UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 24 January 2005, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1.	Call to order	Professor William L. McBride
2.	Approval of Minutes of 15 November 2004	
3.	Acceptance of Agenda	
4.	Remarks by the President	President Martin C. Jischke
5.	Reports of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson	Professor William L. McBride Professor Tim Skvarenina
6.	Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees	For Information Professor Herbert L. Weith
7.	Question Time	
8.	University Senate Document 04-4 Non-tenure Track Research Faculty Appointments	For Action Professor William J. Zinsmeister
9.	University Senate Document 04-6 Proposed Change to the University Senate Bylaws	For Discussion Professor George M. Bodner
10.	University Senate Document 04-7 Proposed Changes in the Composition of Primary Promotion Committees	For Discussion Professor William J. Zinsmeister
11.	Campus Campaign	For Information Robin Prokop Development Officer
12.	New Business	
13.	Memorial Resolutions	
14.	Adjournment	

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 24 January 2005, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *President Martin C. Jischke, William L. McBride (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Brian A. Alenskis, Kristine J. Anderson, Carol L. Baird, Alan M. Beck, Rodney J. Bertolet, Evelyn Blackwood, Richard E. Blanton, George M. Bodner, J. Stuart Bolton, Mark D. Bowman, Shorna R. Broussard, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Yan Chen, John M. Connor, Susan E. Conners, Patrick E. Connolly, John J. Contreni, Terry L. Davidson, Sharon DeVaney, Otto C. Doering III, Harold G. Donnelly, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Richard O. Fanjoy, Greg N. Frederickson, Richard F. Ghiselli, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Alten Grandt, John G. Graveel, Mark A. Green, James P. Greenan, Bruce Hamaker, William A. Harper, Nathan W. Harter, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, R. Neal Houze, Steven D. Johnson, Vicki J. Killion, Charles E. Kline, Daniel J. Kovenock, Thomas Kuczek, Christine M. Ladisch, C. S. George Lee, Andrew U. Luescher, Sally Mason, Sean McDeavitt, David R. McMillin, Mark Morgan, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Rab Mukerjea, Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, David E. Nichols, Robert E. Novak, Morgan R. Olsen, Barry Pittendrigh, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Patrice D. Rankine, Kenneth R. Robinson, Thomas B. Robinson, George E. Rogers, Alysa C. Rollock, John R. Rousselle, John A. Sautter, Dan E. Schendel, Aaron Schnur, Richard Schweickert, Deb Sheets, Timothy L. Skvarenina, Terry S. Stewart, Bernard Y. Tao, Whitney Walton, Ralph Webb, H. Lee Weith, Sirje Laurel Weldon, Clarence W. Wilkerson, David J. Williams, G. Thomas Wilson, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Absent: *Professors Thomas Bauman, Lonnie D. Bentley, JennieMarie Blankert, James R. Bottum, Linda M. Duttlinger, Wendy S. Flory, Eric S. Furgason, David R. Gaskell, April J. Ginther, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Morris Levy, Cary A. Mitchell, Michael R. Oliver, Daryl L. Orth, Frank V. Paladino, Richard C. Penney, J. Paul Robinson, William T. Robinson, Robert Sabol, Farshid Sadeghi, Keith E. Schwingendorf, Glenn G. Sparks, David L. Stanley, A. Charlene Sullivan, Alain S. Togbe, Phillip J. VanFossen, Jacqueline Walcott-McQuigg, Yuehwern Yih and Michael Zoltowski.*

Guests: *Supriyo Datta, Dennis R. Depew, Suresh Garimella, Jay Gore, Linda Katehi, John Pezzuto, Robin Prokop, Amy Raley, Suresh Rao, Dennis Savaiano, Curt Slyder, Ben Steckler, and Connie Weaver*

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

2. The minutes of the meeting of 15 November 2004 were approved as distributed.

3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.

4. President Martin C. Jischke presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A). There were no questions from the floor.

5. Professor William McBride presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B). Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina presented the report of the vice chairperson (see Appendix C).

6. Professor H. Lee Weith, the chair of the Steering Committee presented, for information, the Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix D).

7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor. No questions were forthcoming.

8. At the request of Professor McBride, Professor Zinsmeister reopened the discussion of Document 04-4, *Proposal for Non-tenure Track Research Faculty within Purdue University*. The discussion had been postponed to this meeting from the November 2004 Senate meeting. At the invitation of Professor McBride and with the approval of the Senate, several faculty members came to the podium to speak in favor of passage of the document. These individuals included Professors Weaver, Garimella, and Datta. A discussion followed during which Professor Zinsmeister, Dean Contreni, and Provost Mason answered questions from the floor. Several issues were brought up by faculty members. Professor Connor rose to remind Senators that he and Professor Doering had sent copies of a 2003 Statement of the American Association of University Professors on "Contingent Faculty." That statement expresses concern about the increasing number of part-time and non-tenure-track positions at U.S. universities because of the negative effects on teaching quality, gender equity, and academic freedom. He said that in talks with faculty members that he represents on the Senate, some were worried about the title "Research Professor" itself, but that it was his own view that this was merely a semantic issue. The more serious issue raised by his faculty colleagues was the potential threats to academic freedom. To deal with this concern, Professor Connor proposed an amendment to Section M. Professor Connor proposed adding the following sentence: "Research Faculty are to be conferred the same protections of academic freedom available to tenure-track faculty for the entire terms of their contracts." The added sentence was accepted as a friendly amendment by the Senate. Professor Nakanishi expressed concern about the eligibility of these individuals to supervise graduate students with respect to the 699 courses and their ability to be paid as part-time instructors. Provost Mason stated that 699 courses are largely supervised activities rather than formal courses and the individuals would not be paid for these courses. If the individual wished to teach on a part-time basis, she/he would have to sign an appropriate contract with the department and would still be referred to as a "Research Professor." Professor Nakanishi also wished to know if research faculty would be able to serve as major professors for graduate students. Dean Contreni of the Graduate School stated that "current policy" established by the Graduate Council and the Graduate School states that "Regular certifications are restricted to faculty members who are on tenure-track appointments or who hold regular appointments with voting privileges and are domiciled on a Purdue mission campus. . . . A special certification may be requested by the head of the graduate program for an individual who does not meet the conditions for regular certification. Such a person may serve on graduate students' committees but may not serve as the chair of graduate committees. Since research professors would not be tenure-track they would be regarded as candidates for special certification with the stipulation that they could serve on graduate student committees, but could not chair those committees. The certification process is initiated by the relevant graduate program head and academic dean."

   Professor Levy asked if the research faculty would count toward the proposed Strategic Plan hires that are still ongoing. Provost Mason stated that they would not count towards that category. Professor Schweickert said that he foresees potential problems

with grievance procedures. He also suggested that there were inconsistencies and the document needed to be "tightened up." Professor Doering rose and stated that "historically these positions were designed to avoid hiring tenure-track individuals" and that he was also concerned about quotas. He asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) had compared this document with the document and policies associated with the establishment of the Clinical Faculty. Professor Zinsmeister said that the FAC did not review the earlier document and Provost Mason said that the total number of research faculty would be small, perhaps one or two dozen. Professor Schendel suggested that the wording in Section J was inconsistent with the penultimate paragraph of the document and that it was unclear if these faculty members will be able serve on the promotion committee (Panel C) that has been created to consider the cases of these individuals. Provost Mason proposed an amendment to eliminate the inconsistency. Provost Mason offered the following addition to the first sentence of Section J "…with the exception of membership on Panel C, as described in the penultimate paragraph of this document." This amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment by the Senate. Professor Doering asked if hiring units that had soft money available would be able to hire these individuals. Provost Mason said that they could hire these individuals if funds were available. Professor Kovenock said that the document appeared to permit promotion of an individual without input from the department faculty by allowing formation of an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Vice Provost for Research to consider certain individuals. Provost Mason said that the language was put in to cover cases such as the Cancer Center where the individual would not be covered by normal promotion committees and the *ad hoc* committee would serve instead. Professor Schendel asked if these individuals would be able to apply for tenure-track positions or if tenured individuals could give up their tenure to become Research Professors. Provost Mason said that these options existed for individuals. However, an individual applying for a tenure-track position would be in competition with all of the other individuals who had applied for the position. There are no guarantees that the Research Professor would be hired and there will be no automatic transfers from research to tenure-track faculty. Professor Schendel also expressed concern about being "flanked" by "professional teachers" (continuing term lecturers) and "professional researchers" (Research Professors) in the future and the effects these categories might have on the University. Provost Mason stated that the document was sensitive to this concern and the new category of Research Professor will increase opportunities for collaborations among the various faculty groups.

Professor Tao rose and said that the faculty members in his department had requested that the document be sent to the entire voting faculty of the University for "advice and consent" as allowed by the Senate Bylaws. Professor Tao made the motion to send the document to the faculty and it was seconded. During the discussion, Professor Blackwood pointed out that faculty would need to be informed of all the details of the proposal before they could reasonably vote on it. Following a brief discussion, a secret ballot was taken on the motion. The motion was defeated, 49 to 23.

Following this vote, the discussion of the main motion continued. Professor Kovenock asked about a hypothetical situation in which an organization provided a large monetary gift with the intent to create a research center staffed with Research Professors without going through any department or other unit. Provost Mason said that this might be possible, but was unlikely. Professor McBride asked for additional questions and as

there were none, a secret ballot was held on the original motion to approve Document 04-4. The motion passed 46 to 23 and the document was approved as amended.

9. Professor George M. Bodner presented Document 04-6, *Proposed Change to the University Senate Bylaws*, to the Senate for discussion. Professor Bodner briefly explained the intent of the proposed change. So that the Senate could act on the document during this meeting, Professor Weith moved to suspend the rules. His motion was seconded and passed unanimously on a voice vote. He then moved to approve Document 04-6. This motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote without dissent.

10. Professor Zinsmeister presented Document 04-7, *Proposed Changes in the Composition of Primary Promotion Committees*. Professor Zinsmeister made a brief Power Point presentation explaining the intent of the proposed changes. Professor Schendel began the discussion by stating that the faculty in his department within the School of Management were in favor of this document. In fact, they have included Associate Professors in primary committee meetings in the past and it has worked well. Professor Bodner expressed concern about departmental implementation of the change if the document is approved. Professor Zinsmeister commented that the Faculty Affairs Committee members envisioned these changes occurring gradually in each department over an appropriate period of time. Professor Zinsmeister was asked if the document mandated that all Associate Professors be included on primary committees. He stated that the document does mandate inclusion of all Associate Professors. Based on this mandate, several senators were worried that the size of the primary committees might become unwieldy with the addition of all Associate Professors. According to Professor Blackwood of the FAC, departments would be given some time to come up with their own plans to implement the change, as long as those plans allowed for equal representation of associate and full professors. For example, those departments that are facing large increases in already large primary committees could devise reasonable means to manage their committees, including having a committee that was smaller than the full number of associate and full professors, if that is what a department wanted to do. Such plans would go to the Provost for approval. Professor Stewart asked Provost Mason and Professor Zinsmeister if there is evidence that the promotion system is actually broken and how Purdue University's promotion system compares with our peer institutions' systems. He also saw a contradiction in that the current guidelines require confidentiality while one of the proposed intents of the document is to demystify the process for faculty members, especially assistant professors. Professor Davidson asked why should a "one size fits all strategy" be mandated at this time. Professor Zinsmeister stated that the strategy would help standardize procedures across campus. Professor Blackwood proposed that Vice President Rollock could speak to the matter. VP Rollock stated that the mandate deals with the rights of Associate Professors regardless of their discipline or department affiliation. The document would ensure that these rights would be consistent across campus. The discussion ended at that point and the document will be up for action at the February Senate meeting.

11. The chair introduced Ms. Robin Prokop, Development Officer, who briefly addressed the senate on the Campus Campaign component of the current fund-raising campaign.

12. There was no new business.

13. The chair reported that two memorial resolutions had been received for William B. Bache Professor Emeritus of English and Susan J. Barkman Professor Youth Development and Agricultural Education (4H). At the chair's invitation the senators rose and remained standing for a period of silence out of respect for their departed colleagues. The resolutions are attached to these minutes and copies will be sent to the next of kin.

14. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Appendix A
24 January 2005

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT MARTIN C. JISCHKE

Thank you very much and good afternoon to all of you. Welcome to a new semester at Purdue University. It's always exciting to be off to a fresh start. I know as we get back into classes, meetings and the challenges of research and scholarly pursuits; what is utmost in all our minds right now. Spring. In March, specifically, spring break will have to wait a while, but we can all take comfort that in the long history of Purdue, winter has never failed to end, eventually. Sometimes it doesn't end until April or even May; some years June. But it will end. We hope.

There is a great deal taking place on campus as we continue to progress on our strategic plans. My sincere thanks to all of you for everything you are doing. As we work to accomplish our goals, we are also working very closely with the governor and members of the General Assembly. I am sure you are all aware that our new Governor, Mitch Daniels, presented his state-of-the-state address last week. He was quite direct and plain-spoken in his assessment. The governor said and I am quoting, "The state-of-our-state is far from sound. … Public finances are in ruin. We have outspent our income. We have increased spending faster than any state in the union." The *Indianapolis Star* recently summed it up this way:

"If the state were a Hoosier household, it would be heading to a consumer credit counselor."

The mortgage payment would be late, retirement funds would have been raided and the Visa bill would have been paid with a MasterCard advance — more than once. For every $10,000 in annual income, the household would be spending $10,529. Clearly, the situation is not good. The revenue growth anticipated during the next two years will not be enough to fix the problem by itself. The governor has proposed a number of measures — including a one-year additional one percent tax on businesses and individuals with single or combined adjusted annual incomes above $100,000. Regarding higher education, he said "Education, both K-12 and postsecondary, must play a central role in the fiscal recovery by managing temporarily the current level of funding…no more, but no less."

We are still in the process of analyzing the governor's proposals. As expected, quite a bit of debate already is taking place in the General Assembly, especially concerning the proposed new tax and the funding formula for the K-12 schools. It is still very early in the process, but this much we do know. A $600 million shortfall in revenue is anticipated for this fiscal year, which ends June 30th. Moreover, the state also owes local government, public schools and its state universities, including Purdue, a total of more than $717 million in unpaid "rollovers." Our Vice President for Government Relations, Terry Strueh, tells us, and I can confirm this directly from my own personal interactions, that state officials very much appreciate what we at Purdue are doing to hold the line on expenses and especially to foster economic development. But funding is a huge issue, a huge challenge. I for one applaud the governor for focusing his attention immediately on this budget problem. Finding a way to balance the budget is a concern that cannot and should not be delayed. In the long run it is very difficult to have a great University in an unstable fiscal environment. This is a top priority and action needs to be taken. But as to the proposals' impact on higher education, I have a number of concerns. Let me quickly address briefly four areas:

- Repair and rehabilitation,

- research,
- the additional cost of opening and operating new buildings, and
- our single new proposed initiative called Advancing Indiana Manufacturing.

First, the major emphasis of our capital request to the state is funds for repair and rehabilitation. Purdue University encompasses over 400 buildings spread across more than 18,000 acres on four campuses and numerous agricultural and research properties all across our state. This represents a capital investment whose value easily exceeds $4 billion. Protecting this investment is our highest capital priority. Over the last four years, Purdue's campuses have received a total of approximately $4 million in state repair and rehabilitation funds. This is a dramatic reduction to the long-standing formula that called for investing over $60 million during the same period. Unfortunately, only once during the last ten years has the state been able to fully fund the R&R formula. This lack of repair and rehabilitation funding has resulted in a significant decline in the level of maintenance, repair and renewal of our facilities, and the campus infrastructure that supports these facilities. As a result, we have developed a deferred maintenance backlog currently estimated at over $116 million, and it consists of things that are broken and need to be fixed. Deferred renewal — things that need to be upgraded to be current for programmatic needs — is estimated at an additional $293 million. The maintenance backlog poses a serious threat in my view to the state's investment in the University's facilities. Without repair and rehabilitation funding, we can do little to halt the further deterioration of facilities and the resulting harm to the quality of our learning, discovery and engagement at Purdue. Our Repair and Rehabilitation request to the state is $34.5 million per year. As we understand it, the governor's proposal includes $8 million in this biennium. We still have a shortfall.

Second, research. A new operating fund base adjustment initiative funded in the current 2003-2005 biennium and called "Research Support" recognized the important role of the state's research and doctoral campuses. We have used these funds at Purdue for:

- improving the research infrastructure,
- for strengthening research core areas,
- providing research support to attract new faculty,
- and for providing cost-sharing support for interdisciplinary research such as through Discovery Park initiatives.

The leveraging of the state funds last year resulted in $72 million in multi-year extramural funds connected to Discovery Park alone. A formula was developed to calculate the incremental growth in this state's research funding over a four year period. For 2005-2007, the next biennium, our request according to this formula totals $4.7 million in the first year of the biennium and an increase of $7.7 million in the second. The governor's proposal includes no additional money above the current level.

Third, operating expenses for newly opened facilities. Our 2005-2007 request contains adjustments for the new facilities that have opened or are set to open during the next two years, including:

- the Burton D. Morgan Center for Entrepreneurship,
- the Bindley Bioscience Center,
- the Birck Nanotechnology Center, all in Discovery Park;
- the Forney Hall chemical engineering addition
- the Dauch Alumni Center; and
- the Envision Center for Data Perceptualization.

The only state investment in the construction of these new facilities is $5 million for the Nanotechnology Building. The remaining approximately $117 million was raised externally primarily from gifts, mostly coming from outside the state of Indiana. We are asking the state to leverage this external investment — these private funds in Purdue — by providing support for the operating cost of these and other new facilities. Our needs for the first year of the biennium are $2.6 million and an additional $1.5 million for the second. There is no new money for this in the governor's proposals.

Fourth, the centerpiece of our biennial budget operating request is a multifaceted initiative for Indiana economic development. It is called Advancing Indiana Manufacturing or AIM. AIM is designed to boost the state's largest economic sector. With 11,000 manufacturing companies and more than 500,000 employees, this sector represents almost 20 percent of the jobs in our state and nearly 30 percent of the state's income. It is essential, in my view, that we strengthen the traditional manufacturing base by enhancing its application of advanced technology. We also need to nurture new businesses that utilize advances such as nanotechnology. Purdue is proposing that the state invest $5 million in each year of the next biennium for this AIM initiative that will accomplish these goals. Unfortunately, there is no funding for this in the governor's proposal.

We appreciate everything the governor and the legislature is working to accomplish. We especially appreciate that some money is being proposed for repair and rehabilitation. We will continue working with the Governor and the General Assembly on all of these issues. But I must say that we, like they, cannot be focused only on the short term. We must keep working to build and grow the state's economy in the longer term. And the best way to increase jobs and revenue for Indiana is by using our state's major research universities as engines for economic development.

In this regard, Purdue is ideally situated to lead Indiana into the new worldwide knowledge-based economy. The Indiana Higher Education Efficiency Commission has recently issued a report and has correctly concluded that if our state is to become more competitive in this global economy, its publicly funded institutions of higher education must play a key and central role. Though we do not agree with all of its proposals, we are quite pleased that the commission found Purdue and the other state institutions to be efficiently managed. We also know this to be the case from our own independent studies. I believe that the potential for Purdue and for our state of Indiana is enormous. This is a key year and an important year, as we continue to implement our strategic plans to continue to compete for top students and top faculty. Once again, I appreciate very much all you are doing to use our capacities for learning, discovery and engagement to help this state of Indiana. Thank you very much. I would be pleased to take questions if the time allows, but if it doesn't I will sit down. Are there any questions I can respond to? I see none. Thank you.

Appendix B
24 January 2005

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR WILLIAM L. MCBRIDE

This promises to be a long meeting, since a couple of items that are fairly contentious will be discussed, and in any case it has been a long time since we last met. On one of the items, concerning the proposed new Research Professorship designation, I have received requests from faculty members who are not Senators to be given the opportunity to speak, and I shall ask your leave, in accordance with Senate rules, to allow them to do so when the time comes. The present report will also be innovative, since it will, as stated on the agenda, be a combined effort by both Tim Skvarenina and myself. As Vice-Chair, he attended the late November Board of Trustees meeting, at the end of the same week in which we last met, and he will summarize that. In addition, he has for some time been a member of the ERP (or "Purdue One") Committee that has been considering alternatives for Purdue's much-needed new computer system, and that committee reached an important juncture at the beginning of this month, about which he will also inform you.

Let me begin by noting briefly that, by comparison with the relatively modest response to our previous question concerning the banning of smoking, there was great interest shown in the question that was posted for a two month period, spanning the holidays, on our faculty website, soliciting reactions to the special state committee's suggestion that undergraduate enrollment be reduced and the emphasis on graduate studies and research be heightened here at Purdue. (This is the committee to which President Jischke has just referred.) The vote came out slightly higher against than for the proposal, but it was a near thing, and to me the number of those reacting was particularly gratifying. I don't think I'm saying anything very controversial when I make the comment that this proposal has virtually no chance of being seriously entertained for the foreseeable future, given the state budget situation and Purdue's reliance on undergraduate tuition payments for a significant part of its operating expenses; but I take it that many if not most of those responding were considering the proposal as an ideal rather than something that might be implemented any time soon, and it was most interesting to see how divided the faculty is concerning that ideal. This month we have posted a question concerning a possible ban on sidewalk posters, a possibility that is especially dear to the hearts of those University staff members who have to deal with cleaning up these items. There has already been a considerable volume of response to it. In short, the faculty website, the idea for which was initiated by Bill Harper and others, is working and becoming increasingly used.

Now let me turn the floor over to Tim, and I shall continue after his report.

About the December 18 Board of Trustees meeting, which both Tim and I attended, I can be quite brief, since in keeping with what I understand to be the tradition of the December meetings there was relatively little business transacted. In his opening statement, President Jischke was relatively upbeat about the state of the University in most respects, although of course he noted the forthcoming debates of the state government concerning the budget, which is certain to have an effect on us in one way or another. I found particularly interesting one statistic that he cited, to wit, that 7.4% of the State of Indiana's budget was devoted to higher education three decades ago, as opposed to 4.7% now. The Board approved, with evident pleasure, the appointment of Laszlo Lempert as Distinguished Professor of Mathematics, and he gave a very nicely-turned short speech of appreciation. New degrees in the area of engineering education – a Master of Science, a Master of Science in Engineering Education, and a Ph.D. – were

approved for the West Lafayette campus, a Master of Science in Organizational Leadership and Supervision was approved for the Fort Wayne campus, and a Master of Business Administration was approved for the North Central Campus. The name of the Purdue pharmacy school was changed from "School of Pharmacy and Pharmacal Sciences" to "School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences." Plans to renovate Windsor Hall were accepted, residence hall rates for West Lafayette and for Fort Wayne were approved, and a slight change in athletic ticket prices for next year was also given final approval. The brief meeting ended with a recognition, by President Jischke, of several particularly generous recent donations to the University.

Our February meeting also promises to be quite charged, I think. Assuming that item 04-7 concerning the composition of departmental primary committees, which we shall be discussing later this afternoon, will be up for a vote next time, that will no doubt provoke further debate, and in any case we plan to bring for discussion the smoking restriction proposal of the University Resources Policy Committee; Professor Rousselle experienced some computer problems in forwarding it to us this month, and although we might still have included it if we had circulated it among the Steering Committee members after our meeting two weeks ago, we decided that there would be enough to deal with today without it and that February would be soon enough. The February session will need to be cut short in order to allow the holding of the President's annual Faculty Convocation, which is mandated by University rules and typically takes place immediately following one of the Senate meetings each academic year. In addition, in terms of events at future meetings about which we can be fairly certain at this point, Professor Tao has made what I consider to be a breakthrough concerning the possibility of establishing a Faculty Club, and he has agreed to report on that at the March meeting.

Finally, I have received a detailed explanation from Brent Bowditch concerning the glitches in prescription drug arrangements that occurred at the beginning of this month, as well as some other matters of interest, and I promised him that I would summarize the main points here. The prescription drug glitches were a matter of great concern, and no doubt in a few cases even health-threatening, for a number of us and our colleagues – namely, those of us on the Incentive PPO or Purdue 500 health plans. The problems came about as a result of a new law that was passed, with relatively little fanfare, by the Indiana General Assembly last spring. Essentially, it mandated that henceforth all Indiana State institutions, including the universities, would have one and the same supplier for their independent prescription drug plans as of January 1, 2005. The lowest bidder for this plum last summer, and hence the designated choice of the State, was Anthem. As they had requested, Anthem was given an electronic list of eligible Purdue participants by Brent's office, but the company failed to load this list into its system right away, and so most participants were only listed on January 5th, and for a few – the two categories of dependents over the age of 19 who are eligible (those with handicaps and those who are full-time students) – it took much longer. In addition, there was some failure of internal communication within certain local pharmacies concerning the change, although all of them had been notified of it. Earlier today, I was informed by several colleagues that the prices that they are required to pay for certain of their prescription drugs have risen sharply under the new system, while others have remained the same or roughly the same. Given the way in which all of this has come about, it is clear that Purdue University has not been in a position to do much about it.

There is another issue as well: Anthem has informed Purdue that its system is currently so constructed as to require, generally speaking, the use of individuals' social security numbers, a use which Purdue has, as you know, been working for some time to eliminate. They say that they may be able to change this by January 1 of next year; meanwhile, they have agreed,

individuals who wish to supply the company with alternative numbers for themselves may do so by calling them.

On other matters, Brent wanted me to make faculty members aware of the addition, two months ago, of several new funds to the TIAA/CREF options previously available to Purdue faculty and staff; we are the first university in the country to offer these. TIAA/CREF now has a Purdue-specific website, which is www.tiaa-cref.org/purdue, and more enhancements will be forthcoming soon on this front. The Voluntary Benefits Committee, made up of a cross-section of the Purdue community including our Senate colleague Professor Cindy Nakatsu, who kindly responded to my invitation for a volunteer to join this committee at our first Senate meeting of the year, is working on arranging for pre-paid legal services as a voluntary benefit comparable to the dental and other voluntary benefits already offered; that should go into effect at some time during the spring. Next, there will soon be website information available, courtesy of Mr. Bowditch's office, comparing average costs for the most common physician charges in Lafayette, Indianapolis, Gary, Fort Wayne, and Chicago. This should be very interesting – eye-opening was the word he used. Finally, as of the beginning of this month the Arnett Clinic is no longer a provider of free laboratory services, nor is it a preferred provider for those using either the Incentive PPO or the Purdue 500 plan; they will henceforth be subject to the maximum allowable charges there. The extant options for free lab sites are Mid-America Lab at the Unity health complex, Pathologists Associated on Concord Road, and now, in addition, a third option, the Purdue Student Health Center (PUSH). Brent may be contacted at staffbenefits@purdue.edu or at his personal address, bowditch@purdue.edu .

The best advice I can offer is, I'm afraid, hopelessly cliché-ridden, but what can I do? Stay healthy! And, a bit belatedly, Happy New Year!

Appendix C
24 January 2005

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR TIMOTHY L. SKVARENINA

Good afternoon; I'll try to make this brief as we have a busy agenda today. I would like to report on two items:

1. The Board of Trustees Meeting of November 19, 2004
2. Selection of an ERP program for OnePurdue

By now most of you have probably read or heard of the actions of the Board of Trustees, so I will just mention the highlights. The meeting included the ratification of four members of the faculty to Distinguished or Named Professorships. These were:

1. Dr. Herb Ohm as Distinguished Professor of Agronomy
2. Dr. Vladimir Shalaev as the Burnett Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering.
3. Dr. Monika Ivantysynova as the Maha Named Professor in Fluid Power Systems
4. Dr. Philip Nelson as the Scholle Chair in Food Processing

The Trustees had a lively interchange with the professors.

President Jischke gave a progress report on the Strategic Plan. He reported the increase in the target to $1.5 B due to the success to date. He also indicated one area of concern is the lack of state funding for building maintenance. If that continues, adjustments might be required in the plan to compensate.

Provost Mason presented, and the Board approved, a request to rename seven of the Schools in the University to College. These were Agriculture; Consumer and Family Sciences; Education; Liberal Arts; Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences; Science; and Technology.

In the absence of Bill McBride, I gave the faculty report. I informed the Board of changes we had made to our By-Laws this year, most notably the change in election of the Chair. I also discussed some of the items from the CIC Senate Leaders Meeting that Bill and I attended at the University of Illinois—Bill reported on this meeting to the Senate at our last meeting in November.

There were several resolutions naming new or recently constructed buildings approved: the Lawson Computer Science Building, the Neil Armstrong Hall of Engineering, the Fred and Mary Ford Dining Court, and the Yue-Kon Pao Hall of Visual and Performing Arts.

Finally, the Board approved the leasing of space in the old Whirlpool Building in the Research Park for the OnePurdue effort. That lease has since been approved by the State of Indiana, as well. That brings me to my second topic, OnePurdue.

In the Spring of 2003, I was appointed by Professor Terry Stewart, then Chair of the Senate, to the OnePurdue Steering Committee as the faculty representative. This committee was formed after a lot of work by Professor and Associate Vice President of Information Technology, Jeff Whitten. The Steering Committee helped to formulate plans for acquisition of an Enterprise Resource Planning Program (ERP) to replace much of the legacy software that is currently used for student records, human resources, and finances. As many of you are aware, our current

systems in many cases are old, difficult to maintain, and hard to modify—witness the inability to implement the plus-minus grading that was approved nearly seven years ago. Further, they don't play easily with each other. Grossly simplified, the goal of the OnePurdue plan is to have a modern system with a single data base that provides self-service to faculty, staff, students, prospective students, etc. The Steering Committee went through several iterations as Professor Whitten attempted to develop a plan that was affordable—some of the early adopters of ERP systems spent between $150 to $200M, an amount that Purdue could not afford. Finally, this past summer an acquisition plan was laid out and a series of product demos were held. Four vendors each presented two-days worth of overview to their systems. I attended some 20 hours of demos, primarily focusing on the student module.

At the end of the summer, the Steering Committee was dissolved and replaced by a number of committees. The Oversight Committee, chaired by Provost Mason and EVP&T Olsen has the final responsibility for selection of the ERP Program. The Source Selection Committee, which I currently serve on, has the responsibility for making selection recommendations to the Oversight Committee. Reporting to the SSC were functional committees for the three key areas (student, finance, and HR) as well as several technical areas. In all, nearly 400 people have been involved in the source selection process. An on-line software package was used to determine the requirements for the system and these individuals were asked to go to the website and "vote" on lengthy lists of requirements and to add any that weren't on the lists. This was a time consuming process—I spent eight or ten hours just going through the requirements for the student module. Using those results, the subcommittees came up with the requirements for the request for proposals (RFP) as well as scripted demos for the vendors to present. Each vendor was asked to spend three days, with two parallel sessions showing how their product satisfied our requirements. These sessions were heavily attended by functional users; I personally attended nearly 30 hours of demos, again focusing on the student system. Just in time for semester break, we received proposals from three vendors—Oracle, PeopleSoft, and SAP. One vendor, SCT Banner elected to drop out early in the competition and did not make presentations. Each proposal filled a three-inch binder. From the demos and written proposals, we learned a lot.

For the reasons I mentioned earlier, our systems have the reputation of being very out of date. In fact, however, in some cases we have created services that are very advanced, especially for the students at Purdue University. Although they can't enroll on-line, our students can log in, look at their bills, and even create a sub-account for a parent to look at the bills. We found that none of the vendors provided such a capability. One vendor seemed to have the attitude of, "why would you need that" while the others indicated they might be willing to work with us to develop that capability.

Armed with recommendations of the sub-committees, observation of the demos, and the written proposals, the Selection Committee met on January 3 for over four hours to discuss the vendors. The results of that meeting were sent to the Oversight Committee and as has been announced, the decision was made to continue negotiations with SAP and PeopleSoft (which is now part of Oracle). Concurrently with the negotiations, another RFP is being issued for an implementation partner; i.e., consultants to help set up the system once it is acquired and to train our in-house personnel so they can implement the chosen ERP system. The space at the Whirlpool Building will support some 140 people including Purdue staff assigned to the project and the implementation partner personnel. Once the ERP vendor is selected, the partner will be chosen shortly thereafter. Hopefully, the Oversight Committee recommendations will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the April meeting for approval, and the implementation will begin in July.

Let me conclude by saying, this has been a real learning experience for me. I firmly believe, after seeing the product demos, that training will be key to the success of implementing the ERP system. Every faculty and staff member will interact with it, some more than others. During the demos, it was obvious that heavy users of the system will need a lot of training. A second observation, is that the Senate Committees will need to interact with the implementation to be sure that procedures put into the system are what are desired. Two examples are routing of grade changes and grade reporting deadlines.

Appendix D
24 January 2005

TO: University Senate
FROM: Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Resume of Items Under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson
weith@purdue.edu

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is the organization and distribution of the agenda for each meeting of the University Senate. This committee also receives communications from any faculty member or group of members and directs such communications to appropriate committees or officers for attention.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE William L. McBride, Chairperson of the Senate
wmcbride@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 George M. Bodner, Chairperson
gmbodner@purdue.edu

1. Final exam scheduling
2. Transfer credit
3. Distance learning courses

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE William J. Zinsmeister, Chairperson
wjzins@purdue.edu

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

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE Terry L. Davidson, Chairperson
davidson@psych.purdue.edu

1. Review of the Student Bill of Rights
2. Follow-up concerning the Student Conduct Code
3. Follow-up concerning the OnePurdue system
4. Follow-up with Student Services Office concerning the proposed Disciplinary Process
5. Currently examining the proposed Exam Proctoring system

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE John R. Rousselle, Chairperson
rousselj@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budget process
2. Review of Faculty Committees

Vice Chair of the Senate, Timothy L. Skvarenina, tskvaren@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr.
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/usenate

Attachment A
24 January 2005

CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION

SENATE DOCUMENT	***TITLE***	***ORIGIN***	***SENATE***
*04-1	Nominees for University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 9/13/04
*04-2	Proposed changes to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor William L. McBride	Approved 9/13/04
*04-3	Proposed change to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor William L. McBride	Approved 10/18/04
*04-4	Proposal for Non-tenure Track Research Faculty within Purdue University	Professor William J. Zinsmeister	Approved 1/24/05
*04-5	Reapportionment of the University Senate	Professor Herbert L. Weith	Approved 11/15/04
*04-6	Proposed Change to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor George M. Bodner	Approved 1/24/05
04-7	Proposed Changes in the Composition of Primary Promotion Committees	Professor William J. Zinsmeister	For Discussion 1/24/05

***Approved**

University Senate Document 04-4
24 January 2005
As Amended and Approved 24 January 2005

To: **The University Senate**
From: **Faculty Affairs Committee**
Subject: **Proposal for Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty within Purdue University**
Disposition: **University Senate for Discussion**

INTRODUCTION

The research enterprise at Purdue University is facing significant challenges arising from changes in its environment, including increased competitiveness for external research funding, the need for strategic partnering with industry, and a greater focus and reliance on interdisciplinary efforts and multi-disciplinary proposals. Large multi-year multi-investigator research programs in particular require full-time senior-level personnel to provide continuity and a high level of uninterrupted research time. The same need for full-time attention also frequently occurs during preparation of proposals for large projects. Additionally, units which have major research projects requiring highly qualified full-time research specialists find it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain personnel in these positions due to the lack of a well-defined career ladder and corresponding reward system.

Many of our successful peer institutions have met these needs through the use of Research Professors. In most cases, these are senior researchers with outstanding research credentials who are not tenured or tenure track, are paid on soft (non-general) funds, and carry no teaching duties other than the supervision of graduate students. They are expected to be productive, independent investigators and are evaluated primarily on the basis of their scholarly achievements.

This document proposes the creation of a non-tenure track faculty appointment designated as "research professor". This track will enable the university to recruit and retain top research scholars whose primary responsibilities will be to support and enhance the discovery mission of the university. These positions would (1) not be eligible for tenure, (2) be employed entirely on non-general (soft) funds, and (3) be continued depending upon the availability of soft funding and on performance.

PRINCIPLES

Non-tenured research faculty shall:

1. engage in activities which support the academic and scholarly life of the university, and particularly those which enhance the discovery mission of the university

2. possess the appropriate educational background and professional expertise to engage in research and research-related activities

3. participate in activities which enhance professional growth

4. have an opportunity to be considered for promotion in rank from assistant to associate to (full) research professor

5. possess scholarly research credentials comparable to those of tenured and tenure-track faculty at the same academic rank

6. be considered members of the university faculty

7. be compensated at salary levels roughly equivalent to those for tenure-track faculty at the same rank and in the same professional area.

RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

A. Research faculty will be supported only from extramural or non-general funds. Fringe benefits are charged to the sponsored account.

B. Appointments may be calendar year, academic year, or part-time. Part-time appointments in general should have at least a 0.5 FTE minimum. Appointments less than 0.5 FTE and short-term appointments will not be eligible for benefits.

Research faculty are appointed by a department or research unit for renewable terms not to exceed three years each, and continued appointments are contingent upon availability of funds and satisfactory performance evaluations. The appointment cannot extend beyond the period of availability of supporting funds. If the position cannot be supported at the approved level because of insufficient funds, the appointment will be terminated when funds are exhausted or the effort will be reduced to a level consistent with the salary that can be paid. Any commitment of salary support in the case of unanticipated loss of project funds will be the responsibility of the hiring unit. Bridge funding from general funds may be used for a period up to six months.

C. Research faculty are hired at a rank commensurate with their professional experience and qualifications. These qualifications should be comparable to the research credentials of tenure/tenure track faculty at the same rank.

D. The hiring unit will conduct an annual merit review of research faculty. The timing of this review will coincide with the regular annual review of tenure track faculty and other university employees. Research faculty will be subject to annual merit increases in accordance with the university's annual salary policy. The hiring unit must establish guidelines for annual review, reappointment, and promotion prior to hiring research faculty.

E. Research faculty may be considered for promotion in rank. Criteria for promotion shall be similar to that for tenure-track faculty, but with much greater or singular focus on research accomplishment. Salary supplements for promotion should be consistent with those associated with promotion for tenure-track faculty. The promotion increment must be funded from the same funding source as the base salary. Appointments less than 0.5 FTE and short-term appointments will not be eligible for promotion in rank.

F. The primary responsibilities of research faculty would be research and research – related activities such as proposal writing, project management, and service specifically linked to their research programs (e.g. supervision of graduate students and service to professional organizations). Research faculty may serve as principal investigators on research proposals.

G. Research faculty may be members of the graduate faculty, subject to the policies and procedures of the Graduate School.

H. Research faculty are not eligible for sabbatical leave.

I. An individual holding a faculty or staff appointment at the university may apply for a research faculty position and will be subject to university search and screen policies in effect at the time of application. The same policies apply to research faculty seeking tenure-track positions. Time in non-tenured rank will not count toward sabbatical or the probationary tenure period if subsequently hired into a tenure-track position. Individuals may not hold tenure-track and research faculty positions simultaneously.

J. Research faculty may not be elected to the University Senate and are not eligible to serve on promotion and tenure committees with the exception of membership on Panel C, as described in the penultimate paragraph of this document. Other voting privileges of research faculty will be decided by the unit in which they have their primary appointment.

K. Research faculty may not have regular teaching duties except on an ad-hoc basis. In rare cases where a research faculty member is considered for a teaching assignment, a separate part-time teaching appointment is required.

L. Research faculty are eligible for emeritus status, subject to the same eligibility criteria as outlined for tenure-track faculty.

M. Except as noted previously, research faculty are subject to the policies, procedures, guidelines and regulations governing tenure track faculty. Research faculty are to be conferred the same protections of academic freedom available to tenure-track faculty for the entire terms of their contracts.

N. Research faculty will be eligible for all leaves of absence provided to faculty by university policy, with the exception of sabbatical leave and paid leave for outside activities.

O. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of the Provost.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH RESEARCH FACULTY POSITIONS

Requests for the establishment of research faculty positions must originate within an academic unit or center. Requests from a department must have approval by the Department Head, School Dean and Vice Provost for Research. Requests from School-based centers must have approval by the center director, Dean, and Vice Provost for Research. Requests originating from a multidisciplinary center must have center director and Vice-Provost for Research approval. The request must be consistent with the guidelines established for research faculty, define the position responsibilities, and describe the source(s) of funding used to support the position. The request shall also include guidelines for performance evaluation and promotion. All approvals must be obtained before an offer is made.

GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Review of candidates for hiring and promoting research faculty shall be conducted with the same rigor accorded hiring and promoting within the tenure track ranks. Qualifications for the three research faculty ranks are roughly equivalent to those of tenure track ranks, with primary or singular focus on research credentials. The ability to secure external funding does not automatically qualify individuals for research faculty appointments.

Assistant Research Professor
Candidates for appointment to the rank of assistant research professor must exhibit significant promise for the establishment of an independent research program and related scholarly endeavors which contribute to the discovery mission of the university.

Associate Research Professor
Candidates for appointment to the rank of associate research professor must have a significant and sustained record of scholarly accomplishment and externally funded research. The candidate must show promise of continued professional growth, recognition, and contribution to the discovery mission of the university.

Research Professor
Candidates for appointment to the rank of research professor should be recognized nationally or internationally as authorities in their fields of specialization, have established significant and sustained extramural research funding, and have significantly contributed to the discovery mission of the university.

PROMOTION PROCESS

Research faculty are eligible for promotion in rank from assistant research professor to associate research professor to research professor. Recommendations for changes in rank will be considered during the normal fall and spring semester faculty promotion cycle in accordance with guidelines issued annually by the Provost.

Research professors hired by departments will be reviewed for promotion by the departmental primary committee and the school area committee, with the addition of one or more research faculty, as appropriate. Professors hired by a unit other than a department will be assigned to a departmental primary committee for review or to an ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost for Research. The area committee will consist of five members appointed by the Vice Provost for Research.

At the university level, Panel C will review all research faculty promotion candidates. Panel C shall consist of the Provost as chair, the Vice Provost for Research, two academic school deans or associate deans for research from schools employing research faculty, and six faculty members. The Provost shall nominate three of these faculty from Panel A of the University Promotions Committee; the remaining three faculty shall be research professors appointed by the Provost.

Assistant research professor appointments are not subject to the seven-year probationary period applicable to tenure track faculty. Assistant and associate research professors must be reviewed at least every five years for retention in rank or for promotion. During the fifth year, the research faculty member must be informed by the unit administrator that he/she has the right to be reviewed for promotion; it will then be up to the faculty member to request a review.

Approving:
A.M. Beck
E. Blackwood
S. Broussard
J. Duzinkiewicz
V.J. Killion
G. Lee
D.R. McMillin
M.T. Morgan
A.C. Rollock
W.J. Zinsmeister

Absent:
L.D. Bentley
J.J. Contreni
S.F. Mason
A.C. Sullivan
J.A. Walcott-McQuigg
Y. Yih

University Senate Document 04-6
24 January 2005
As Approved 24 January 2005

TO: **The University Senate**
FROM: **University Senate Educational Policy Committee**
REFERENCE: **Bylaws of the University Senate, Section 5.50**
DISPOSITION: **University Senate for Discussion**

Proposed		**Present**	
5.50	*The Educational Policy Committee*	5.50	*The Educational Policy Committee*
The Educational Policy Committee shall consist of thirteen senators, *three advisors*, three students (two under-graduates; one graduate), *and ex-officio members as deemed appropriate by the EPC.* The Purdue Student Senate shall recommend the undergraduate students and *the Purdue Graduate Student Government* shall recommend the graduate student. The University Senate Nominating Committee shall present this slate of three student nominees to be elected by the University Senate at that meeting of the senate at which senators are normally elected to fill vacancies on standing committees. Each student so elected shall serve for a term of one year.		The Educational Policy Committee shall consist of thirteen senators, two advisors and three students (two undergraduates; one graduate). The Purdue Student Senate shall recommend the undergraduate students and the graduate student organization approved by the Graduate Council shall recommend the graduate student. The University Senate Nominating Committee shall present this slate of three student nominees to be elected by the University Senate at that meeting of the senate at which senators are normally elected to fill vacancies on standing committees. Each student so elected shall serve for a term of one year.	

Rationale for Change:

For several years, the Educational Policy Committee has benefited from the services of three advisors: the Registrar, the Dean of Students, and a representative of the Provost's Office. Last year, the Committee expressed interest in having an ex-officio member of the committee, who represents the Academic Advisors. The proposed language also recognizes the existence of the Purdue Graduate Student Government.

Approving:	Absent:	Abstaining:
K. Anderson	Ghiselli	C. Ladisch
C. Baird	Jordan	T. Hawkins
G. Bodner	Robinson	D. Sheets
P. Connolly	Schweickert	
E. Furgason		
J. Greenan		
R. Penney		
A. Peter		
A. Savikhin		
T. Skvarenina		
I. Wait		
S. L. Weldon		

University Senate Document 04-7
24 January 2005

To: **The University Senate**
From: **Faculty Affairs Committee**
Subject: **Change to Composition of Primary Committee**
Reference: **Academic Procedure Manual, p. H-75**
Disposition: **University Senate for Discussion**

Proposed Changes:

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

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

Approving:

A. M. Beck
L.D. Bentley
E. Blackwood
S. Broussard
J.J. Contreni
J. Duzinkiewicz
V.J. Killion
G. Lee
S.F. Mason
D.R. McMillin
M. Morgan
A.C. Rollock
A.C. Sullivan
J.A. Walcott-McQuigg
Y. Yih
W.J. Zinsmeister

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

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

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
William B. Bache
1922-2004

Bill Bache earned his Ph.D. degree from Penn State University in 1952 and came to Purdue in 1953. He taught for 39 years in the English department before retiring in 1992. In his long career at Purdue, Bill Bache impressed everyone with whom he came in contact with his passion for the essential components of the profession of English: reading, writing and teaching. He professed to his students and colleagues that the opportunity to practice and teach these three skills was what drew him to our profession in the first place and what sustained him throughout his career of teaching undergraduate and graduate students, of helping graduate students write their M.A. theses, Ph.D. dissertations and first books, of writing his own critical and creative works, and of talking about literature with his colleagues at every opportunity. 18 holes of golf with Bill Bache was often the equivalent of a 3-credit course on Shakespeare or E.M. Forster.

Professor Bache was passionate about Shakespeare, powerfully attracted to but suspicious of modern fiction, militant about New Criticism, a stickler for the right word and the necessity of rhythm in both his own writing and that of his students, and a working proponent of diversity before anyone at Purdue ever thought of making it one of the reigning buzz words of our university life.

Shakespeare was his great love and in New Criticism he found a theoretical stance and methodology that allowed him to commune with the soul and language of our greatest poet and playwright. Close reading for him was an opportunity to literally move inside the mind of the poet and collaborate in the expression of his words' meaning.

During the summer of 1954, on the seventh tee of the Purdue golf course, Bill Bache was also one of the founders of *Modern Fiction Studies*. For 39 years he served as one of its advisory editors, writing thoughtful and rigorous reviews in almost every issue. Over his career, he wrote three books on Shakespeare and numerous articles, but his secret indulgence was his creative writing, poems and short stories that were often autobiographical, highly symbolic, and usually wryly humorous. In Shakespearean terms, he was much more comfortable with comedy than tragedy. Only two years ago, Bill Bache published his defining creative work, a fictional non-fiction memoir, *On the Road to Innsbruck and Back*. It recounted with bitter good humor his combat duty in Europe in WWII and the wound that ended the war for him in Austria in 1945.

But Professor Bache will be most fondly remembered by his students. His kindness toward his students, his gentle rigor, made reading and writing a pleasure for generations of Purdue undergraduates. In the sixties and seventies, before diversity became a university mantra, Bill Bache was its foremost practitioner in the English department. Graduate students who were far from their native lands and trying to write a dissertation in their 2nd or 3rd language, students who were othered due to their racial heritage, sexual orientation or physical handicaps inevitably found their way to Professor Bache because they knew that in his soft-spoken way he would understand and try to help.

W. Joseph Palmer

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
Susan J. Barkman
April 26, 1952 – August 15, 2004

Susan J. Barkman was born on April 26, 1952 in Somerset, PA and her family later moved to Baltimore, Maryland. Susan started her college education at the University of Maryland and received a B.S. in Home Economics Education in 1974. From 1974 to 1977 Susan was an Assistant Youth Extension Adviser for the University of Illinois Extension Service in Melvin, IL. In 1977 she moved to the position of Youth Extension Adviser with the University of Illinois Extension Service in Champaign, IL. In 1980 Susan earned a M.S. degree in Clothing and Textile Science at the University of Illinois, while working full-time. She took a job as a Lecturer in the Home Economics Department with the State University of New York, Oneonta, NY, in 1981. In 1982 she began her career with Purdue University when she was hired as an Assistant Professor in the 4-H Department. In 1989, Dr. Barkman received her Ph.D. in Curriculum Design and Evaluation from Indiana University. Dr. Barkman was promoted to associate professor in 1990 and obtained the rank of professor in 1996.

Dr. Barkman was a highly motivated, visionary, and innovative leader who served Purdue University, the citizens of Indiana, and people nationally as a youth education specialist. She was recognized nationally as a leader in the areas of curriculum design, youth development and evaluation.

In 1990 Dr. Barkman led a massive effort to develop new and innovative curriculum for use in informal educational settings such as 4-H. A significant focus of the new curriculum included an effort to enhance the life skills learning aspect of the curriculum while setting it in a system that was educationally sound and written specifically for the wide range of youth involved with 4-H (3^{rd} – 12^{th} grades).

Dr. Barkman provided leadership in the development of three field guides:

- Utilizing the Logic Model for Program Design and Evaluation;
- Designing Quantitative Instruments; and,
- Using Qualitative Methods

These guides made evaluation easier to understand for extension field staff and specialists. Susan developed a program, "What Makes a Good Evaluation?" that was presented to all Indiana CES field staff as well as Extension staff in several states. She led a statewide research study of the impact of the 4-H program on tenured 4-H members. At the national level Dr. Barkman presented 19 research papers and seminars on evaluation and was invited to present staff development workshops for extension staff in 14 different states.

In 1998 Dr. Barkman designed the "Four-fold Youth Development Model" which described 47 key youth development skills. It is the only model that included a research focused "skill set" for each developmental increment. The Model includes evaluation instruments designed for the research-based "skill sets" with an on-line instantaneous data analysis and printable report. The Four-Fold Youth Development Model received the 1999 President's Maximum Award presented by the American Evaluation Association and, was featured in the Fall 2000 issue of the Community Youth Development Journal.

During her career Susan authored or co-authored 75 educational publications, six instructional videotapes and 53 refereed papers and published proceedings. She was a member of many

professional and scholarly societies, including the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents (served on the Board of Directors from 1992-93), National Society for Performance and Instruction (Northern Indiana Chapter president, 1991), Epsilon Sigma Phi, National Peer Helpers Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Science Teachers Association, and the American Evaluation Association.

Susan Barkman received numerous awards for her efforts, including recognition by the National Association for Extension 4H Agents with their Distinguished 4H Service Award in 1993, receiving the Sharvelle Distinguished Extension Specialist Award in 1997 and being honored with the President's Maximum Evaluation Award from the American Evaluation Association in 1999.

Susan J. Barkman is survived by her father, Robert O. Barkman; two sisters, Barbara Ott (husband: Harold) of State College, PA, and Judy Bliley (husband: Leo) of North East, PA; and two brothers, Brad Barkman (wife: Jody) of Boynton Beach, FL and Robert Barkman (wife: Wanda) of Millers, MD.

Roger Tormoehlen
Natalie Carroll