPROPRIATIONS* + LINE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>FY 2018 Request</th>
<th>FY 2019 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Moves</td>
<td>$4M</td>
<td>$4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Summer</td>
<td>$5.5M</td>
<td>$5.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes ADDL & Dual Credit. Assumes no change in operating appropriations.
NEW LINE ITEM REQUESTS

Purdue Moves $4 Million
• Growing Engineering
• Growing Computer Science
• Growing Purdue Polytechnic

Think Summer $5.5 Million
• Summer Start
• Summer Stay
• Summer Finish
Dear President Daniels and Provost Dutta:

President Trump’s ban targeting 7 countries could curtail or terminate the education and work opportunities of many members of the Purdue community. We urge you to take every measure to protect them.

The ban is both illegal and discriminatory: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/opinion/trumps-immigration-ban-is-illegal.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=opinion-c-col-left-

The University of Michigan has already stated that it will not cooperate with the Trump Administration by refusing to provide it sensitive information http://www.politicususa.com/2017/01/28/university-michigan-defies-trump-refusing-release-immigration-status-students.html as has Duke University: http://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/education/article129485844.html

While we acknowledge Daniels’ recent statement that President Trump’s order against immigration is “a bad idea,” we strongly urge him and the rest of the administration to follow the lead of other universities that have refused to release immigration-related information about faculty, staff, and students.

More broadly, we urge the University to take every measure to protect all students, faculty and staff and Purdue whose country of origin is on the “ban” Trump list. According to Purdue’s ISS Enrollment and Statistical Report Fall 2016 data, more than 100 students from the banned countries were enrolled at Purdue in Fall 2016. These include 94 students from Iran; 3 from Libya; 5 from Syria and 2 from Yemen.

These students face immediate interruption of their academic careers under the Trump ban. Purdue should assure their right and ability to complete their education by any means.

The data also includes 12 Purdue faculty, researchers, and staff from Iran, who
are also affected by Trump’s “ban” list. Purdue University must provide the necessary support and protection to all of these students, faculty and staff, as they are valued members of our Purdue community.

Sincerely,

Megha Anwar, Lecturer, Honors College
Jean Beaman, Assistant Professor of Sociology; Affiliated Faculty Global Studies Program
Tithi Bhattacharya, Associate Professor of History; Director, Global Studies Program
Bill Mullen, Professor of American Studies; Affiliated Faculty Global Studies Program
And Concerned Faculty
TO: University Senate
FROM: Gerald Shively, Chairperson of the Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
Gerald Shively shivelyg@purdue.edu

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
David Sanders senatechair17@purdue.edu

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Natalie Carroll ncarroll@purdue.edu

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Ralph Kaufmann rkaufman@purdue.edu
1. Assessment of critical thinking skills of Purdue students
2. Academic integrity at Purdue
3. Clarification of student regulations and academic policies

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Linda Prokopy lprokopy@purdue.edu
1. Dialogue circles
2. Implementing Senate Document 15-11 (freedom of expression)
3. Implementing Senate Document 15-19 (enhancing faculty recruitment and retention)
4. Opportunity hires

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Levon Esters, Chairperson lesters@purdue.edu
1. Procedures for Reducing Teaching Duties in Cases of Child Birth, Adoption and Foster Placement
2. Continuing Term Lecturers (CTL) Policy and Procedures

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Russell Jones, Chairperson russjones@purdue.edu
1. Developing a Resolution on Absence Approval for Students on University Sanctioned Activities
2. Working with Purdue Graduate Student Government on a Bill of Rights
3. Passed a Resolution in support of the Purdue Honors Pledge

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
Alan Friedman afridd@purdue.edu

Chair of the Senate, David A. Sanders, senatechair17@purdue.edu
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## Faculty Committee Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Committee</th>
<th>Selected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Organization</td>
<td>Abdelfattah Nour, Robin Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Progress &amp; Records</td>
<td>David Atkinson, Sammie Morris,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need 1 more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural &amp; Land. Design</td>
<td>Gemma Berenguer, Amy David, Sean Brophy, Kristine Holtvedt, Stephanie Thomovksy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Affairs</td>
<td>Stacy Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Interp, Eval, &amp; Review</td>
<td>Nancy Pelaez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censure and Dismissal Proc</td>
<td>Jeff Volenec, Richard Ghiselli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compen &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>Peter Goldsbrrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Informetrics</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Appeals</td>
<td>Andrew Freed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Kenitra Hammac, Janelle Wharry, Wen-wen Tung, Trevor Anderson, Frederick Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking &amp; Traffic</td>
<td>Need 1 more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T, Panel A</td>
<td>Sophie Lelièvre, Holly Mason, Donatella Danielli-Garofalo, Lisa Mauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T, Panel B (Clinical/Prof.)</td>
<td>Tim Gibb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Delinq. &amp; Readmits</td>
<td>Malathi Raghavan, Carol Werhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Appeal Board, Traffic Reg</td>
<td>Roy Dejoie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Excellence</td>
<td>Matthew Lanham, Kimberly Kinzig, Li Qiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Jianguo Mei, Mary Johnson, Greg Michalski, Nicholas Dib, Amanda Deering, Erla Heyns, Heath Howard, Thanos Tzempelikos, Pamela Karagory, Vilas Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Tom Creswell, Ronald Hullinger, Tim McGraw, Dawn Marsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Also (names passed to others):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Selected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Appeals Board – to Jeff Stefancic</td>
<td>Gail Newton, Haley Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Standards Board – to Jeff Stefancic</td>
<td>Haley Oliver, Carol Ott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subjects (IRB) – to Rick Mattes</td>
<td>Chad Carroll, Irwin Weiser, Nicole Widmar, Kwamena Quagrainie, Karen Marais, Nicholas Moyer, Robert Hallock, Kara Weatherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Programs – to Sarah Prater</td>
<td>Ben Lawton, George Moore, Gary Steinhardt, Matthew Stevens, Janet Thorlton, Sigrid Zahner (<a href="mailto:snprater@purdue.edu">snprater@purdue.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Advisory Com. on Equity – to Alysa Rollock</td>
<td>Amy David, Joe La Lopa, Abdelfattah Nour, Shripad Revankar, Wen-wen Tung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Julie Mariga would like to be on this committee if there is an opening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Resolution 16-05
Background

• Senate Resolution 97-9 makes the 2 numbers mandatory (overall course and overall instructor) which stifles innovation
• No correlation with effective teaching
• Increasing evidence of bias
• No widely accepted solution that will work across campus

• But something needs to change...
Don’t misread this resolution!

• Enables and encourages change rather than mandates a new system
• Starting point – not a singular change
• Units can be entrepreneurial and good systems get promoted across campus
• Purdue can lead the way, rather than follow

• The numbers can STILL be used until there is a new system; they are just no longer mandatory

• Support from CIE, EDC & EPC
FAQs

1) Has the Senate tried to do something about this before?
2) Why is there no replacement for the numbers?
3) Are we just trying to get rid of student opinions of teaching?
4) Aren’t there better alternatives we could just adopt?
5) Why isn’t this stronger?
6) But what about response rates?
7) Does this impact the regional campuses?
One possible addition

• The Provost’s office will present possible alternatives to the 2 numbers to the University Senate by January 2019.
HISTORY

Purdue 1st African American Graduate
David Robert Lewis 1894

BCC Founded 1969
New Facility 1999
Architecture Design
Cultural Art Series

Presented throughout the academic year and highlights those who have contributed extensively to human rights, business and education. A full calendar of events including guest lectures, workshops and seminars.
Performing Arts Ensembles

Black Voices of Inspiration
Haraka Writers
Jahari Dance Troupe
New Directional Players
Black Thought Collective
Gordon Parks Ensemble
Purdue Express – 2016 DTA Winner!
Student Success

Education + Entertainment = Edutainment

Research Tours

Surviving to Thriving 92% Retention Rate for African American students

Academic Success

Vincent Tinto “Students who are actively engaged in campus community perform better academically than those who are not engaged”

Study Abroad Opportunities – Ghana, Brazil, and Cuba
Library

Contains materials relevant to the historical, sociological, political and cultural aspects of the Black experiences.

Houses more then 7,000 books, subscribes to more than 40 periodicals including scholarly journals, and electronic resources.
QUESTIONS?
FOR MORE INFO
WWW.PURDUE.EDU/BCC

Renee Thomas, Director
Purdue Black Cultural Center
1100 Third Street
West Lafayette, IN 47906
rathomas@purdue.edu (765) 494-3091
• UNIVERSITY FINANCES
• ENDOWMENT PERFORMANCE
• BUSINESS PROCESS RE-ENGINEERING ("BPR")
TOPICS

• UNIVERSITY FINANCES

• ENDOWMENT PERFORMANCE

• BUSINESS PROCESS RE-ENGINEERING (“BPR”)

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
STATEMENT OF NET POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Position</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CREDIT RATINGS

MOODY’S – Aaa
STANDARD & POORS – AAA

ONE OF ONLY 6 PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES WITH HIGHEST RATING FROM BOTH AGENCIES
## FINANCIAL OPERATIONS

**Fiscal Year Ended June 30**  
*(dollars in thousands)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>$766,802</td>
<td>$747,513</td>
<td>$727,256</td>
<td>$730,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>1,341,279</td>
<td>1,378,114</td>
<td>1,585,978</td>
<td>1,408,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,108,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,125,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,313,234</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,139,120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$2,001,892</td>
<td>$1,919,679</td>
<td>$1,930,823</td>
<td>$1,911,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,189</strong></td>
<td><strong>$205,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>$382,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>$227,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FINANCIAL OPERATIONS

**Fiscal Year Ended June 30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(dollars in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$2,001,892</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Net Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$106,189</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Net Assets from Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INVESTMENT IN PURDUE MOVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Nonrecurring</th>
<th>Recurring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>$2,142,190</td>
<td>$2,553,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Expansion</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science Pillars</td>
<td>$29,135,713</td>
<td>$843,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>$6,276,966</td>
<td>$1,155,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Science</td>
<td>$28,025,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>$23,473,934</td>
<td>$9,808,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Discovery</td>
<td>$29,707,434</td>
<td>$2,012,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$178,761,237</td>
<td>$53,923,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY HEADCOUNT 2014 to 2017

**Faculty & Instructors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Tenured or on Tenure Track</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IU Bloomington</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Faculty & Instructors**

- **Post Doc**: +100
- **Tenure / T. Track**: +114
- **Clinical/Prof**: +71
- **Lecturers**: +71
- **Research**: -1
- **Adjunct**: +17

**Total Increase**: 375 or 12%

---

---

---
ANOTHER RECORD YEAR

2016 INCOMING CLASS VS. 2013 INCOMING CLASS

+17,500 Applicants
+900 Freshman
+10% Hoosiers
+24% Underrepresented Minorities
-5% International Students

Top Indiana Academic Profile & Improving
LESS LOAN DEBT

Millions of Loan $ vs. $ Per Undergraduate

- Undergraduate Loan Debt
- Per Undergraduate


11
TUITION FREEZE IMPACT

• Foregone Tuition Revenue FY14-FY17: $70M Recurring (assuming 2.5% tuition increase)

• Investments in Purdue Moves: $54M Recurring

• Total $125M Recurring

• Funded by:
  $57M Realistic Tuition Budgeting
  $20M Unit Contributions to Student Affordability Account (majority from admin areas)
  $12M UDO Transition to Self Funded Model
  $18M Student Mix / Growth
  $ 5M Increased Interest from PIPC
  $ 9M Medical Savings/Cost Avoidance
  $ 4M Other Revenue Streams
  $-0- Unit Budget Reductions
  $125M
TOPICS

- UNIVERSITY FINANCES
- ENDOWMENT PERFORMANCE
- BUSINESS PROCESS RE-ENGINEERING ("BPR")
PURDUE ENDOWMENT RETURNS

**Annual Returns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Purdue Endowment</th>
<th>Custom Benchmark</th>
<th>60/40 Global Agg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY 2012</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY 2013</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY 2014</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY 2015</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY 2016</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 Year Annualized Returns**

- Purdue Endowment: 7.1%
- Custom Benchmark: 7.0%
- 60/40 Global Agg: 6.1%
TOPICS

- UNIVERSITY FINANCES
- ENDOWMENT PERFORMANCE
- BUSINESS PROCESS RE-ENGINEERING ("BPR")
To create a world-class administrative foundation worthy of a world-class institution
• Ineffective and inefficient business processes

• SAP structural impediments
FOCUS

TOTAL BUSINESS PROCESS RE-ENGINEERING

Human Capital Management
Implement a technology-enabled and automated system

Enterprise Asset Management
Consolidate systems and increase functionality

General Ledger
Optimize financial structures, analysis and reporting
Funds Management Project

University Senate Meeting
January 30, 2017
PROGRESS TO DATE

• Cash balances have been studied and analyzed
  • Major fund group
  • Groups of accounts supporting a common use

• Recommendations are currently under development

• Beginning to craft the report of the Committee
THE FINANCIAL FACTS

• At the end of FY16, University balances totaled $1.8B at WL (all funds)
• $651M was in units reporting to the Provost
  (excluding sponsored program accounts)

• Balances in the Provost units have increased . . .
  $367M in FY11 → $651M in FY16
SUBCOMMITTEE STUDIES

- Central Bank Concept
- Faculty Start-up
- Professorships
- Faculty Discretionary Funds
- Scholarships
- Fellowships
- Appropriated Funds
- State Line Items
- Income Producing Funds
- Student Life
- Gifts
- Provost Central Reserves
GENERAL FINDINGS

• The University’s investment strategy fully capitalizes on the investment of cash balances

• Significant commitments exist against year-end balances; uncommitted balances are far less in every fund group

• Agency or university restrictions can limit the ability to use cash
GENERAL FINDINGS, CONTINUED

• Timing of program activities or accounting transactions impact balances on 6/30

• Process and reporting improvements can enhance the use of balances in some funds

• Cash flowing commitments is an alternative to fully funding multi-year commitments
GENERAL FINDINGS, CONTINUED

• University requires full funding for facilities expenses before planning process begins

• Some funds need to accumulate balances to achieve purpose

• Stewardship of some funds require balances to be maintained at a specific level
RECOMMENDATIONS

• Subcommittees are developing recommendations
• Maximize benefit to the academy
• Assure financial stability
• Account for unit needs
• Address current and ongoing balances
Faculty, staff and colleagues are encouraged to provide feedback and input by emailing the FMP Committee at:

fundsmangement@purdue.edu

Questions?
PGSG statement about Student Evaluations

"Our Community Team, which contains our policy group, explored an early version of this discussion during their November meeting. They voted unanimously against removing the overall course and instructor ratings from course evaluations. While they fully acknowledged the biases that have been shown in these types of ratings, they found the questions’ outright removal, rather than appropriate interpretation, to be ineffective and potentially counterproductive in solving institutional inequities and tenure discrepancies."

Read by: Chris Kulesza
On behalf of Purdue University
Graduate Student Government

January 2017
University Senate Meeting
Memorial Resolution on Behalf of Darrell I. Leap, PhD

October 19, 1937 – October 29, 2015, Emeritus Professor
Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, Purdue University

It is with great sadness that the Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences announce the passing of Dr. Darrell I. Leap who died on October 19th, 2015, peacefully at home surrounded by his family.

Dr. Leap, born October 19, 1937 in Huntington, West Virginia, and received a B.S. in Geology from Marshall University, a M.A. in Geology from Indiana University, and a Ph.D. from The Pennsylvania State University. His doctoral research focused on the glacial geology and hydrology of Day County, South Dakota, and is still referenced in geological publications today.

Dr. Leap served as a Commissioned Officer/Lieutenant in the U.S. Naval Reserve on the oceanographic ship, the USS Tanner. This assignment resulted in the first mapping of the Persian Gulf by the U.S. Navy. Dr. Leap was a Registered Professional Geologist and served as a geologist/hydrologist with the South Dakota State Geological Survey and as a hydrologist with the U.S. Geological Survey in Arlington, Virginia and Denver, Colorado. During his employment at the USGS in Colorado he worked on a project at the Nevada Test Site.

In 1980, Dr. Leap was recruited to Purdue because of the quality of his research, his important applied experience with the South Dakota State Geological Survey and the US Geological Survey, and his strong interest in mentoring students. At Purdue, Dr. Leap was a highly effective professor of Hydrology and Geosciences, teaching numerous courses in hydrogeology, supervising many graduate students, and publishing more than 60 articles on ground water supply and contamination, landfills, and geologic disposal of wastes. Dr. Leap was passionate about supporting the development of graduate students, and noted that his greatest joy as an academic was the privilege of teaching and mentoring his students, and being able to watch them go on to achieve a wide range of accomplishments in their careers and family lives. In support of his profession, Dr. Leap was very active in the Hydrogeology Division of the Geological Society of America, organizing short courses, field trips, and presenting papers. His leadership was also important in the early years of the Indiana Water Resources Association – an organization that he served as president for in 1982.

Dr. Leap retired from Purdue in 2004 as Professor Emeritus. During his time at Purdue and after retirement he served as an expert witness and consultant for many ground water projects throughout the state and was passionate about serving the people of the State of Indiana in this way.

Most importantly, Dr. Leap was a faithful and devoted husband to his wife Myra, as well as a wonderful son, brother, uncle, great-uncle, friend, and mentor.
Jim Douglas Jr., the Compere and Marcella Loveless Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Computational Mathematics at Purdue University, died April 27, 2016, after a brief illness.

Born in Austin, Texas, in 1927, he was awarded undergraduate and masters degrees in Civil Engineering from the University of Texas and a Ph.D. in mathematics from Rice University.

He began his career at Humble Oil, which was later a part of the Exxon-Mobil Corporation. There he worked with Henry Rachford, Don Peaceman, and John Rice (now the W. Brooks Fortune Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Computer Science at Purdue University) on the numerical simulation of the flow of fluids such as oil or natural gas.

The computing devices in 1955 had extremely limited storage: only 864 words. Their machine did not have enough storage to use the usual method of Gaussian elimination for linear systems. In response, Douglas, Peaceman, and Rachford developed the so-called Alternating-Direction Implicit (ADI) method, which overcame the problem of limited storage and later received great attention. The Douglas-Rachford variant of the method became an important technique in convex analysis and optimization, and most recently in areas of "Big Data".

In 1957, Jim was appointed Assistant Professor of Mathematics at Rice University; he was promoted to Full Professor in 1961 and named the W.L. Moody Professor in 1964. He moved to the University of Chicago in 1967. There he played a large role in developing the mathematical understanding of the finite element method for partial differential equations. In 1987, he was appointed Director of the Center for Applied Mathematics and named the Compere and Marcella Loveless Distinguished Professor of Computational Mathematics at Purdue. He held these positions until his retirement in 2003.

Prof. Douglas wrote over 200 papers with over 70 co-authors. Among his many recognitions were the Cedric K. Ferguson Medal from the Society of Petroleum Engineers, the Robert Earll McConnell Award from the American Institute of Petroleum Engineers, and a Commemorative Medal from Charles University, Prague. Jim was a Fellow of SIAM and the AMS.

He had a tremendous influence on young people, both as an advisor to graduate students and as someone who helped shape many professional mathematicians early in their career. Many of his students and post-doctoral associates became Fellows of the AMS and SIAM and leaders in computational science both in the US and abroad.

Prof. Douglas is survived by his wife Graça, and by Jimmy and Craig, his sons with his late wife Mary Lou.

Department of Mathematics