AGENDA

1. Call to order                      Professor Terry S. Stewart

2. Approval of Minutes of 21 October 2002

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the President          President Martin C. Jischke

5. Report of the Chairperson         Professor Terry S. Stewart

6. Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees For Information Professor Joseph W. Camp, Jr.

7. Question Time

   Reapportionment of the University Senate

9. University Senate Document 02-3 For Discussion Professor Wallace B. Morrison
   Formation of the Faculty Informetrics Committee

10. University Senate Document 02-4 For Discussion Professor Olivia Bennett Wood
    Changes to Regulations & Procedures
    For Recognized Student Organizations

11. New Business

12. Memorial Resolutions

13. Adjournment
2. The minutes of the meeting of 21 October 2002 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
4. Professor Stewart noted that because of the faculty convocation to follow the Senate the president has asked to delay his remarks till that time. (See Appendix A for the President’s Address to the convocation following the meeting.)
5. Professor Terry S. Stewart presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).

Following his report, Professor Stewart invited Professor William Harper to update the senate on the program of faculty scholarships for students and staff. Professor Harper reported that $4532 had been contributed for student scholarships. The Office of Financial Aid identified seven students who were perceived to be in greatest financial need and each one was awarded $500. The remaining $1032 was left in the fund for the
next round of awards. For scholarships for staff $2642 was contributed. Fourteen of the twenty-nine applicants received awards to cover the cost of taking a three-credit course. He concluded by saying that there would be another solicitation in the spring and it is intended to make awards during the summer for the following fall and spring semesters.

6. Professor Joseph W. Camp, Jr., chairperson of the Steering Committee, presented the resume of items under consideration by various standing committees (see Appendix C). Following his presentation he invited Professor Wallace B. Morrison, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, to address the senate on the work of his committee. Professor Wallace B. Morrison rose and addressed the senate as follows:

The Faculty Affairs Committee is concerned with those matters that pertain primarily to the responsibilities, rights, privileges, opportunities, and welfare of the faculty, collectively and as individuals. Such items as tenure, procedures for academic promotions, orientation of new faculty members, insurance and health program planning, academic responsibilities, and standards of appointment are topics which fall within the areas of responsibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The current members of the committee are Alan Beck, Evelyn Blackwood, Stuart Bolton, Wanda Fox, Bill Harper, Shirley Rose, Charlene Sullivan, Robert Van Etten, Jacqueline Walcot-McQuigg, Mary Alice Webb, Donna Whitten, and William Zinsmeister. Provost Mason and Vice President for Human Relations Rollock serve as advisors.

The five Senate committees that report to the Faculty Affairs Committee are the Censure Dismissal and Procedures Committee, the Collective Bargaining Committee, the Documents and Records Committee, the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee, and the Grade Appeals Committee.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has had a number of items under discussion since our first meeting of the year in August. One of the things that emerged from the Faculty Survey last year is the need to continue to evaluate, communicate, and follow up on items of concern to faculty that were identified in the survey. We also recognized the need for future polling of faculty and subsequent data analysis. The result of these discussions is the proposal by Bill Harper for a new Faculty Committee on Informetrics that will report to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The committee shall be charged with continuing data collection and analysis of faculty surveys, coordination of all other faculty survey related activities, and sharing collected information regularly with the faculty. The proposed Faculty Committee on Informetrics was approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee unanimously and has been forwarded to the Senate for consideration.

In response to topics identified in the Faculty Survey, there were several open forums held last year. Among them was a forum on Post Tenure Review. As a follow up to those discussions, seven focus groups of full professors are planned to discuss this topic. One hundred twenty-five professors were invited, 70 agreed to participate. The first focus group
was held on 11/4/02. It was well attended and received. The women only focus group was held on 11/8/02. No one elected to be in the minority only focus group so it was canceled.

Faculty have voiced two items of concern in recent months that have been discussed by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The first item is the introduction of Windows XP system onto campus. On November 4 the Faculty Affairs Committee met with VP Jim Bottum and John Campbell to discuss faculty concerns regarding the Window XP. The second item of discussion is the Purdue Health Care plan. The Senate Steering Committee has also had this topic under discussion. As you will recall, Brent Bowditch made a presentation about the Purdue Health Care plan at the last senate meeting.

It has become clear to me that a lot of the tension surrounding these issues is at least in part due to inefficient communication between various parts of administration and the faculty and staff. Intense efforts to communicate were made by administration on these issues, but for variety of reasons, communication has been inefficient and ineffective. I serve on a newly formed committee chaired by Jerry Sheehan from ITaP that is currently charged with evaluating campus bulk email policy for faculty and staff. However, it is now apparent that there is also a need to reevaluate and restructure campus wide communication avenues to make them more efficient and successful.

Another item of concern that was voiced to the Faculty Affairs Committee was the elimination of the document copy service by the campus libraries. This topic was forwarded to the Resource Policy Committee.

An ongoing concern of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Provost's Office is the timeliness with which decisions on student grade appeals are made. The process is complex and not well understood by faculty. The FAC met with the Dean of Students and the outgoing chair of the Grade Appeals Committee late last year, and we were forwarded some recommendations that may clarify the process and shorten the time required for Grade Appeals Committee decisions. We will be following up with the new chair of Grade Appeals at our meeting in December.

During our last meeting, one of our members raised the issue of safety in the classroom. The discussion was sparked by the recent murder of university faculty in Arizona. During the discussion we learned that our campus police are a very good resource and that they can provide an excellent program for campus units concerned with safety, classroom violence, and troubled students.

7. At question time it was reported that no question had been submitted in writing and questions were invited from the floor. None were forth coming.

8. Professor Joseph W. Camp, Jr., chairperson of the Steering Committee, presented for discussion University Senate Document 02-2, Reapportionment of the University Senate 2003-2004. He briefly introduced the document noting that there were no changes in the
reapportionment of the senate since last year. Accordingly he moved to suspend the rules so that the document could be voted on at this meeting. The motion was seconded and approved in a voice vote without dissent. Professor Camp then moved approval of the document. The motion was also seconded and, following a brief discussion, was approved in a voice vote without dissent.

9. Professor Wallace B. Morrison, chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented for action University Senate Document 02-3, Formation of the Faculty Informetrics Committee. He briefly introduced the document and discussed how it was related to the work/life survey of the Purdue faculty. He explained that the document had originated at the request of the chairperson of the Steering Committee, who had proposed the creation of a permanent faculty committee to continue the work of this faculty survey. The result is, he concluded, the Informetric Committee which will report to the Senate via the Faculty Affairs Committee. Following his presentation, he responded to a number of questions from the floor.

10. Professor Olivia B. Wood, chairperson of the Student Affairs Committee, presented for discussion University Senate Document 02-4, Changes to Regulations and Procedures for Recognized Student Organizations. She briefly introduced the document and asked the chair to recognize Mr. Pablo Malavenda from the Dean of Students Office to address the senate on the proposed document. Associate Dean Malavenda addressed the senate on the proposal. He reviewed the document point-by-point giving the need — and justification — for each of the proposed changes. Following his presentation, he responded to several concerns raised by senators.

11. There was no new business and no memorial resolutions. The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
Good afternoon! I’d like to thank all of you for attending this convocation. I very much enjoy having an opportunity to share a few thoughts with you. Asking a University president to speak can perhaps be compared with gossip; they are both very easy to get started and then almost impossible to stop. I will try hard not to keep you too long but I did want to share a few thoughts. When I complete these remarks I will be delighted to take questions or comments.

Let me begin by saying that I believe this is a pretty exciting time here at Purdue; it certainly is a very exciting time to serve as president of this University. I trust and hope it is an equally exciting time to be a part of the faculty. We have drafted strategic plans and we are now taking this University forward to preeminence and world leadership. I believe we have a very bold agenda. We are adding 300 faculty, we are increasing the diversity of our University, we are increasing scholarship and learning, we are investing in people – top faculty in particular –, we are investing in student financial aid, and we are trying to increase our capacity for research especially in interdisciplinary areas that we believe will have some impact. We are investing more than three-quarters of a billion dollars in new and upgraded facilities, and we have launched the largest capital campaign in our history and the history of higher education in Indiana, the 1.3 billion dollar Campaign for Purdue. Now after just one year of this activity we are seeing the impact of our plans. We received a record number of applications for admission this fall. We have admitted and enrolled the statistically best academically prepared class in the history of the University and also the most diverse class in our history. We are developing Discovery Park. This is a place where we hope Purdue faculty and students will be able to explore new science and new technology from nanotechnology to bio-sciences and e-enterprises along with entrepreneurship that will change the way we live and work.

Next year in Discovery Park we will break ground on a $56 million dollar Birck Nanotechnology Center, a $15 million dollar Bioscience Center and we have already broken ground on the $7 million dollar Morgan Center for Entrepreneurship. We are hard at work putting the funds together for the $10 million dollar e-Enterprise Center. What is quite amazing is how a little less than a year after we announced Discovery Park, that project has attracted nearly $80 million dollars in grants including the $26 million dollar grant from the Lilly Endowment. There is more building taking place at Purdue than at anytime in the University’s history; more than $300 million dollars worth of construction is planned and $183 million of it is already underway. This is increasing classroom, laboratory and office space. We are stepping up our technology and learning environments. We are increasing discovery and engagement.

At the heart of everything that is taking place at the University today, is the faculty. I must tell you now after more than two years here at Purdue I am very, very impressed by the quality of the faculty at this University. As a land grant institution we have a rich and complex set of missions that are built around what we call learning, discovery and engagement. Any one of those missions is enough to keep anyone of us very, very busy. Efforts to do all three require remarkable skill, dedication and hard work. It is my judgment that the Purdue faculty are doing a tremendous job with this agenda of learning, discovery and engagement. I am very impressed with what I see. I am personally very, very proud to be a member of this faculty and equally proud to be able to represent you around the state and around the nation. I know that few people in this world feel that they get all the credit they deserve for all of their hard work, and on occasion faculty, like others, feel they get a bit more criticism than praise. But I can tell you I deeply
appreciate everything that you and your colleagues are doing for this University and for our students. I am impressed with the depth and strength of your commitment to Purdue and to our students. There is, in my judgment, no greater reward in life, at least on the job, than seeing these students grow and learn here at the University, and then watch them go on to lead very successful lives and take their place in society. Teaching young people like this is among the most rewarding jobs in the world and I believe that Purdue faculty do that very well. In fact I have commented on a number of occasions that the respect that I see students having for their faculty, their teachers, and the respect that is returned by the faculty to the students is as wholesome and rich as at any University I have been at and I believe it creates a special learning environment here at Purdue.

Just as these are exciting times for the University they are also interesting and exciting times to be alive in a world that is filled with interesting opportunities, interesting problems, and interesting challenges. I think that this is a pretty exciting century that we have just entered and I believe we live in a time of great possibilities. There is an ancient Chinese curse. (I am not absolutely certain that it is ancient. In fact I am not absolutely certain it’s Chinese but lots of people say it is both ancient and Chinese and it might as well be. It’s certainly true.) The curse goes like this: “May you always live in interesting times”. It’s an interesting statement. We certainly live in interesting times today. As long as I am on this subject, I might as well tell you two other curses that are generally attributed to the magnificent ancient Chinese culture. The first is “May your every wish be granted,” and the second “May you come to the attention of those in high places”. So I believe the conclusion from all of this is if your every wish comes to the attention of those in high places you will most definitely live in interesting times.

One of the major reasons I think this is such an interesting age is that we are in a time of considerable transformation. My sense is that the winds of change are blowing in our society. Pessimists complain about the changing winds, but an optimist simply assumes that wherever the changing winds take us will be for the best. Some University presidents take an even different approach. They appoint a committee, and ask them to study it and get back to him or her with a full report of recommendation before the next board of trustees meeting! Actually our strategic plans, in my view, are a bit like sails, whichever way the winds of change blow we can adjust those sails to take us toward our destination. That this is a time of change for higher education, at least to me, is quite clear. I believe the shifting winds provide us with much to think about and much to discuss. I would like to take my time with you today to briefly talk about four examples of trends of change that I see happening in higher education. I will tell you at the beginning that I believe Purdue is addressing these trends, each of them, and I believe our faculty is responding to them. I believe as with all change, properly approached, they provide us with enormous opportunities and they are the stuff of interesting times.

The first item I want to discuss centers on learning. This is in my view the core mission of the University. Let me be clear where my own priorities are and where my central focus is aimed. I believe that at Purdue the learning of our students ought to be the first priority. The environment for student learning, what they learn, how they learn, how they are evaluated and held accountable for their learning, is a fundamental faculty responsibility. Today there are interesting new approaches being developed for student learning. Throughout the country and certainly here at Purdue, for example, there is growing interest in what is called “student service learning”. I should tell you that I am also very impressed with the students of Purdue. They appear to me to be rather serious, career oriented, they work hard, and I find them with good attitudes and habits by in large. I also find them good citizens of our community.
Among the many focuses that we have is trying to encourage more of them to engage in what we call “service learning”. We are part of a large number of American Universities that have joined in a pledge to emphasize the importance of service learning. That pledge states, in part, that our country cannot afford to educate a generation of students that acquires knowledge without ever understanding how that knowledge can be used to benefit society or how they, as students or as citizens, can influence decision-making in this democracy. At Purdue we are taking the initiative to teach our students their responsibilities to their communities, to this nation, and maybe most importantly to one another. But service learning I believe is about more than a greater sense of civic responsibility in our students although that is an important objective in and of itself. There is a growing view that students who have these service learning experiences truly develop important critical thinking skills. They become better students. They achieve fundamental academic goals. They begin to understand better how others think and perceive issues, problems, and the world itself. They begin to develop a broader perspective on complex issues. They begin to understand subtlety and nuance. They begin to understand how their education relates to this larger world. In my view these are very important goals for any education and certainly for a great education at a great University. In addition, these experiential learning opportunities help students understand how their specific field of study, their discipline, has impact in the world. We see this very vividly, for example, in the EPICS Program, Engineering Projects and Community Service, we see it in the Burton Morgan Center for Entrepreneurship, in the internships, and we see it in students who study abroad. All of these broaden the experiences of our students and I believe enhance their overall learning. We are also seeing, on this campus and frankly all across higher education in the country, an increased emphasis on learning through what I would call team or group experiences; and the development and the skills of working more effectively in teams and not necessarily teams of people who are studying exactly the same thing. This is potentially a challenge for those of us on the faculty. I believe we are all at our core committed to the notion of evaluating and assessing individual performance and individual achievement. We award degrees to individuals, we award grades to individuals. So we must balance this basic responsibility of the individual for learning and the evaluation of that individual’s learning with developing team skills. I don’t think this is easy, frankly. What one student might see as team participation and developing teaming skills, another might see as cheating. These are issues that will keep our work interesting. I believe though they are opening up very important opportunities for greater student learning.

Information technology is also having a huge impact on student learning. It is my sense that it changes the way students learn; it surely changes how they use our library and other information sources. It clearly opens tremendous horizons for collaboration. The explosion of access to information that has occurred over the past several years is to me a profound change. The explosion of information places, in my view, a much greater emphasis on helping our students understand how to learn, how to judge the accuracy and quality of information. A goal of education today, I believe, should be the development of skills for learning and a deeper more deliberately developed understanding of the process of learning. Students also need to learn the motivation for learning. I believe that at its very best, university education for our students leave them with a greater thirst for learning than they had when they came. All of these issues surrounding learning and how it is changing seem to me to represent very important questions for faculty to address.

My second example of the winds of change, new trends in higher education, is the growing internationalization or what someone would call globalization of the University. On our campus and at universities across the nation there is clearly a growing interest in study abroad. This generation of students is more at home in studying in other places, and the world they are a part of is beginning to reward and recognize that experience as part of building the portfolio for life.
We here at Purdue are enrolling record numbers of international students. I believe they contribute enormously to the vitality of this University and a learning environment for all of our students and I think there is more, generally a growing interest in trying to bring a global perspective to all areas of study — and I truly mean all areas.

An example: the $116 million dollar gift we received from General Motors, EDS, and Sun Microsystems is an interesting example of the revolution that is taking place in the global workplace as it affects design. Engineering design in the automotive industry and others now takes place on a global scale. GM employees in Detroit use the software to do their work on a project and when their day ends and they leave, they pass the project off to people in Asia. They begin their workday and at the end of that eight or so hour experience, they leave to go home. They pass it off to a team in Europe and they do the same thing; and in 24 hours the process starts over. It’s at the heart of the speed-up by which large design projects are brought to market. It’s a factor of three increase in speed. The car that took 45 months to design might take only 15. It’s an indication of a global economy and I think also we see these institutions of higher education like Purdue and others reaching more and more for international collaboration.

All of these forces for internationalization are at work at the very time where we are now confronted with a war on international terrorism. The very forces and tools that allow this globalization and internationalization to take place — information technology, the internet, transportation systems — are in a very perverse way the very tools that some are using for terrorist reasons. We have seen the impact of these changing times already here at Purdue. There are students from abroad who have been accepted for study here, and are not yet on campus because they are not able to get a visa. There are discussions taking place in Washington about a new idea called “Sensitive But Unclassified Information”.

So how do we deal with all of this and how do we deal with international security implications? We have just had a conference workshop on homeland security and there is clearly an interest nationally. I think that many of you would want to participate in these efforts to harness our research capacities to deal with these threats to the national security. We now have a Center for Homeland Security. An interesting question, in my view, is about where this will ultimately take us. Will these tensions we see in today’s world force us to focus even more attention, more interest on internationalization and globalization, or could we see this as ultimately restricting this trend? It is clear that in some of the student bodies at major universities, there are real tensions rising between those who come from different parts of the world and our universities have almost become a stage for them to act out, work out, debate, discuss and other things regarding those differences. I believe we need to pay close attention to this including in the classroom or more generally around the campus. My own personal view is that bringing a global perspective to the curriculum and to our research is an imperative for the university that we must continue to pursue. Many believe in the enormous benefits of internationalization. Whether you believe this or not, it is hard to deny its importance. I believe turning back the clock on the globalization-internationalization of the University is quite unlikely and these issues, these problems of our times, will continue to impact much of what we do.

The third trend of change I want to call attention to is the increasing attention to interdisciplinary activities. The great universities of the world are great in large part because they have tremendous, deep, disciplinary strengths. The arts and sciences and their applications in the various disciplines are the core strengths of universities including Purdue and there is absolutely no substitute for excellence in these core disciplines. What we are now finding is that some of the most important and interesting new opportunities for learning and discovery cut across disciplines. In part it’s influenced by the convergence of advances in different disciplines;
nanotechnology on the one hand, the globalization of the curriculum on the other, for example are in my view, inherently interdisciplinary areas. How are we as an institution to develop this capacity to study and teach these interdisciplinary activities, nimbly, effectively, on the one hand and at the same time ensure the continuing strength of our core disciplines? It’s an interesting balancing act. This represents another challenge. For an example of change that I would call attention to is the broadening agenda of what we once called outreach and now use the term engagement — especially in this new century, engagement with a greater focus on economic development. This word “engagement” carries with it some implications and it is deliberately chosen to suggest more than the word outreach. It carries with it the implication for greater consultation, greater interaction, and finding a mutuality of interest with those with whom we would engage. When engagement is done well there is a view of a coming together of interest, the university's interest on the one hand and it's basic missions for learning and discovery and the interest of those outside the institution who are often focused at least today on issues of economic development. I believe there is a deeper issue at work here and a more fundamental issue, and that is in today’s so-called learning society.

Not all of the learning is taking place inside the university and while I believe we can certainly play a leadership role in learning, the word engagement suggests that perhaps we and our students can learn from those outside the university. That is a change! All of this has implications for responsibilities of faculty and for the rewards they receive. It has implications for the curriculum, what we will give credit for in particular, is an interesting issue that presents, I think, a real opportunity. Everything that I see at this point as I travel around the country and certainly around Indiana, it is very clear to me that this emphasis on engagement including, in particular, economic development will continue to grow and will not abate. Those who support us both publicly and with private funds want to see the University more engaged in this kind of activity. I would argue that our ability to continue to command adequate funding from the public sector, from the state in particular, depends in part, on the state’s economy performing well and we perhaps can contribute to that through our own economic development efforts.

The fourth and final example I have of change is the evolving pattern of funding for public research universities. This is actually a rather long-term trend and has been going on for at least three decades, perhaps more. What is clear is that in public research universities like Purdue there is an increasing reliance on tuition, sponsored programs, and private funding to fund the operating budget of the University. This year at Purdue for the first time in our history, student fees and tuition fund a greater share of the operating budget than do appropriations from the state of Indiana. I would tell you the arrow has been pointing in this direction for a long time. The trustees actually have a graph that they have referred to as the “scissors graph” in which they have plotted a relative contribution of tuition from students and the state appropriation. Roughly, twenty years ago it was a seventy thirty split in favor of the state contributing seventy percent of the total. This year the student fees and tuition I believe, if I remember correctly, are fifty-two percent and the state’s contribution is forty-eight percent. I would tell you quickly that the state has not decreased its contribution except this year. But the general trend is a smaller and smaller share of our operating budget. I don’t see anything on the horizon that will change that trend. I don’t think we are going to go back the other way.

In this new century, it seems to me that states, not just Indiana but states in general, will not likely be able to fund the level of excellence to which we at Purdue and other research Universities aspire. This is leading to a national discussion, a dialogue about the so called “hybrid university”. Mark Yudof, the former president of the University of Minnesota and now Chancellor at the University of Texas, wrote an article about this last January in the Chronicle for Higher Education. Yudof said this: “The 21st Century will see the evolution of a hybrid public research university, one
with roots in both the public and private sectors.” “These institutions” Yudof said, “will have to convince public officials that significant tuition increases are necessary to keep public research universities viable and competitive. They will have to prove that their impact on economic development works and it’s worth the cost of the investment. At the same time they will have to ensure access for low income and historically disadvantaged students.” Yudof said, “Public universities may have to explore new partnerships with private organizations and foundations, charge fees for traditionally free programs, and call for more direct ear-marked state support.”

I think it is very hard for us to deny that this is happening and happening here at Purdue. The challenge is how do we deal with this changing pattern of funding, use it to promote our University and its growing excellence, while at the same time sustaining some of our most cherished values; in particular the commitment to access for talented students not necessarily of significant financial resources.

I presented these examples of change today not with the intention of coming to conclusions today. If we can come to conclusions in this short a period of time, I would suggest that we all think about leaving the University and becoming high paid consultants at universities around the world. These are large, important and difficult issues. There are no easy or simple answers but I must tell you as I have reflected on now almost two and a half years at Purdue that I am quite optimistic about how Purdue is responding to these trends of this changing environment. First, I believe we are dealing with these issues and I believe we are dealing very well. Thanks in large part to this faculty, its staff, and the students of Purdue, there is an ability here I believe to deal with these issues, deal with change, take advantage of new ideas. But my sense is that these trends are going to continue and they will have implications for all of us. I hope we continue adapting, watching, openly discussing the changes that we see today and indeed the changes that we don’t see that inevitably will come. My view of this is that it is in the nature of a great university to see a bit further than others, to respond to the challenges a changing world presents and to serve this enduring goal of universities to help our students and our society understand the change that is all about us. Purdue is a great University and I believe that we are fulfilling our responsibilities in an exemplary fashion. My hope is that it will always be the case.

Thank you very much! (Applause).
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REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE – PROFESSOR TERRY S. STEWART

A goal for both the Senate and Administration Leadership is to accelerate the time frame of communications so faculty and staff are aware of potential changes under consideration to allow opportunity for discussion. In that spirit, several of today’s comments are oriented towards items under consideration.

As a result of Brent Bowditch’s presentation at our last senate meeting, there was a moderate level of e-mail traffic related to both the health benefits plans and communications of changes in general. Brent suggested he provide the Steering committee a list of items under consideration as a way to enhance communications. To summarize;

1) The one-year waiting period for new employees to qualify for long-term disability benefits will be eliminated January 1, 2003. This will extend financial protection to starting faculty.
2) Changes in the Federal Tax laws allow the creation of 457(b) retirement accounts for those that have maxed-out their 403(b) (SRA) contributions. So if you are among the 375 faculty and staff that have maxed out their 403(b) contact the benefits office about setting up a 457(b) account.
3) The HRIS (Human Resources Information System) software implementation is delayed until at least January 2004. (ITaP is exploring software implementation options for both HRIS and TRAX).
4) There is continual updating of PHCS doctor lists on the web site at http://www.adpc.purdue.edu/Personnel/PHCSWLaf.htm (I included this and other update information in the e-mail I sent to all senators 2 weeks ago).

Vicki Killion of the University Resource Policy Committee is unable to be with us today so I will report for her that the parking plan that was presented to the senate in March 2000 (see March 20 and April 24, 2000 minutes) is still in place even though the fee increase scheduled for 2000 was not implemented. The Parking and Traffic Committee is discussion the reimplementation of that plan with the parking facilities management. The planned fee increase for 2003 may take effect as originally scheduled (A and C-Garage permits would increase from $72 to $150; B and C-surface permits would increase from $36 to $60).

I have asked Bill Harper to give a short report on the faculty scholarships for staff which had its inaugural awards November 1st. (See item 5 of these minutes).

In closing, I encourage you to provide any feed back on the Senate Web page and the electronic distribution of senate minute via the web page. Sol Gartenhaus included a cover sheet with the October minutes stating the intention of converting to electronic delivery with e-mail notification. If you or the faculty you represent have opinions on the issue, please let us know.
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TO: University Senate
FROM: Joseph W. Camp, Jr., Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Resume of Items Under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
Joseph W. Camp, Jr., Chairperson
dirus@purduenc.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
Terry S. Stewart, Chairperson of the Senate
tstewart@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
Steven E. Widmer, Chairperson
sewidmer@tech.purdue.edu

1. Impact of TRAX on educational policy issues
2. Merger of the University Division with Undergraduate Student Programs

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Wallace B. Morrison, Chairperson
wbm@purdue.edu

1. Grade Appeals Process
2. Committee on Informetrics
3. Follow-up on post tenure review

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Olivia Bennett Wood, Chairperson
woodo@cfs.purdue.edu

1. Academic Integrity
2. University Regulations Revisions: Student Organizations
3. Student Disciplinary Process

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
Vicki J. Killion, Chairperson
vkillion@purdue.edu

1. Childcare for Purdue employees
2. Faculty input into the budget process
3. Monitor space and facilities in light of increasing enrollment
4. Computing policy issues

Vice Chair of the Senate, Dan E. Schendel; schendel@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Solomon Gartenhaus; garten@physics.purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/usenate
# Calendar of Status of Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Document</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*02-1</td>
<td>Nominees for Senate Committees</td>
<td>University Senate Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Elected 9/9/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*02-2</td>
<td>Reapportionment of the University Senate 2003-2004</td>
<td>University Senate Steering Committee</td>
<td>Approved 11/18/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-3</td>
<td>Structure and function of new University Senate standing committee reporting to Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-4</td>
<td>Changes to Regulations and Procedures for Recognized Student Organizations</td>
<td>University Senate Student Affairs Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approved
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Steering Committee  
SUBJECT: Reapportionment of the University Senate 2003-2004  
REFERENCES: University Senate Document 90-5, University Code D 3.00: Bylaws of the University Senate, Items 2.00 and 2.01  
DISPOSITION: Faculty Units

Section D 3.00 of the University Code, and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred members. Eight of these are specified in items 1 through 8 below. This leaves ninety-two to be apportioned among the faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two senators. There are 1941 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette and North Central campuses. When this number is divided by ninety-two the result is 21.098. To qualify for more than two senators, therefore, a faculty unit should have fifty-three or more voting faculty members. Since no faculty unit can have fewer than two senators, the Libraries qualifies for two senators. The remaining units have a total of 1905 voting faculty members with ninety senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The number 1905 divided by 90 equals 21.167. The apportionment of senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the school by 21.167. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 14.314; Consumer and Family Sciences, 2.787; Education, 2.693; Engineering, 12.661; Liberal Arts, 18.283; Management, 3.874; North Central, 4.063; Pharmacy, Nursing and Health Sciences, 4.819; Science, 13.464; Technology, 9.307; and Veterinary Medicine, 3.732.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas Represented</th>
<th>Number Voting Fac. Members</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>Number Voting Fac. Members</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chief Fiscal Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Calumet Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fort Wayne Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IUPUI Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Graduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Faculty Units</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer &amp; Family Sci</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharm, Nurs &amp; Health Sci</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY INFORMETRICS COMMITTEE

Rationale

In the late spring of 2001, a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee conducted a work/life electronic survey of the Purdue faculty culture. Results of that survey were analyzed and then disseminated electronically in the fall of 2001. Given the success of this baseline survey, a need was created for assigning formal responsibility to the Faculty Affairs Committee for continuing to collect additional faculty-related information and opinion over time. Consequently, on March 5, 2002, Joe Camp, the Chairman of the University Senate Steering Committee, suggested that the Faculty Affairs Committee “propose to the Senate formation of a permanent standing committee to carry on the duties associated with the 2001 Purdue Faculty Survey.” The Faculty Affairs Committee is pleased to comply, and is hereby asking for University Senate approval for creating a permanent standing Faculty Informetrics Committee that reports to Faculty Affairs.

A. Membership

Eight members: five faculty members, including two liaison members from the Faculty Affairs Committee; one liaison to represent the Office of the Provost; one liaison to represent the Office of the Vice-President for Human Relations; and one liaison to represent the Office of Institutional Research.

B. Nomination, Election, and Tenure

The University Senate Nominating Committee shall nominate three faculty members to staggered three-year terms. The Chair of Faculty Affairs will appoint the two liaison members from Faculty Affairs no later than May of each year. The three Offices represented shall appoint their liaison members.

C. Chair

The Chair shall be a member of the faculty. In April or May of each year, the outgoing Chair shall: a) arrange for the continuing and newly appointed members to elect a Chair for the succeeding year, and b) report the name of the new chair to the Faculty Affairs Committee and to the Secretary of Faculties.
D. Area of Responsibility

The Committee shall be charged with continuing data collection and analysis of faculty surveys, coordination of all other faculty survey related activities, and sharing collected information regularly with the faculty.

E. Meetings and Reports

Recommendations and reports will be made directly to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. The Informetrics Committee shall send minutes of its meetings and present a brief annual summary of its activities to the Faculty Affairs Committee and to the Secretary of Faculties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approving:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
<th>Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Beck</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donna Whitten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Blackwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stuart Bolton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Frost Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alysa Rollock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Van Etten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Alice Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Walcott-McQuigg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zinsmeister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Student Affairs Committee  
SUBJECT: Changes to Regulations and Procedures for Recognized Student Organizations  
REFERENCES: University Regulations, 2002-03 (page 66 and 67); Academic Procedure Manual 0-75  
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Approval  

Present
Part 7  
Section III  
Requirements for Holding Office

Proposed
Part 7  
Section III  
Requirements for Holding Office Members, Officers, and Advisors

A. General Membership
1. The control and operation of a student organization must remain with the student members. Full voting privileges may be granted only to Purdue University students.
2. Membership and participation in student organizations must be free from discrimination based on race, religion, color, sex, age, national origin or ancestry, marital status, parental status, sexual orientation, disability, or status as a disabled or Vietnam-era veteran.
3. Students must be free to join or leave an organization without being subjected to pressure, harassment, or intimidation.
4. Hazing is prohibited by university regulation (part 7, section VIII) and state statute.

A. Eligibility for Campus Activities

B. Requirements for Holding Office
1. These regulations shall apply to the undergraduate officers of recognized student organizations on the West Lafayette Campus, and to the undergraduate participants in student activities representing Purdue University off campus, including extramural sports clubs, bands, glee club, and debate teams, and to those presented as student participants in all-campus dramatic and musical productions.
2. Each student organization or director of
an activity shall be expected to define the requirements for eligibility of its own officers and participants.

3. Regardless of further requirements that may be established by a student organization or director of an activity, an officer or candidate for office of an organization or participant in an activity as defined in Section III-A-1 must satisfy the following:
   a. He/She must have been admitted to the University as a regular student and must have been assessed full student fees.
   b. He/She must be in good standing, i.e., has not been dismissed, suspended, or dropped from the University without thereafter having been readmitted.
   c. He/She must have:
      • Earned a total number of semester hours of credit not less than the number of his/her current classification according to the registrar minus one times 12; or
      • Earned a minimum of 12 semester-hours of credit in the semester immediately preceding and be currently enrolled in a minimum of 2 hours of course work.

4. Each organization shall be responsible for confirming the eligibility of students as candidates for office or officers of the organization.

B. A student placed on disciplinary probation or probated suspension, as part of that probation, may be required to resign from an office in a student organization, refrain from seeking such an office, or discontinue participation in a special activity.

as student participants in all-campus dramatic and musical productions.

2. Each student organization or director of an activity shall be expected to define the requirements for eligibility of its own officers and participants.

3. Regardless of further requirements that may be established by a student organization or director of an activity, an officer or candidate for office of an organization or participant in an activity as defined in Section III-A-1 must satisfy the following:
   a. He/She must have been admitted to the University as a regular student and must have been assessed full student fees.
   b. He/She must be in good standing, i.e., has not been dismissed, suspended, or dropped from the University without thereafter having been readmitted.
   c. He/She Undergraduate students must have:
      1. Earned a total number of semester hours of credit not less than the number of his/her current classification according to the registrar minus one times 12; or
      2. Earned a minimum of 12 semester-hours of credit in the semester immediately preceding and be currently enrolled in a minimum of 2 hours of course work.

   d. Graduate students must be enrolled as full-time, degree-seeking students.

4. University probation
   a. A student placed on disciplinary probation or probated suspension, as part of that probation, may be required to resign from an office in a student organization, refrain from seeking such an office, or discontinue participation in a special activity.
   b. Students on academic probation are not eligible to hold an executive officer position.

5. Students may not hold more than
C. Advisors to student organizations
1. All organizations are required to have an advisor, who should serve in an advisory role only and may not have voting rights, including voting to approve expenditures or programs. Advisors provide advisement and support, and enhance student life outside the classroom.
2. Advisors must be either full-time faculty or administrative/professional staff at Purdue University or otherwise approved by the Office of the Dean of Students. Individuals classified as graduate student staff are not eligible to be advisors to student organizations.
3. In addition to their primary advisor, organizations may have community advisors, instructors, and coaches with limited authority. Many recreational and sports clubs have non-university affiliated instructors and coaches because of a need for specialized instruction or discipline. However, the direction of the group remains with the student members. Provisions must be made in the constitution for selection and removal of such instructors and coaches.

D. (formerly A.4) The officers of each student organization shall be responsible for confirming the eligibility of students as candidates for office or officers of the organization of the members, officers, and advisors of the organization.

Approving:
Mark W. Bannatyne  Kirstin Leach
Noreen Castor  Robert E. Montgomery
Daniel S. Elliott  Hisao Nakanishi
Blake Everhart  Thomas B. Robinson
Wendy S. Flory  John A. Sautter
Wanda Fox  Rahim Sewani
John G. Graveel  Matthew P. Stephens
L. Tony Hawkins  G. Thomas Wilson
Wei Hong  Olivia Bennett Wood
Scott D. King  Ann Vandermolen

Absent:
Terry L. Davidson
Howard Mancing
Mamadou Niang