UNIVERSITY SENATE
Sixth Meeting, Monday, 24 March 2003, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Terry S. Stewart

2. Approval of Minutes of 17 February 2003

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
   For Information
   by Various Standing Committees
   Professor Joseph W. Camp, Jr.

7. Question Time

8. University Senate Document 02-8
   Nominees for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson
   of the University Senate
   For Action
   Professor Charles E. Kline

9. University Senate Document 02-9
   Nominees for University Senate Steering
   and Nominating Committees
   For Action
   Professor Charles E. Kline

10. University Senate Document 02-10
    Nominees for Faculty Committees
    For Action
    Professor Charles E. Kline

11. University Senate Report 02-1
    Report from the Athletics Affairs Committee
    For Information
    Professor Olivia Bennett Wood

12. University Senate Report 02-2
    Instructional Type Classifications &
    Semester Credit Hour Guidelines
    For Information
    Professor Steve Widmer

13. Housing Facilities Master Plan
    West Lafayette Campus 2000 - 2014
    For information
    Vice President John Sautter

14. New Business

15. Memorial Resolutions

16. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Sixth Meeting, 24 March 2003, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center


Guests: Morgan Burke, Elaine McVay, and Amy Raley.

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor Terry S. Stewart, at 2:30 p.m.

2. The minutes of the meeting of 17 February 2003 were approved as distributed (on the Web).

3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.

4. President Martin C. Jischke presented his remarks to the senate (see Appendix A).

5. Professor Terry S. Stewart, chairperson of the Senate, presented the report of the chairperson (See Appendix B).

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 questions from the floor directed to the chairs of the various standing committees. In the absence of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Professor William A. Harper, a member of that committee, elaborated briefly on item 4, “Tenure Promotion Process” listed under the FAC in the Resume.
7. At question time, no questions having been submitted in writing, questions were invited from the floor. Professor Otto Doering asked for the floor and called attention to two bills currently before the legislature that would be of interest to the faculty and asked that a copy of these be sent to each senator.

8. Professor Charles E. Kline, chairperson of the Nominating Committee, presented for action University Senate Document 02-8, Nominees for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate. He placed in nomination Professors William A. Harper, William L. McBride, and Steven E. Widmer. The motion was seconded and additional nominations were called for. None were forthcoming. The chair then invited each of the nominees to the podium and Professors Harper and Widmer briefly addressed the senate. At the chair’s invitation, the secretary read a brief statement from Professor William L. McBride who was unable to attend the meeting. A vote by secret ballot was carried out with Professors A.N. Beck and R.E. Blanton serving as tellers. None of the three nominees received a majority vote and a run-off was held between Professors Harper and McBride with Professors Beck and Blanton again serving as tellers. Professor William A. Harper was elected chair of the University senate for the year 2003-04.

An election for vice-chairperson of the senate was then held between Professors William L. McBride and Steven E. Widmer. The vote was again by secret ballot with Professors Beck and Blanton serving as tellers. Professor McBride was elected vice-chairperson of the senate for the year 2003-2004.

9. Professor Charles E. Kline presented, for action, University Senate Document 02-9, Nominees for University Senate Steering and Nominating Committee. For the two vacancies on the Steering Committee, he nominated Professors David W. Frantz, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Cindy H. Nakatsu, and Farshid Sadeghi. For the four vacancies on the Nominating Committee, he nominated: Professors Joseph W. Camp, Jr., Patrick E. Connolly, Bruce Hamaker, Charles E. Kline, Daniel J. Kovenock, Glenn G. Sparks, Bruce A. Watkins, and Sirje Laurel Weldon. Additional nominations were called for but none were forthcoming. The vote was by secret ballot with Professors S.D. Johnson and V.J. Killion serving as tellers for the Nominating Committee ballots and Professor W. Walton and J. Walcott-McQuigg serving as tellers for the Steering Committee ballots. Professors Gabriele F. Giuliani and Cindy Nakatsu were elected to membership on the Steering Committee, each for a term of service of three years and Professors Joseph W. Camp, Jr., Bruce Hamaker, Charles E. Kline, and Glenn Sparks were elected to membership on the Nominating Committee, each for a term of service of three years.

10. Professor Charles E. Kline presented for action University Senate Document 02-10, Nominees for Faculty Committees. For the four vacancies on the Collective Bargaining Committee he nominated Professors James Auter, Liping A. Cai, Patricia Hart, and David Sanders for terms of service ending May 31st, 2005. For the two vacancies on the University Grade Appeals Committee he nominated Professors John Finley and Sara Wallace for terms of service ending May 31st, 2006. For the University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee he nominated for the four vacancies, as regular members, Professors Jeffrey L. Bennetzen, Joel R. Ebarb, Jeanne Romero-severson, and Karen S. Yehle; and for the four vacancies as alternate members he nominated Professors Jennifer Richards, Jeffrey Siskind, Sharon D. Solwitz, and Beth Starnes each for a term of service ending May 31st, 2006. The motion was seconded and additional
nominations were called for. With none forthcoming the foregoing were declared elected by acclamation.

11. Professor Olivia Wood, chairperson of the Students Affairs Committee, presented, for information, University Senate Report 02-1, Report from the Athletic Affairs Committee. She introduced Professor Robert E. Montgomery the liaison member to the Athletic Affairs Committee from the Student Affairs Committee who then discussed the report in some detail. Following his presentation he responded to several questions from the floor.

12. Professor Steven E. Widmer, chairperson of the Educational Policy Committee, presented for information University Senate Report 02-2, Instructional Type Classifications & Semester Credit Hour Guidelines. He described the report briefly and responded to several questions from the floor. In response to a suggestion, he agreed to make a minor modification which would be included with the final version of the report included with the senate minutes.

13. The chair introduced the Vice President for Housing and Food Services, John Sautter, who made a power point presentation entitled “Housing Facilities Master Plan West Lafayette Campus 2000-2014”. Following his presentation, he responded to several questions from the floor and asked that copies of his power point slides be included with the minutes. (See Appendix D).

14. There was no new business. The chair reported that a memorial resolution had been received for Irving Sosensky, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy. At the chair’s invitation, the senate rose and remained standing for a period of silence out of respect for their departed colleague. The resolution is attached to these minutes and copies will be sent to the next of kin.

15. The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
REMARKS BY PRESIDENT MARTIN C. JISCHKE

Thank you and good afternoon to all of you. Welcome back from spring break.

We have all returned to campus at a very difficult time for our nation and for our world. War is under way in Iraq. In the United States the terrorism level has been raised to orange or high. There is a great deal of concern here and everywhere. Our thoughts are first with our United States military personnel. Over the past three months a number of reserve units here in Indiana and elsewhere have been activated. As of Friday the total number of Purdue West Lafayette and Statewide Technology students called to active military duty is sixty. We look forward to their safe return and thank them for their service to our country. I am very sorry to say we are hearing reports of fatalities involving Purdue people. On Thursday, February 6th, Brian Clemens, a Purdue Statewide Technology student at Kokomo, was the first Indiana National Guard member killed overseas since Desert Storm. He died after his Humvee overturned in Kuwait. Last Friday a former Purdue student died in a helicopter crash in Kuwait. Marine Corporal Brian Matthew Kennedy was enrolled in Purdue in Freshman Engineering. He was a student here in the fall and spring semesters of 1995-96 and the summer of 1996 before he transferred to Texas Tech University. His mother, Melissa Derbyshire, who lives in Maine is a Purdue Graduate. Our deepest sympathies go to the family and friends of these two young men.

These international events are impacting Purdue. As there is understandably some tension on our campus, there is understandably some worry from the families of our students. But we have no indication that we need to be concerned beyond normal vigilance; Purdue is well prepared for any emergency. We have in place an integrated emergency response plan that we would use to guide us in response to any incident. We have practiced implementing it. Many Purdue building supervisors have already pulled together safety committees and they are addressing specific concerns, identifying individuals who might need assistance such as research that needs constant monitoring or special attention. Anyone who has these kinds of concerns should make them known to supervisors who will relay them to the appropriate building deputy. Purdue also has a communications plan to share information with faculty, staff, students and parents. The plan includes a website where information will be posted and questions regarding security addressed. The site is linked from the University’s homepage at www.purdue.edu

I believe we can all take a great deal of pride in the way that the Purdue University community is responding to these world events. We have more international students than any other public university in the United States. Our students and faculty come from many areas of the world including those that are deeply impacted by what is taking place. Throughout these trying times the Purdue community has shown great respect for individual rights and the benefits that emerge from our diversity. Our commitment on this campus is to the recognition and appreciation of the value and worth of every individual. Our commitment is to inclusiveness for every person. We all learn from our differences and we grow together in our togetherness. I hope that in the days and weeks ahead we will continue to come together to learn, grow and celebrate this diversity.

In Indianapolis we are working closely with the governor and the general assembly on the budget for next biennium. The budget that was passed by the House of Representatives in February provides, I believe, convincing evidence that Indiana’s legislators recognize the
strategic role of higher education in our state. House Bill 2008 restores many of the budget reductions imposed on Indiana colleges and universities under the governor’s deficit management plan. The bill adds $60 million in operating appropriations to higher education funding for fiscal year 2003 – 04 and another $26.1 million for the following year. It also includes $12.7 million in repair and rehabilitation funding for each year of the biennium. While this is a step in the right direction I would also tell you that these revenues do not restore all the budget reductions in funding delays that Purdue and other universities had experienced. For example, that $25.5 million in repair and rehabilitation funding represents only one-fourth of the amount requested driven by a formula regarding the maintenance and repair of buildings.

According to the Commission for Higher Education all the budget cuts and delays to the seven institutions of higher education add up to $250 million for the 2001 – 2003 biennium we are now in. The impact on Purdue alone has been $75 million not counting the 21st century fund reductions. However, I believe it is quite significant that the house approved a budget that attempts to restore some of higher educations’ losses at a time when the state continues to face significant revenue shortages. This tells me, I think it should tell all of us, that our legislators understand that education will play a major role in eliminating these kinds of revenue shortages in the future. It is also encouraging to me that the House budget includes bonding authority, totaling more than $222 million for economic development related to facilities at campuses throughout the state. Two key Purdue projects in West Lafayette are among those approved. First, the millennium engineering building that will house a variety of programs and is central to a major upgrade of the schools of engineering and, second, the bio-medical engineering building that will grow out of this program impacting our state’s economic future. The state budget is now being considered in the senate. We should have some indication by the end of the week as to exactly what the senate would propose. We’re hopeful that members of that chamber will also recognize the impact Purdue and all of higher education have on Indiana economic development.

Finally I am happy to report that all of the information we have to date regarding enrollment for next fall is positive. We continue to be on track. We are among the top eleven public universities in the entire United States in the number of applications we received. At this time it appears all of our numbers for next fall will continue to advance our strategic plans for better academically prepared students and increased numbers of minority students.

Thank you for everything you are doing. I am looking forward to a very exciting, rest of the spring, if you will, on our campus. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have for me at this time. Thank you!
Since the President has commented on the Iraqi situation, I will omit my remarks on that topic.

Staff Benefits is planning to have a Health Forum during the 15\textsuperscript{th} week of the semester to talk about benefits under consideration for 2004 and beyond. It is being co-sponsored by APSAC, CSSAC and the University Senate. Watch for an announcement of the specific times and locations and please encourage your constituents to attend. The folks in personnel are working to get information out to the faculty and staff earlier in the planning process and we need to respond by participating and providing feedback. As an update, the voluntary benefits program is moving forward. A broker is being selected and a dental program will be the first item addressed. Recall that with a voluntary program, the individual pays 100\% of the premium costs but at group rates.

Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics COIA update – If you recall, at the January meeting I mentioned that the CIC elected faculty leaders initiated the formation of a Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics to include faculty leadership representatives from the six conferences involved in the Bowl Championship Series. COIA will then work with a counterpart group of university trustees and a committee from the AAUP. Professor Bob Eno at IU is providing leadership to a steering committee and the Coalition has progresses to the point of having a proposed charter (see below) and will have its first meetings in the Summer and Fall of 2003. I will include a copy of the draft charter in my published comments but in brief summary; the goal of the coalition is to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission.

There has not been a board of trustees meeting since our last Senate meeting so I do not have anything new to report from their deliberations.

Outline Charter for the Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics
-- for discussion by coalition members (March 2003)

The Coalition. The Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is a group advocating for reform in intercollegiate athletics, created by and representative of faculty senate leaders at Bowl Championship Series conference schools.

Origins. The impetus for creating the Coalition was evidence of some sustained momentum towards reform, as indicated by a succession of national statements from groups such as the Knight Commission and the AAUP, a series of studies that provided new data and insight on relevant issues, and the formation of the Group of Six cooperative effort among BCS-conference
presidents. In late 2002, the adoption of the initial set of Group of Six reform proposals and the appointment of Myles Brand at the NCAA reinforced this momentum.

**Goals.** The Coalition’s purpose is to articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work with other groups committed to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission. The expectation at the outset is for an initial period of several years of high Coalition activity, leading towards adoption of an acceptable comprehensive program of staged reform by the NCAA or by some alternative emerging structure, followed by a diminishing role tracking the success of the adopted program.

**Strategy.** The Coalition advocates a strategy of reaching consensus among groups interested in reform on the desired long-term outcome of comprehensive reform, and building an agenda of specific phased steps to accomplish that goal over time. While rapid elimination of negative aspects of athletics practices may be desirable, emphasis on speed may limit both the goals that can be set and the chances of success. Therefore, the Coalition’s strategy balances goals of speed, comprehensiveness, and practicability.

**Membership.** The Coalition has been established on the basis of membership by individual faculty senate leaders, who have determined individually the degree to which they may seek sanction for their decision to participate from faculty leadership groups within their institutions. Its initial structure is ad hoc, and it makes no strong claim to represent faculty in a broad sense. To the degree that the Coalition is able to build legitimacy by developing a clear program that faculty may broadly support and accomplishing steps towards initial success, it may choose to formalize issues of membership, engagement with local faculty leaderships, etc., to maximize the degree to which it can claim to represent a national faculty voice.

**Leadership.** The Coalition will initially be led by a Steering Committee that includes at least one and no more than three representatives from each of the six conferences that have participated in founding the Coalition. Committee members are nominated by faculty senate leaders within each conference, and appointed by agreement of those leaders. The committee will begin from ad hoc procedures, and formalize its governance principles to the degree this seems useful to the committee, or to the degree Coalition members indicate this necessity. Initially, the Steering Committee will attempt to draft a vision of long-term reform objectives and a tentative agenda for reaching them that Coalition members can respond to, refine, and perhaps adopt. The committee is also charged to undertake on its own activities intended to provide a foundation for the Coalition’s organizational viability, and play a leadership role in the activities listed below.

**Activities.** The Coalition’s activities may fall into the following categories:

1) Bringing together ideas from a wide variety of people, both within the Coalition and outside, faculty and non-faculty, and including campus NCAA faculty athletics representatives, administrators, and trustees interested in reform, and national groups, such as the NCAA, AAUP, and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB).

2) Drafting documents that articulate faculty viewpoints and that constructively contribute to reform efforts.

3) Organizing or participating in events, such as conferences, that can bring together people interested in reform, both to enlarge the coalition and to accomplish specific tasks efficiently.
4) Identifying key issues and proposals where developing additional data is critical to designing reform or effectively advocating for it, and working with other groups, such as the NCAA, AAUP, and AGB, to identify specialists and find funding to support necessary research.

**Scope of Reform.** The Coalition seeks comprehensive reform that would affect five broad categories of intercollegiate athletics activities (the examples below are not intended to be exhaustive and some bridge more than one of the five categories):

1) **Academics.** This includes issues of initial and continuing eligibility; admissions and student-athlete academic standards, etc.

2) **Student Welfare.** This includes issues of scholarship policies; academic advising and other forms of student support; equity concerning matters such as gender and race; athletics scheduling; training expectations and time limits; athletes’ engagement in campus life, etc.

3) **Finances and Scale.** This points towards issues related to the athletics “arms race,” and includes the cost structure of athletics departments and revenue/non-revenue programs; financial planning, reporting, and monitoring; competitive equity within conferences and divisions; the relationship between winning programs and solvency; the constraints of anti-trust law, etc.

4) **Commercialization.** This concerns responses to financial imperatives that may lead to dependency on corporate and media funding, requiring various forms of commercial behavior that may conflict with academic missions or values, including corporate sponsorship contracts and branding control; media contracts and scheduling/marketing control; high-stakes dependency on revenue streams influenced by factors outside institutional control and not related to institutional priorities, etc.

5) **Governance.** This includes the shared governance roles among faculty, presidents, athletics administrators and trustees on individual campuses over such matters as academic standards and support for student-athletes, athletics personnel decisions, supervision of financial planning and performance of athletics auxiliaries, programmatic athletics department decisions, etc.
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
jcamp@pnc.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. Study of Instructional Types

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

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

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

1. Review of Student Bill of Rights
2. Student Athlete Report
3. TRAX Review
4. Academic Integrity
5. Need for exam proctors

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

1. Faculty input into the budget process
2. Computing policy issues
3. Review of Faculty Committees

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
**Student Housing Market Dynamics**

- Students not required to live on campus
- Students have greater expectations for housing
- Oversupply of off-campus student housing (2000+ beds)
- Additional 1000 beds of off-campus student housing expected for fall 2003

**Factors That Drive Housing Choice**

- Proximity to campus
- Convenience and amenities
- Relationship with University
- Dining options
- Community and privacy
- Value

**Status of University Residences**

- In 2000, average space was 42 years old
- Majority of spaces are non-AC rooms on double-loaded corridors
- Not easily reconfigured to contemporary housing styles
- Down-sizing due to academic campus expansion, decreasing income base and community oversupply

**Housing Facilities Master Plan**

**Objectives**

- Guarantee housing for beginning students
- Provide high-value housing
- Offer range of rates and accommodations
- Generate funds for R & R funding and major facilities upgrades
Plan: Housing Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9,459</td>
<td>7,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>10,709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan: Air conditioned spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>4,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan: Fire Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sprinkled Spaces</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result: Facilities Average Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Master Plan</td>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>42 years</td>
<td>56 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Master Plan</td>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>42 years</td>
<td>56 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Major Projects

- Cary Renovation
  - $51M renovation
  - Currently in 3rd of 6 phases
  - West Hall reopens Fall 03
  - 1.5% surcharge each year for 5 years, FY 2001 – FY 2005

- Dining Services
  - $48M, 6 phase plan, resulting in five full service dining courts
  - Funded through annual savings and efficiencies of $4.4M by 2006 - 2007
  - Earnhart Dining Court begins serving March 2003
  - Stadium Avenue Dining Court in next phase
Current Major Projects

- Student Room Air Conditioning
  - $29 M, which includes cost of sprinkling
  - Retrofit 4 residence halls
  - Phase 3 of 3 for Streve completed 2003 using R&R funds
  - Future projects funded through premium charged for AC users

- Fire Sprinkling
  - $10 M
  - Ten Year plan underway
  - Funded from reserves and a 0.5% surcharge for 4 years ending FY 2006
  - Currently in year 3 of project

Critical Operational Elements

- Convert Meredith and Earhart Halls to co-ed
- Close Hilltop I & II, convert Hilltop III to family housing
- Close Purdue Village North
- Convert Young Graduate House to office facility
- Close Meredith Hall

Critical Major Projects

- Build 1000 apartment spaces (2 phases)
- Renovate Windsor Halls
- Renovate Purdue Village South

New Major Projects

1. New Apartments:
   - 1000 Spaces
   - $50 M
   - Phase I open Fall 05

2. Windsor Renovation:
   - 748 Spaces
   - $17.1 M
   - Construction begins Summer 2006
   - Completed Fall 2011
New Major Projects

3. Purdue Village South Renovation
   - 644 spaces
   - $30 M
   - Construction begins Summer 2004
   - Completed Fall 2010

Annual Decrease in Revenue Base

- $1.30 M Purdue Village North closing (448 spaces)
- $0.85 M Young closing (546 spaces)
- $2.40 M Hilltop I & II closing (818 spaces)
- $1.85 M Meredith closing (620 spaces)

Total: $6.40 M by 2014 (decrease of 2,432 spaces)

Funding the Plan

Rate Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TDD</th>
<th>TDU</th>
<th>TDO</th>
<th>TDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 5.72% TDD, 1.95% TDU, 0.50% TDO

Housing Facilities Master Plan Summary

This plan will:
- Adjust housing spaces to local housing market
- Upgrade housing facilities
- Expand range of rates and accommodations
- Guarantee campus housing for beginning students
- Fund $6 M annually for R & R and finance major projects

Housing Facilities Master Plan
West Lafayette Campus

2009-2014
## 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>Formation of the Faculty Informetrics Committee</td>
<td>University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Approved 01/27/03</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>Approved 01/27/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-5</td>
<td>University Division Faculty Advisory Committee</td>
<td>University Senate Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Approved 02/17/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-6</td>
<td>Change to University Regulations 2002-2003</td>
<td>University Senate Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Approved 02/17/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-7</td>
<td>Nominees for Advisors to the Senate</td>
<td>University Senate Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Approved 02/17/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-8</td>
<td>Nominees for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate</td>
<td>University Senate Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Approved 03/24/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-9</td>
<td>Nominees for University Senate Steering and Nominating Committees</td>
<td>University Senate Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Elected 03/24/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-10</td>
<td>Nominees for Faculty Committees</td>
<td>University Senate Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Elected 03/24/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approved

## SENATE REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE REPORTS</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-1</td>
<td>Report from the Athletics Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-2</td>
<td>Instructional Type Classifications &amp; Semester Credit Hour Guidelines</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Nominating Committee proposes the following nominees for service on the University Senate Nominating and Steering Committees. The persons elected are to serve the period of years shown following each name. Resumes of the nominees are attached.

A. For the two vacancies on the **Steering Committee**, the following four faculty members are proposed:

- David W. Frantz 2 Statewide Technology
- Gabriele F. Giuliani 3 Physics
- Cindy Nakatsu 3 Agronomy
- Farshid Sadeghi 2 Mechanical Engineering

B. For the four vacancies on the **Nominating Committee**, the following eight faculty members are proposed:

- Joseph Camp, Jr. 3 Biological Sciences
- Patrick Connolly 3 Computer Graphics
- Bruce Hamaker 3 Food Science
- Charles Kline 3 Educational Studies
- Daniel J. Kovenock 3 Management
- Glenn Sparks 3 Communication
- Bruce A. Watkins 1 Food Science
- Sirje Laurel Weldon 3 Political Science

**Approving:**
- Mark S. Cushman
- Natalie J. Carroll
- Charles E. Kline
- Craig M. Miller
- Glenn G. Sparks
- Whitney Walton
- John D. Zimbrick

**Absent:**
- Linda M. Duttlinger
- Christoph M. Hoffmann
STEERING COMMITTEE

David W. Frantz

Dr. Frantz currently serves as an Associate Professor of Organizational Leadership and Supervision for Purdue University. He has taught at Purdue’s location in Richmond, Indiana, since 1994, and became a tenured faculty member in 2001. He teaches courses in Applied Leadership, Human Behavior in Organizations, Managing Change, Conflict Management, Leadership Philosophy, Leadership for Team Development, Human Resource Issues and Training Methods.

Prior to joining Purdue University, Dr. Frantz was a Director and Vice President of Human Resources from 1982 to 1993 for several major healthcare organizations in the Chicago area (Evangelical Health Systems) and on the West Coast (Sisters of the Holy Cross, Mercy Healthcare and Kingsview). Dr. Frantz was also an admissions counselor for George Williams College in Downers Grove, IL from 1980-1981. Dave consults with numerous companies regarding management and leadership training, strategic business planning processes and performance management techniques. He earned his undergraduate degree at North Central College in 1974, and his doctorate specializing in Religion and Psychological Studies at the University of Chicago Divinity School in 1980.

Gabriele F. Giuliani

Professor Giuliani joined the Physics Department of Purdue University in 1984 and holds degrees from The University of Pisa and The Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa. Alongside his research activity he has taught a variety of graduate and undergraduate courses at Purdue.

Professor Gabriele F. Giuliani’s research interests are in the field of Condensed Matter Theory. In particular he carries out theoretical work in the areas of many-body physics and superconductivity.

During his career, besides being associated with Purdue University and the above two Institutions, Professor Giuliani has also been at The University of Rome, Brown University, and The International Center for Theoretical Physics (in Trieste, Italy) in each of which he has carried out research in Condensed Matter Theory. He is currently working on the theory of transport phenomena in superconductors and on electron gas theory as applied to low dimensional electronic structures. Finally Professor Giuliani’s further area of interest is the experimental verification of elementary friction theory.

Cindy H. Nakatsu

Dr. Cindy H. Nakatsu has been on faculty in the Department of Agronomy at Purdue University since 1995. She received her Ph.D. in 1993 from Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada and her M. S. (’83) and B. S. (’78) degrees from the University of Toronto in Toronto, Canada. Her research is focused towards gaining a greater understanding of the diversity of microorganisms in nature and the genetic mechanisms used by bacteria to adapt to their environment. Molecular genetic, traditional microbiology and ecology experiments are used in her research program. Major projects currently being investigated are: (1) To determine the diversity and role of microbial populations in various ecosystems; (2) To determine methods to detect potential sources of pathogenic microorganisms in the environment; and (3) To determine the genetic
elements and mechanisms involved in horizontal gene transfer in the environment. Publications include 34 refereed research articles, 6 book chapters, 14 proceedings, and over 80 research abstracts. She has given over 20 national and international invited lectures. She has received a number of awards including the Purdue University Research Faculty Scholar, Dow Elanco Young Investigator’s Award, Ontario Graduate Scholarship, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Postgraduate Scholarship, and University of Toronto Open Fellowship. Dr. Nakatsu currently teaches two courses, Molecular Microbial Ecology (AGRY649) and Soil Ecology (AGRY 349). Over the years she has served on numerous committees including: University Graduate council, University Faculty Compensation and Benefits committee, President’s committee to review University staff benefits, School of Agriculture Grade Appeal committee, and School of Agriculture Graduate council.

**Farshid Sadeghi**

Professor Sadeghi received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from university of Tennessee in 1979 and 1981 respectively and his Ph.D. from North Carolina State University in 1985. He joined the faculty of Purdue University as an Assistant Professor in January of 1986. He was promoted to Associate Professor and Professor of Mechanical Engineering in 1991 and 1996, respectively. Upon arrival at Purdue he founded the Mechanical Engineering Tribology Laboratory (METL). His area of research includes, tribology, micro-electro-mechanical sensors, stress analysis, fatigue and machine design. He has graduated 7 PhD and 21 M.S. students. Currently serving as the chairman of two Ph.D. and 7 M.S. students. He has published over 50 archival journal publications in the leading international journal and has given over 100 conference and invited presentations at various conferences, governmental Laboratories and industries. He has received over 8.8 million Dollars in research grants and contracts from governmental agencies and industrial companies. He has received two best paper awards (one from ASME and the other STLE) and one educational award from SAE. Since arrival at Purdue, Professor Sadeghi has developed two undergraduate and two graduate courses. The undergraduate courses are at the junior level and are entitled “Machine Design I” and “Mechanics of Materials”; the graduate courses are entitled “Advanced Machine Design” and “Lubrication, Friction and Wear”.

Professor Sadeghi was elected in 1998 and then reelected in 2002 by the faculty of the School of Mechanical Engineering to serve on the University Senate. In 1998 he was elected by the faculty of the School of Mechanical Engineering to serve as a member of the Engineering Grade Appeals Committee. He became the chair of the Grade Appeals Committee in 1999. In this capacity, he met with students, discussed their cases and options, organized, participated and chaired a panel of seven faculties to review the students’ grade appeals for all of engineering. He served on the Mechanical Engineering Advisory Committee from 1995 to 1997. From 1991 to 1994 he served on the Mechanical Engineering Graduate Committee. He served on the Mechanical Engineering Curriculum Committee from 1988 to 1990. Professor Sadeghi has chaired, co-Chaired and/or organized over 30 sessions at international conferences. He served as the 2000 ASME Tribology Conference Chair in Seattle, Washington.
Professor Camp received his Ph.D. degree in Biology from Wake Forest University in 1980. In 1985 he joined the faculty at Purdue University North Central (PUNC) as an Assistant Professor of Biological Sciences. He was promoted to Associate Professor of Biological Sciences in 1990 and to Professor in 1999. He currently serves as acting chair of the Biology/Chemistry Department at PUNC. Professor Camp has taught undergraduate and graduate courses in general biology, anatomy and physiology, ecology, marine ecology, and parasitology. He won the outstanding undergraduate teacher award in the Sciences in 1992-93 and again in 1998-99. His research focuses on parasite ecology and freshwater ecology. His research efforts include the participation of undergraduate as well as graduate students. Professor Camp is a member of AAAS, American Society of Parasitologists, Annual Midwest Conference of Parasitologists, Helminthological Society of Washington, Indiana Academy of Science, The American Fisheries Society, Sigma Xi, and The Council on Undergraduate Research. Professor Camp serves as faculty advisor for the Tri Beta Honorary Biology chapter at PUNC. Professor Camp served on the University Senate (1991-94, 2000-03), the University Senate Student Affairs Committee (1991-94), the Senate Steering Committee (chair 2001-03), and several ad hoc university committees. Professor Camp also serves on Faculty Senate at the North Central campus.

Patrick E. Connolly

Patrick Connolly is an associate professor in the Department of Computer Graphics Technology with Purdue University at West Lafayette, Indiana. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in Design and Graphics Technology and Master of Science degree in Computer Integrated Manufacturing from Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah. Professor Connolly has been teaching at Purdue since 1996, and has received several awards for teaching excellence and academic publications. Prior to entering academia in 1996, Professor Connolly worked for twelve years in the aerospace and computer software industries and has extensive experience in CAD applications and design, CAE software support, and customer service management. He is currently a member of The American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE), ASEE-Engineering Design Graphics Division (EDGD). His current interests include solid modeling applications, visualization techniques, learning styles, e-enterprise, and distance learning.

Bruce Hamaker

Bruce Hamaker is a professor in the Department of Food Science, School of Agriculture. He obtained degrees in biology (B.S., 1977) from Indiana University, and human nutrition (M.S., 1983) and food science (Ph.D., 1986) from Purdue University. Prior to returning to Purdue as a faculty member, he took a post-doctoral position at a nutrition research center in Lima, Peru (1986-88) under the auspices of Johns Hopkins University and was an Assistant Professor at University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (1988-91). Following his undergraduate studies, Bruce was a Peace Corps Volunteer in Liberia, West Africa (1977-79). At Purdue, he was tenured in 1995 and obtained full professor in 1999. His research interests have focused on ways to improve nutritional and processing quality of cereal grains, particularly sorghum and corn grains; chemical and physical interactions among cereal components related to product textural properties and health-related attributes; cereal utilization in developing countries; and cereal protein allergens. His group’s work on the basis of the poor digestibility characteristic of
sorghum protein, and subsequent identification and characterization of a high protein
digestibility sorghum mutant, earned him the Agriculture Research Award in 2000. He has
active collaborative research projects in West Africa and India. Recently, he was named a
University Faculty Scholar.

Charles E. Kline

Charles E. Kline is an Associate Professor of Educational Administration in the Department of
Educational Studies, School of Education. He received his Ph.D. in Educational Administration
from the University of Wisconsin. During his first term on the University Senate, he served on
the Nominating Committee and in 2002-03, he was committee chair. He was elected to the
Senate for a second term, 2003 – 2005. He has served on the International Education
Programs Committee and the Scholastic Delinquencies and Readmissions Committee. He
teaches graduate level courses in educational administration. His research interests are
focused upon educational leadership and he has published articles on administrative behavior,
applied leadership, and K-16 administration. Since 1996, he has consulted and conducted
research with the Mongolian government regarding the reorganization of the national education
system of Mongolia.

Daniel J. Kovenock

Dan Kovenock serves as Professor of Economics in the Krannert School of Management. He
received his B.Sc. in Mathematics and Economics from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in
1977 and his Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1983. He has
served on the faculty at Purdue since 1983, and was Economics Policy Chairman between 1997
and 2001.

Professor Kovenock's main fields of interest are industrial organization, game theory,
microeconomic theory, and political economy. He has published 35 articles on a wide range of
topics within economics and the management sciences. Professor Kovenock is currently an
editor of the *International Journal of Industrial Organization* and a co-editor of *Economic Theory*.
He also serves on the editorial board of the *Strategic Management Journal* and is a past co-
Professor Kovenock is also a member of the Executive Committee of the European Association
for Research in Industrial Economics and is a Research Fellow of the CESifo (Munich) Research
Network.

Professor Kovenock held an assistant professorship in the Econometric Institute at the Erasmus
University Rotterdam in 1989 and 1990 and returned to Rotterdam in the
1994-95 academic year as a Tinbergen Institute Professor at the Tinbergen Institute and
Erasmus University. He has also held visiting professorships at the Catholic University Leuven,
the University of Melbourne, and the University of Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne).

Glenn G. Sparks

Glenn Sparks received the B.A. in Speech Communication (1975) from Wheaton College (IL),
the M.A. in Communication (1976) from Northern Illinois University, and the Ph.D. in
Communication Arts (1983) from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. After a three year
appointment as Assistant Professor of Communication at Cleveland State University, he came
to Purdue in 1986 to join the Department of Communication. He was promoted to Full Professor
in 1995.
He teaches courses in the theory and effects of mass media, children and television, and research methods. He is the author of over 50 publications that focus on the cognitive and emotional impact of media messages on children, adolescents, and adults. He has been recognized as among the top 100 researchers in the field of communication over the 80-year period from 1915-1995. He serves on numerous editorial boards and has chaired various committees in his field’s professional associations. His recent research has focused on the appeal of media violence, emotional responses to frightening mass media and the impact of media messages depicting the paranormal on beliefs about the paranormal and beliefs about science. He has testified before government committees on the effects of the mass media and is regularly cited in the national press for his expertise in this area. He has a recent textbook (2002) on media effects research published by Wadsworth.

During his tenure at Purdue, Glenn has served on many committees including the University Human Subjects Committee, the School of Liberal Arts Senate, the Liberal Arts Grade Appeal Committee, and the Selection Committee for the Liberal Arts Center for Social and Behavioral Science. Beginning in July 2001, he started his current position as the Assistant Department Head for the Department of Communication.

Glenn lives in West Lafayette with his wife, Cheri (Ph.D. in Psychological Sciences from Purdue), and his daughter, Jordan, a senior at West Lafayette High School. His son David is a graduate of Indiana University and his oldest daughter is a senior at the University of Chicago.

Bruce A. Watkins

Bruce A. Watkins is Professor and University Faculty Scholar of food science at Purdue University, and adjunct Professor of anatomy in the Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, School of Medicine, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. He is also the Director of the Center for Enhancing Foods to Protect Health at Purdue. Bruce obtained both the BS and the MS degrees in nutrition from Colorado State University and the Ph.D. degree in nutrition and physiological chemistry from the University of California, Davis in 1985. He received the BioServ Award from the American Society of Nutritional Sciences in 1994 and the Institute of Food Technologists (IFT) Research and Development Award in 1999. His research interests include biochemical and molecular actions of dietary fatty acids and phytochemical analysis of food and plants. Bruce is an author for more than 100 publications and he serves on four editorial boards for nutrition and food science research. He recently completed the ESCOP/ACOP leadership development program for land grant universities and the CIC academic leadership program for inter-institutional cooperation of universities. He teaches courses on lipid chemistry and nutritional sciences.

Sirje Laurel Weldon

S. Laurel Weldon is an Assistant Professor in Political Science. She received her Ph.D from the University of Pittsburgh in 1999. Her fields of interest are public policy, women and politics, and political economy. She has published a book, entitled “Protest, Policy and the Problem of Violence Against Women”, and articles on policies on violence against women, civil society, and political representation. Her work combines qualitative and quantitative methods. In the Department of Political Science, she has served on the teaching excellence and standards committee, the graduate committee, and two search committees among others.
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for Faculty Committees
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slates of nominees for service on the University faculty committees listed below. The faculty members elected are to serve for terms as specified:

A. Collective Bargaining Committee
   James Auter (Educ. Studies)
   Liping A. Cai (HTM)
   Patricia Hart (FLL)
   David Sanders (Biol. Sci.)

   for terms of service ending May 31, 2005.

B. University Grade Appeals Committee
   John Finley (PHYS)
   Sara Wallace (VPA)

   for terms of service ending May 31, 2006.

C. University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee
   As regular members: As alternate members:
   Jeffrey L. Bennetzen (BIO SCI) Jennifer Richardson (C&I)
   Joel R. Ebarb (VPA) Jeffrey Siskind (E&CE)
   Jeanne Romero-severson (FORS) Sharon D. Solwit (ENGL)
   Karen S. Yehle (NURS) Beth Starnes (NURS)

   for terms of service ending May 31, 2006.

Present and Approving: Absent:
Mark S. Cushman Linda M. Duttlinger
Natalie J. Carroll Christoph M. Hoffmann
Charles E. Kline
Craig M. Miller
Glenn G. Sparks
Whitney Walton
John D. Zimbrick
TO: The University Senate
FROM: Athletic Affairs Committee
SUBJECT: Athletic Affairs Committee Report to the University Senate, Spring 2002-03
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Information

Purdue University's commitment to the academic and social well being of its student-athletes is focused through the activities of the Athletic Affairs Committee (AAC) and the Intercollegiate Athletics Department (IAD). This report will cover the two regular semesters in the year that has passed since the last report from the AAC: the Spring Semester of 2001-02 and the Fall Semester of 2002-03.

**ACADEMIC STATUS OF STUDENT-ATHLETES**

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

- **Spring '01-02**
  - Men: 16,756
  - Women: 12,102
  - Total: 28,858

- **Fall '02-03**
  - Men: 18,159
  - Women: 12,849
  - Total: 31,008

Of these enrollments, student-athletes totalled:

- **Spring '01-02**
  - Men: 285
  - Women: 197
  - Total: 482

- **Fall '02-03**
  - Men: 273
  - Women: 179
  - Total: 452

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

Specific objectives related to these goals include achievement of the stated performance levels for both the semester and the cumulative GPAs each semester. Details of the academic performance of student-athletes during the subject semesters, as compared to the corresponding university wide averages, is shown in the table below, including GPAs and other relevant statistics. It is noteworthy that the Fall '02-03 semester was the 11th consecutive semester in which the cumulative GPA of Purdue's student-athletes exceeded the all-campus cumulative GPA.
### Student-Athlete Academic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance Measures:</th>
<th>Spring ’01-02</th>
<th>Fall ’02-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of Semester GPA of 3.0 or higher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>52.9% (239)</td>
<td>51.3% (232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of Academic Honors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>27.7% (125)</td>
<td>24.1% (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s List and Semester Honors</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Honors only</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s List only</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of perfect 4.0 Semester GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>8.8% (40)</td>
<td>6.1% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement on probation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>7.7% (35)</td>
<td>7.9% (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drops from the University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>0.8% (4)</td>
<td>0.6% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

According to NCAA reporting requirements, for a student-athlete to be counted as a graduate in a cohort, he or she must graduate from the institution of initial enrollment (Purdue) within six years of original entry. The most recent cohort to have completed the six-year reporting period is that for 1995-96. For that cohort, 75% percent of student-athletes (men 74%, women 78%) graduated within the six-year reporting period. 62% of all Purdue students (men 61%, women 64%) graduated in the same time frame.
A related objective of the IAD for student-athletes is that the 4-year graduation rate for student-athletes exceed that of the overall student body. The 4-year rate is a "rolling average" of the four most recently completed 6-year cohorts, in this case the 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95, and 1995-96 cohorts. This 4-year rate was 71% for student-athletes and 64% for the student body.

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

Appendix 2 summarizes the statistical report (data received from the Office of the Registrar), and compares the graduation rates for student-athletes to the rates for all Purdue students who entered the University in the academic year 1995-1996 and to the rates for NCAA Division 1A schools.

The 75% graduation rate for the Purdue student-athletes is above the 60% graduation rate for student-athletes in all Division 1A Schools. The Purdue graduation rates are greater than the rates in every sport for Division 1A Schools for men and women with only one exception.

Note: Figures showing the distribution of student-athletes among the Schools of Purdue University during the Spring 2002-03 (current) semester appear in Appendix 6.

FACULTY OVERSIGHT OF ATHLETICS

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

NCAA requirements pertaining to initial-eligibility standards for full and partial qualifiers is listed in Appendix 3, and Appendix 5 contains the minimum core-curriculum requirements for initial eligibility under the existing 13 core course rule. Those standards apply to student-athletes entering college prior to August 1, 2003. Appendix 5 also lists the minimum core-course requirements for the new 14 core course rule, with the corresponding initial-eligibility standards shown in Appendix 4. Student-athletes first entering college on or after August 1, 2003 but before August 1, 2005 may meet initial-eligibility requirements under either the 13 core course rule or the 14 core course rule. Students entering college on or after August 1, 2005 must meet the new 14 core course rule. Note that computer science is being eliminated as an acceptable core-course area for students first entering any college or university on or after August 1, 2005.

Monthly meetings of the AAC are held at which members hear reports and participate in discussions pertinent to their mandate. Coaches from all sports are regularly invited to speak to the AAC on the academic status of the student-athletes and individual teams. Topics dealt with this year also included ongoing updates on such projects as the renovations to Ross-Ade Stadium.
The members of the AAC continue to be very impressed with the efforts that the professional staff and coaches at Purdue University make on a continual basis to emphasize the importance of academic achievement to the athletes in their charge. It is the opinion of all members of this committee that the coaches and their staff as presently constituted at Purdue University expend an effort to assist their athletes in all aspects of their academic and social growth well beyond that which would normally be expected of them. Indeed, they are to be commended for the work they are doing both on and off the field of sport.

HIGHLIGHTS OF OUR SPORTS TEAMS IN 2002:

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

Sports in which both Men and Women Compete

Swimming & Diving: The women's team finished the 2002 season 7-3-1, 3-3 in the Big Ten. Their 5th place finish at the 2003 Big Ten Championships was their highest finish since 1996 and their 403 points was their most since 1992.

The men's team finished the 2002 season 7-5, 2-5 in the Big Ten after beginning the year with a 7-0 record. At the 2003 Big Ten Championships, they finished 7th, improving on their 8th place finish of last year.

Basketball: The men's basketball team is 17-9 overall and 9-6 in conference play; they accomplished a 14-1 home record for the season. With one game remaining at Michigan they are a likely 3rd or 4th seed in the Big Ten Tournament, and may qualify for this season's NCAA Tournament.

The women's basketball team finished 23-5 and 12-4 in the Big Ten. The Boilermakers tied for second in the Big Ten, marking the seventh straight year that Purdue has placed in the top three in the league standings.

Tennis: The 2001-02 women's tennis team finished 10-12 and posted a 5-5 record in Big Ten play, garnering a tie for fifth in the regular-season conference standings.

The 2001-02 men's tennis team finished 13-12, with a 6-4 record in Big Ten play, and tied for 4th at the conference tournament. In the NCAA Championships, Purdue won its opening-round match against Ball State before bowing out to host Notre Dame.

Golf: The women's golf team competed in the NCAA Championships for the third consecutive year, finishing 16th, after finishing 2nd in the Big Ten Championships.

The men's golf team advanced to the NCAA Championships for the second consecutive year, finishing 7th, after finishing 3rd in the Big Ten Championships.

Track and Field: In the current indoor season the men won the Armory Invitational in New York against the top-ranked competition in the nation,
including the defending NCAA champs, LSU. They finished 3rd at the Big Ten Championships with a sweep in the 60M dash and several first-place finishes.

The women had a disappointing indoor Big Ten Championships finish, but are looking forward to the outdoor season. At the Big Ten Indoor Championships at Indiana University, the team finished in 8th place.

Cross Country: The men's 2002 cross country team finished 10th at the NCAA district meet after a 9th-place showing at the Big Ten Championships.

The Boilermaker women's 2002 cross country team finished 8th at the Big Ten championships and 13th at the NCAA district meet.

Women’s Sports

Soccer: The women's soccer team finished 14-6-2 overall, 6-3-1 in the Big Ten. Their 3rd-place Big Ten finish was the highest finish in program history. They made their third consecutive Big Ten Tournament appearance, and qualified for the NCAA tournament for the first time in program history. Ranked as high as 14th during the season, they finished the season ranked 18th in the nation.

Softball: The softball team finished the spring of 2002 33-26 after a 27-11 start for a disappointing 10th place Big Ten finish.

Volleyball: The volleyball team went 12-21 in 2002 and finished a disappointing 10th in the Big Ten conference.

Men’s Sports

Football: The football team finished the 2002 season with a 7-6 overall record after winning the Sun Bowl 34-24 over Washington. The Boilermakers, who were 4-4 in the Big Ten for a fifth-place tie, won three of their last four games, and their six losses were by a combined 26 points.

Baseball: The Purdue baseball team finished the 2002 season with an overall record of 24-32 and a Big Ten mark of 13-19, finishing in ninth place.

Wrestling: The Boilermaker wrestling team completed its 2003 regular season with a record of 15-6 and a conference mark of 3-5. Purdue is currently ranked No. 15 in the nation, and will compete in the Big Ten Championships March 8-9.
2002-2003 ATHLETIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Janet Purath (Committee Chair, Associate Professor of Nursing)
Roger L. Blalock (Associate Athletic Director for Sports)
Jeffrey T. Bolin (Professor of Biological Sciences)
Morgan J. Burke (Athletic Director)
Nancy L. Cross (Senior Women's Administrator Associate A.D. for Marketing & Development)
Robert L. Holloway (Alumni Representative)
Edward G. Howat (Assistant Athletic Director for Student Services)
Jennifer Ann Jacobson (Student Representative)
John A. Knote, M.D. (Alumni Representative)
George P. McCabe Jr. (Professor of Statistics)
Robert E. Montgomery (Student Affairs Liaison, Associate Professor of Engineering)
Philip E. Nelson (Professor and Head of Food Science, Faculty Athletic Representative, Food Sciences)
Scott E. Priebe (Student Representative)
Megan S. Walbaum / Christina M. Ribnek (deceased) (Director of Academic Support Services)
Thomas B. Robinson (Presidential Liaison, Vice President for Student Services)
Christie L. Sahley (Asst. Dean of Science, Faculty Athletic Representative, Science Administration)
Dianne Sautter (Community Representative)
Thomas J. Templin (Head, Department of Health, Kinesiology, & Leisure Studies)
Glenn F. Tompkins (Senior Associate Athletic Director for Business)
Olivia Bennett Wood (Associate Professor & Director Didactic Program in Dietetics, Foods & Nutrition)
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
VISION

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

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
MISSION

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

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

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

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
GOALS

Athletic

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

Academic

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

Fiscal

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

Equity

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

Image

All actions, whether proactive or reactive, will create, maintain and project an image of excellence.
### STUDENT-ATHLETE GRADUATION RATES*

Graduation Rates for Freshmen Entering in 1995-1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Purdue</th>
<th>NCAA Division 1A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athletes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>50%***</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Other Sports</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Football</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Baseball</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Other Sports</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

** Above averages based on 65 Purdue student-athletes and 7,412 student-athletes in Division 1A schools.

*** Sample size is less than 5.
### DIVISION I QUALIFIER INDEX

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

### PARTIAL QUALIFIER INDEX

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

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

** For SAT tests taken on or after April 1, 1995.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core GPA</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.550 &amp; above</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.525</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.475</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.350</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.325</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.275</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.225</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.075</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.025</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.925</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>740-750</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>840-850</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.350</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.175</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MINIMUM CORE-CURRICULUM AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR INITIAL ELIGIBILITY – DIVISION 1

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

* Students first entering college on or after August 1, 2003 but before August 1, 2005 may meet initial-eligibility requirements under either the 13 core course rule or the 14 core course rule. Students entering college on or after August 1, 2005 must meet the new 14 core course rule.** Computer science is being eliminated as an acceptable core-course area for students first entering any college or university on or after August 1, 2005.
## NUMBER OF STUDENT-ATHLETES BY SCHOOL

### Spring 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of Student-Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer &amp; Family Sciences</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh-E</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy &amp; Pharmacal Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EET</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Studies Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT: Instructional Type Classifications & Semester Credit Hour Guidelines  
REFERENCES: Academic Procedures Manual N-144-146, Instructional Organization Classifications & O-3, Section II A, Hour of Credit

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Educational Policy Committee as a result of the Course Verification Project recommends the enclosed documents replace existing N-144-146, Instructional Organization Classifications & O-3, Section II A, Hour of Credit documents in the Academic Procedures Manual. The changes in Instructional Types and Unit of Credit reflect the current Instructional Types and Credit Hour disposition in use by University Academic units. The changes reflect only current practice and do not mandate policy adjustments for any specific courses. More importantly the documents give latitude to faculty and academic units to adjust Instruction to facilitate current student-learning environments.

This report includes four appendices as follows:
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Appendix B: Existing Instructional Organization Classifications  
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Appendix D: Existing Hour of Credit
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INSTRUCTIONAL TYPE CLASSIFICATIONS
(DOCUMENT I OF II)

The delivery of instruction often requires educational material to be organized and presented to students in a variety of ways. In order to facilitate the planning for and scheduling of classes to accommodate these multiple types of instruction, it is necessary to divide courses into organizational parts which reflect the unique combinations of instructors, meeting places, and time patterns used to conduct the instruction.

A system for classifying these organizational parts has been developed as an aid in planning instructional offerings and for subsequent analysis of instructional data for internal management and reporting to external agencies. The instructional types listed below are intended to reflect the nature of activities required of students, the relationship between students and their instructors, and the settings required to deliver the content of an instructional offering.

Many of the definitions refer to weekly student class hours (WSCH) or credit hours that are associated with the type of instruction. Often, the relationship between the expected learning outcome for a particular organizational part, and the number of class hours or credit hours associated with it, will define the appropriate instructional type to be used. The specific measures in each definition are intended as a guide, and reflect typical situations for the type of instruction described. The relation between class hours and credit hours for a particular organizational part may vary from these guidelines, but should only do so if this results in awarding credit that is more appropriate to the educational experience provided. Procedures for assigning credit hours are defined in a separate document Semester Credit Hours Guidelines that relates the outcomes expected, the mode of instruction, the amount of time spent in class and the amount of outside preparation or work expected for the class to the number of credits awarded.

ORGANIZED CLASS INSTRUCTION

This major category includes all instructional situations where the same group of Students is scheduled to meet together with one or more instructors on a regular basis, whether on or off campus. Classes with a specified number of hours “to be arranged” are included.
NON-LABORATORY CLASS INSTRUCTION

These instructional settings are defined when the subject matter is primarily delivered by the instructor or a fellow student’s verbal or visual presentation rather than through the student’s own active practice or experimentation. Instruction is usually conducted in general-purpose classroom facilities, including lecture halls and seminar rooms. Non-laboratory class instruction includes video presentations where an instructor is also present. Examples: lecture, recitation, quiz, discussion, presentations, case studies, team-based learning and seminar activities. Please refer to *Semester Credit Hours Guidelines* that relates the outcomes expected, the mode of instruction, the amount of time spent in class and the amount of outside preparation or work expected for the class to the number of credits awarded.

**Lec – Lecture** – Refers to the first or primary organization of non-lab class instruction, e.g., a lecture where instructor based material is presented, or a seminar where material is analyzed and discussed by both students and instructor. Also includes case studies and team-based learning situations.

**Rec – Recitation** – Refers to a second organization of non-lab class instruction, typically smaller groups reviewing or discussing material previously presented in a lecture section.

**Prsn – Presentation** – Refers to classes that are designed simply to present material to students, with minimal preparation expected on their part and only nominal use of specialized equipment/facilities. Example: a guest lecture series.

Additional scheduling organizational parts may be necessary as a result of complex time statements or room assignments. These are designated by Lec 1, Lec 2, . . . , or Rec 1, Rec 2, . . . , etc.

LABORATORY CLASS INSTRUCTION

Instructional activities in settings providing specialized facilities or equipment for students to master the subject matter either by performing experiments or practicing the skills being learned. The instructor generally supervises, assists, answers questions, etc., rather than making presentations. Examples: science laboratories, computer laboratories, private lessons, auto-tutorial, or self-paced classes, studios, and clinics. Please refer to *Semester Credit Hours Guidelines* that relates the outcomes expected, the mode of instruction, the amount of time spent in class and the amount of outside preparation or work expected for the class to the number of credits awarded.

**Lab – Laboratory** – Refers to the first organization of laboratory class instruction unless one of the other classifications below is more appropriate. Includes both group instruction and individualized instruction such as music and flight training lessons, supervised computing exercises, and hands-on activities. Use Lab 1, Lab 2, . . . , etc., for additional organizational parts, if any.
**LabP – Lab Prep** – Refers to those situations in which lab classes meet together, usually in a separate location from the laboratory, for a brief period prior to the laboratory class to receive instructions.

**Clin – Clinic** – Refers to situations where the student is engaged in the practice and use of techniques for treating clients or patients for the purpose of improving the clients or patients’ well being. The instructor’s role varies from direct assistance to simple availability for questions and supervision. Student activities cover a broad spectrum: observation, interviewing, therapy, rounds, diagnosing, etc.

**Stdo – Studio** – Refers to situations where the student is engaged in the practice and use of techniques for productions in the areas of theater, dance, music, visual arts, and other art forms in the presence of an audience. This instruction is used to further advance student's skills in their field of performance. The instructor role varies from direct assistance to simple availability for questions and supervision. Student activities cover a broad spectrum: dance rehearsals, theater productions, vocal performances, recordings and visual work of art, etc.

**INDEPENDENT STUDY**

This major category includes those instructional situations where students work largely on their own initiative, and contact with an instructor is usually quite infrequent and irregular compared with that in the Organized Class Instruction category above. Instruction may be individualized or in small groups as determined by the instructor. Normally, no pre-defined meeting times are associated with these situations, therefore, no weekly student class hours are generated by these instructional types. In addition, these activities are typically performed outside the usual classroom and class laboratory setting. Refer to *Semester Credit Hours Guidelines* that relates the outcomes expected, the mode of instruction, the amount of time spent in class and the amount of outside preparation or work expected for the class to the number of credits awarded.

**Expr – Experiential** – Refers to those situations where the student applies previously acquired knowledge and skills in a supervised situation which approximates the conditions under which those knowledge/skills will ultimately be used, usually off campus. Examples: practice teaching, practicums, on-the-job training, work experience programs, cooperative education programs, apprenticeships, externships, preceptorships, etc.

**Res – Research** – Used for courses in which students are enrolled to conduct thesis research at the undergraduate or graduate level as required for their program. Examples: Senior thesis, Master's thesis, and Doctoral thesis.

**Ind – Individual Study** – Refers to those situations where students work primarily on their own initiative through reading, writing, performing experiments or non-thesis research, etc. Contact with an instructor may be one-on-one or in small groups and is generally only on a few arranged occasions throughout the semester to receive assignment, have progress checked, etc. Examples: directed reading, honors projects, problems and special projects courses, etc.
**Dist – Distance Education** – Refers to a structured learning process where a student is physically removed from the instructor and instructional setting associated with the campus, but has the opportunity to interact with the instructor or also with other students in instructional activities. This interaction can take on a variety of forms. Examples: instruction delivered via computer or other electronic media, correspondence, or other appropriate mechanism.

**NON-DIRECTED STUDY**

This major category includes those instructional situations where the student is expected to conduct various activities on a fairly regular basis independent of any contact with an instructor. However, physical resources, usually specialized, are required to conduct these activities. In some cases, these activities are essentially equivalent to homework for traditional classes. Examples: music practice, scheduled time in open computing labs, group project sessions, use of campus audio/visual resources with no instructor present, language practice sessions in non-supervised facilities, etc. Please refer to *Semester Credit Hours Guidelines* that relates the outcomes expected, the mode of instruction, the amount of time spent in class and the amount of outside preparation or work expected for the class to the number of credits awarded.

**PSO – Practice/Study/Observation** – Refers to those situations in which specialized facilities are made available for a student to practice, observe, or study in addition to the time spent in contact with an instructor in other instructional settings. This option is selected for administrative purposes when there is a need to schedule specialized facilities. This instructional type must be used in conjunction with another instructional type and cannot be offered alone.
The organization of a course may make use of one or more types of instruction. The type of instruction reflects the nature of activities required of the student as well as the relationship between the student and the instructor or instructional devices used to deliver the content of a course. The identification of the types of instruction is essential for the scheduling of classes and for analyzing instructional data for internal management and preparation of reports required by external supporting agencies.

Course organization involves a combination of class size, facility, FTE staff, and time pattern used to conduct the courses. A course will have a separate part for each unique combination of these four elements.

**NON-LABORATORY CLASS INSTRUCTION**

Subject matter is primarily delivered by the instructor or a fellow student’s verbal or visual presentation. Normally, a student earns one semester hour credit for each fifty minute period. This includes TV presentations with an instructor present. Examples: lecture, recitation, quiz, discussion, and seminar activities.

- **PRIM – Primary**  
  Refers to the first or primary organization of nonlab class instruction, e.g., a lecture, recitation, or seminar only.

- **SEC – Secondary**  
  Refers to a second organization of non-lab class instruction, e.g., a recitation following a lecture.

  Additional non-laboratory course parts credited by complex time statements, etc., may be designated by PRIM1, PRIM2,.., or SEC1, SEC2,.., etc.

**LABORATORY CLASS INSTRUCTION**

Students master the course subject matter primarily through performing various experiments, procedures, and practices while the instructor generally supervises, assists, answers questions, etc. Students generally meet on a weekly basis, either on a regular or self-scheduled basis, and usually require specialized facilities. Normally, a student earns one semester of credit for two or three fifty minute periods of instruction. Examples: art and science laboratories, studio, private lessons, auto-tutorial, or self-paced classes, laboratories, and clinics.

- **LAB – Laboratory**  
  Refers to the first organization of a laboratory class unless one of the other classifications below is more appropriate. Includes private instruction such as music and flight training lessons. UseLAB1, LAB 2,.., etc., for subsequent organizations, if any, (except LAB 5)
LAB 5 – Lab Prep  
Refers only to those situations in which lab sections meet together, usually in another room, such as a classroom, for a brief period prior to the laboratory class to receive instructions.

ATSP – Auto-Tutorial Self-Paced Instruction  
Refers to situations in which the instructional materials are designed, set up, and staffed in a manner to allow students to work essentially at their own pace, usually in settings in which they have an opportunity to use electro-mechanical equipment in conjunction with other types of learning arrangements including frequent progress tests. The facilities used are usually kept open and staffed many hours each week.

CLIN – Clinic  
Refers to situations in which the student is engaged in the practice and use of techniques for treating clients or patients for purposes of improving the client’s or patient’s well being. The instructor’s roll varies from direct assistance to simple availability for questions and supervision. Student activities cover a broad spectrum: observation, interviewing, therapy, rounds, diagnosing, etc. (Note: Related non-lab class activities such as rounds, or independent study, should be identified separately only when set up as a separate course.)

INDEPENDENT STUDY  
Refers to situations characterized by the fact that students work largely on their own initiative, and contact with an instructor is usually quiet infrequent and irregular. Normally, these activities are performed outside the usual classroom and class laboratory settings. The number of credits generally varies.

EXPR – Experimental Learning  
Refers to those situations, which require the student to apply previously acquired knowledge and skills in a closely supervised situation which approximates the conditions under which those skills and knowledge will ultimately be used, usually off campus. Examples: practice teaching, practicum’s, on-the-job training, work experience programs, apprenticeships, externships, preceptorships, etc.

THES – Thesis  
Used for those courses in which students are enrolled to receive credit for work leading to Masters or Ph.D. thesis. In the Purdue system, this applies to 698 and 699 courses by definition.

IND – Individual Study  
Refers to those situations in which students work primarily on their own initiative through reading, writing, performing experiments, etc. Contact with an instructor is generally only on a few arranged occasions throughout the semester to receive assignment, have progress checked, etc. Examples: directed reading, honors projects, problems and special project courses, etc.
NON DIRECTED STUDY

Refers to situations in which the student is expected to conduct various activities on a fairly regular basis each week independent of any contact with an instructor. However, physical resources, usually specialized, are required to conduct these activities. In some cases, these activities are essentially equivalent to homework for traditional courses. No credit or staff effort is directly associated with these learning situations. Examples: music practice sessions, clinic observations, on campus TV presentations with no instructor present, language practice sessions in non-supervised facilities, etc.

PSO – Practice/Study/Observation

Refers to those situations in which a student is expected to practice, observe, or study in specialized facilities in addition to the time spent in contact with an instructor in other instructional settings.
Introduction

Credit hour is the unit by which an institution measures its course work. The number of credit hours assigned to a course quantitatively reflects the outcomes expected, the mode of instruction, the amount of time spent in class, and the amount of outside preparatory work expected for the class.

Considerable variation exists from institution to institution and within a given institution. A semester credit hour is the most commonly used system of measuring course work and is usually based on at least a 14-17 week calendar. Further, a class hour varies from 45 to 60 minutes in various institutions. Many of the definitions refer to weekly student class hours (WSCH). Most faculties adopt a consistent measure within guidelines for their institution’s course offerings.

These consistencies have made it possible for accrediting groups to compare programs at multiple institutions. They make the handling of transfer credit from institution to institution reasonably systematic. They make it possible that institutions can issue “transcripts that follow commonly accepted practices and accurately reflect a student’s academic experience” as required by Criterion 5 of the North Central Association’s Criteria for Accreditation (Adopted February 2001). Further, prospective students can make meaningful comparisons between institutions and academic programs. Additionally, federal and state reporting requirements can be analyzed, achieved, and communicated.

Using the 16-week semester, the semester credit hour, and the 50-minute class hour, Purdue University course offerings are measured under the following guidelines.

Credit Guidelines

One semester credit hour is assigned in the following ratio of component hours per week devoted to the course of study:

---

NON-LABORATORY CLASS INSTRUCTION ²

Lecture, Recitation -  
Normally, one credit hour is associated with a class meeting for 50 minutes per week for an entire semester (or the equivalent 750 semester-minutes, excluding final exams). Another widely repeated standard states that each in-class hour of college work should require two hours of preparation or other outside work.

Presentation –  
1/2 credit hour is associated with a class meeting for 50 minutes per week for an entire semester (or the equivalent 750 semester-minutes, excluding final exam).

LABORATORY CLASS INSTRUCTION ³

Laboratory, –  
Normally, one credit hour is associated with a class meeting for 50 to 200 minutes per week for an entire semester (or the equivalent 750 to 3,000 semester-minutes, excluding final exam, in other meeting formats). Two semester credit hours could be earned for a class meeting for 150 to 300 minutes per week over the semester. (The overlap in minutes in class allows for departmental discretion.)

Lab Prep –  
One semester credit hour is associated with a class meeting 50 to 150 minutes per week over the semester.

Clinic –  
One semester credit hour is associated with a class meeting 100 to 300 minutes per week over the semester.

Studio -  
One semester credit hour is associated with a class meeting 100 to 300 minutes per week over the semester.

INDEPENDENT STUDY ⁴

Experiential, Research, Individual Study –  
Credit hours associated with this type of instruction will be assigned credit depending upon the amount of activity associated with the course, faculty supervision, and students outside work activity.

Distance –  
Credit hours associated with this organizational type of a course should be
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equivalent to credit hours when a course is delivered in another format on campus.

NON-DIRECTED STUDY 5

Practice/Study/Observation –
No credit hours or staff effort are directly associated with these learning situations.

Types of Credit Awarded in the Purdue University System

Regular Credit:
Credit earned for regularly offered collegiate courses of instruction that meet the requirements of a degree program.

Thesis Credit:
Credit awarded to students for research toward completion of a research project, or a degree thesis or dissertation. This credit allows measure of the expected amount of work and the resources used, while the student actually earns zero degree credit hours. The benefit obtained is primarily to account for the resources provided, to use in reporting to governments, and in maintaining the students’ financial aid position. Example: Senior Research Project, Master’s Thesis, Doctoral Dissertation.

Equivalent Credit:
Hours are assigned to courses to reflect the value of resources used to provide the class, such as rooms, instructors, equipment, etc. Equivalent hours are used in the registration process but revert to zero when posted to the student’s academic history. Example: A seminar with a visiting professor, over and above existing degree requirements. The benefit obtained is primarily to account for the resources provided, to use in reporting to governments, and in maintaining the students’ financial aid position.

Continuing Education Units (CEU):
These units of credit are usually assigned to continuing education work accomplished during short courses and conferences. Typically, this is not work used to complete requirements for a degree but may contribute to maintaining licensing or other certification.

Procedure for Exceptions

Many situations and new developments may cause a given department or faculty member to vary from the guidelines listed above in the assigning of credit. If this situation should arise, a Registrar Form 40 should be submitted creating or revising the course, specifying the type of variance to be applied, and the expected benefit. This formal notification will allow the Office of the Registrar to document such variances, continuously synchronize the faculty’s pedagogical
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expectations, and will assist in acknowledging interdepartmental preferences that may logically be converted to needed revisions of the guidelines and policies.

**Value of Guidelines**

Even though exceptions may be necessary, guidelines are still useful in assigning a measure of the student’s academic experience. Consistency in measuring the effort of students and faculty contributes greatly to reliable reporting and evaluation.

These guidelines also help a student to understand the amount of effort that must be expended to complete a course or receive a degree. At most institutions on a *semester credit hour* system, a four-year degree usually requires 120-140 semester hours of credit, implying that the full-time student would earn 15 to 17 semester credit hours for each of eight semesters. If each semester credit hour represents about three hours of study or class attendance each week, this would imply an average 45-51 hour workweek for the student.
## SUMMARY OF SEMESTER CREDIT HOURS GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Type</th>
<th>Weekly Student Class Hours</th>
<th>Preparation Weekly per Class Hour</th>
<th>Semester Minutes Class/Prep (excluding final exams)</th>
<th>Number of Semester Credit Hours Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Laboratory Class Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>1 class hour</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>750/1500</td>
<td>1 semester hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recitation</td>
<td>1-2 class hours</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>750-1500/1500</td>
<td>1 semester hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1 class hour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750/0</td>
<td>1/2 semester hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laboratory Class Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>1 to 4 class hours</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>750-3000/0</td>
<td>1 semester hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>4 to 6 class hours</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>3000-4500/0</td>
<td>2 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Prep</td>
<td>1 to 3 class hours</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>750-2250/0</td>
<td>1 semester hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>2 to 6 class hours</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>1500-4500/0</td>
<td>1 semester hour, equivalent hours may be assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>2 to 6 class hours</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>1500-4500/0</td>
<td>1 semester hour, equivalent hours may be assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Same as if course taught on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Directed Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice/Study/Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 regular credit, equivalent hours may be assigned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing Education – Other Credit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short course/conference</td>
<td>10 class hours</td>
<td>500/0</td>
<td>1 ceu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: Existing Hour of Credit

SECTION II
ACADEMIC PROGRAM

A. Unit of Credit

The semester hour shall be the unit of University academic credit which shall represent approximately three hours of work per week by an average student throughout a normal semester, or its equivalent in total work for short courses and summer sessions. Any reference to credit hours, course credits, etc., shall be understood as referring to semester hours.
Memorial Resolution
for
IRVING SOSENSKY
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy
January 24, 1920 – February 24, 2003

Irving Sosensky, a member of the Purdue Philosophy Department (originally the Department of History, Government, and Philosophy) from 1956 until his retirement in 1988, died in Durham, North Carolina, the home of his daughter, Jennifer, on February 24. He was born on January 24, 1920, in New Haven, Connecticut, received his B.A. with distinction from Wesleyan in Middletown in 1942, earned an M.A. at Yale in 1946, and received his Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1955. Before coming to Purdue, he was a half-time instructor at Bard College in 1947-48 and an instructor at the University of Missouri/Columbia from 1950-56.

Irv's areas of specialization were early modern philosophy and the philosophies of science and of social science. He was the principal instructor in introductory ethics during his earliest years at Purdue, and he initiated the first philosophy of science course to be taught here.

Among his other contributions to the university, he served at various times as a member of the Senate of what was then the School of Humanities, Social Science, and Education and of the school's Grievance Committee, as Chair of the Science and Culture Curriculum Committee, and as Department Scheduling Deputy and a member of the departmental Graduate Committee. Within the Greater Lafayette Community, he was one of the early members of the Unitarian Fellowship.

During a sabbatical year just prior to his final year here, Irv discovered the charms, intellectual and other, of Paris, and, although he had purchased and owned a home in North Carolina (the home state of his wife, Catherine, who died suddenly and tragically a quarter-century ago), he spent almost all of his remaining years in Paris until his death, doing research on Descartes and related figures, participating in the Paris Unitarian Church activities (including a poetry group -- he turned out to have a considerable talent for poetry), and eventually, during his last years, being a leader of the Democratic Party abroad. Among other things, he organized the Paris speakers' series for the Party and was elected to the Executive Committee of the Party there; he was a delegate to the national convention in summer 2000. These activities led him to postpone his planned return to North Carolina until, previously quite healthy, he fell ill just two months ago. Jennifer Sosensky is his only immediate survivor. Memorial services were held in North Carolina the week of his death and in Paris the following week.

William L. McBride
Calvin O. Schrag