AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of Minutes of 21 October 2013 Senate Meeting

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the President
   President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.

5. Remarks of the Chairperson
   Professor David J. Williams

6. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees For Information
   Professor David A. Sanders

7. Question Time

8. Senate Document 13-2 Reapportionment of the Senate For Action
   Professor David A. Sanders

9. Senate Document 13-3 Sense of the Senate Resolution on House Joint Resolution 6- Amendment to the Indiana Constitution Concerning Marriage For Discussion
   Professor David A. Sanders

10. Improving Faculty and Exponent Relationships For Information
    Editor-in-Chief of The Exponent Matt Thomas

    Vice President for Ethics & Compliance Alysa Rollock

12. The Development of an Undergraduate ESL Program For Information
    Senator April Ginther and Associate Dean of International Programs and Director of ISS Joe Potts

13. New Business

14. Memorial Resolutions

15. Adjournment


GUESTS: Sara Williams, Liz Evans, Matthew Thomas, Audeen W. Fentimen, Ralph Cherry, Hayleigh Colombo, Amanda Hamon, Tara Lannan, Rob Wynkoop, Jeremiah Forbes, Suthathip Thirakmholovit, Nancy Kauper, Sally Rehnel, Joe Potts, Dennis Koyama, Joshua Perry, Spencer Deery

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson David J. Williams.
2. The minutes of the 21 October 2013 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as distributed.
4. President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A).
5. Professor Williams presented the remarks of the Chairperson (see Appendix B).
6. Professor David A. Sanders presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix C). Chairman of the University Nominating Committee Professor Michael A. Hill reported that he had received an inquiry asking how Senators were selected and how many of the current Senators held
positions with significant administrative duties. He stated that there is no consistent mechanism for selecting Senators and the process varies widely among the various units. He said that 9 current Senators hold positions with significant administrative duties. Professor Hill asked for feedback from the Senators to determine if there should be a standard procedure for selection of Senators. The Vice-Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) Professor Michael Fosmire reported on the committee’s activities. The other committee chairs had no reports.

7. At Question Time, questions were asked from the floor.

Professor John Graveel noted that he had heard that an outside consulting firm has been retained to help plan the on-campus bike paths. Vice President Michael Cline verified that a firm has been retained and their services will be used in the long-term, but are not being used at this time.

Professor Wayne Campbell and his department colleagues have been dealing with an issue of underfunding of an ongoing infrastructure project. The costs were underestimated by 30%. This will compromise research in the long-term and will make it more difficult to obtain grants, especially NIH grants that require infrastructure that will not be included due to the underfunding. Professor Campbell is uncertain how this occurred and is worried about it occurring again in the future. President Daniels said that he will consult with Vice President Cline and Vice President Diaz to learn what occurred and to avoid such situations in the future.

8. Professor Sanders introduced Senate Document 13-2, Reapportionment of the Senate. In order to vote on the document at this meeting, he made a motion to suspend the voting rules. His motion was seconded and the motion passed by consent of the Senate. Following the suspension of rules, Professor Sanders made a motion to approve the document. His motion was seconded and the document was passed by unanimous voice vote.

9. Professor Sanders next introduced Senate Document 13-3, The Purdue University Senate Expresses Public Opposition to the Amendment to the Indiana Constitution Concerning Marriage (HJR-6). In order to vote on the document at this meeting, he made a motion to suspend the voting rules. His motion was seconded. A motion was then made to approve the document and this motion was seconded. Professor Sanders explained the rationale for Senate Document 13-3. Discussion of the document followed with several questions and statements from the floor. Professor Charlene Sullivan asked if the state constitution is amended will this have an impact on the benefits program of Purdue University. Professor Sanders said that he has spoken with several attorneys and they have answered “no” to this question. However, in other states that passed similar legislation benefits to domestic partners did become a target for the backers of said legislation. Senator Christopher Kulesza asked: What happens next? Professor Sanders said that this was all the Senate would do on this matter. He emphasized that the President and administration had asked for input from the campus stakeholders and this was the Senate’s response to that request. Several Senators asked about dissemination of the document and the vote on the document. The consensus was that there would be numerous reports in various media and the results of the vote would be known widely and quickly. Professor Fosmire noted that once the vote was finished it would be in the public domain. Senator Kyle Pendergast asked:
Why is the University Senate voting on this issue and what is the benefit to Purdue? Professor Sanders emphasized that the faculty are entrusted with the responsibility to ensure that the values espoused by Purdue University are maintained and passed on to future generations. Professor Evelyn Blackwood said that the results of the vote on the document would speak to the climate at Purdue University. Without Purdue University’s support of this resolution we risk losing faculty members and it would make it more difficult to recruit faculty members. Professor Stephen Martin read the following statement from Professor Richard Cosier into the record:

“As the former dean of the business school at Purdue, I believe that the economy of Indiana is best served if the State is perceived to be an inclusive, tolerant and welcoming place for all people. Therefore, if I could attend this meeting I would vote in favor of a faculty resolution to support the opposition to the proposed State Amendment banning gay marriage and civil unions.”

Professor Janusz Duzinkiewicz noted that the regional campus Faculty Senates had or will have voted on similar resolutions by the end of the current semester. Professor Peter Hirst mentioned the 2010 Purdue University Policy on non-discrimination and asked if its approval had indicated support from the Board of Trustees. Professor Sanders stated that he could not speak to that question. Professor Williams said that he had received numerous email messages concerning this resolution and they indicated near-unanimous support for its approval.

The discussion ended and the vote was taken. The motion to approve Senate Document 13-3 was passed with 63 Senators voting in favor, 4 Senators voting in opposition and 2 Senators abstaining from the vote.

10. Matthew Thomas, Editor-in-Chief of The Exponent, gave a brief presentation to the Senate. His topic was improving relations and interactions with the faculty members of the University. He acknowledged that some professors will not speak to reporters from The Exponent because they are afraid of being misquoted and they believe that they cannot review a story for accuracy prior to publication. He ensured the Senators that all faculty members can review articles prior to publication and inform The Exponent staff of any inaccuracies. These inaccuracies will be corrected prior to publication. Mr. Thomas emphasized that The Exponent staff members do want to hear from faculty members about items of interest to the Purdue University community. He also recognizes that the faculty members comprise one of the audiences of The Exponent and wants to ensure that erroneous information is not published for any audience. He urged faculty members to contact him. Contact information is readily available within the pages of The Exponent.

11. Vice President for Ethics & Compliance Alysa Rollock presented a report on the Comprehensive Policy Review Process and Recommendations (see Appendix D). Following the presentation she answered questions from the floor about freedom of speech, academic freedom, online availability of current and archived policies and the differences among definitions of policies, guidelines, standards and procedures. These definitions can be found in Appendix E. Vice President Rollock assured the Senate that she is a strong advocate for freedom of speech and academic freedom. She acknowledged that some of the descriptions of these are scattered among several policies or guidelines. She said that she would like to see a stand-alone policy created that specifically addresses provisions of academic freedom at Purdue University. She
also noted that 1st Amendment rights are dear to President Daniels and the administration as a whole. Vice President Rollock mentioned that all policies are available at the Purdue University Policies web page. Finally, she said that resources are available for professors who need help ensuring that their web sites are accessible to the disabled students and others who use the web sites. The Office of Institutional Equity personnel stand ready to assist professors in this matter.

12. Professor April Ginther and Associate Dean of International Programs Joe Potts presented a report on The Development of an Undergraduate English as a Second Language Program (see Appendix F). There is a need for this program because Purdue University has either the 2nd or 3rd most undergraduate students (depending on the data source) of any public university in the United States. Many of these students arrive in the U.S. with poor writing and speaking skills. The proposed program will provide these students assistance with their English-language skills early in their academic career at Purdue University. Senators expressed strong support for the development of this program and encouraged the administration to provide the needed resources for this important initiative. Professor Ginther said that the details of the program are being worked on and it should be implemented by the fall 2014 semester.

13. No memorial resolutions had been received.

14. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
**Vehicle/Bike Accidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- - - Existing bicycle routes in place prior to Fall 2013
--- Existing bicycle routes added in Fall 2013
>>> Shared lane markers
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SAVINGS

$262,000 a year by consolidating data centers
$254,000 a year by consolidating desktop support
$106,628 through ITAP review of IT purchases
$118,635 through increased ITAP/Calumet collaboration
$102,399 through new computer lab replacement strategy
$125,000 a year through e-transcripts
$51,000 a year in new revenue to backup data for City of Indianapolis
NEGOTIATION & AGGREGATE PURCHASING

DIESEL COSTS

CITY BUS CONTRACT

$100,000+ saved
More to come

PARKING ENFORCEMENT
UNNEEDED VEHICLES

$10,000 per van × = $100,000 In Savings
STORAGE

$162,000 in savings a year
WASTEBASKET POLICY

• Faculty & staff will no longer need to carry non-recyclable waste to a central location.
• As of Dec. 1, choice to:
  o Use hanging sub-divider for recyclables, and the bigger basket for non-recyclables, or vice-versa.
Chairperson’s Remarks
University Senate Meeting
November 18, 2013

Welcome to the third, and final meeting of the University Senate for this semester. Where has the time gone?

I want to begin my remarks with a story. It’s a good story, with a happy ending. For years I have listened to my wife, Andrea, who teaches in the Academic Success Center, bemoan the difficulties our international students, especially our burgeoning Asian enrollment, face in speaking and writing in English. I also listened to April Ginther describe the same situation in various committee meetings where few paid attention to her. This summer I visited with Charlene Sullivan, who described the same situation in Krannert. But it wasn’t until Andrea and I walked up to Starbuck’s on a beautiful Saturday morning this summer, shortly before the beginning of this semester, that I realized I had to speak out as the Chair of the University Senate. For what happened at Starbucks that morning started a chain reaction that brings us to this announcement today. Two young Asian students sat next to us after we had our tea. They had just arrived from China and were full of enthusiasm as they began to explore their new home. Andrea introduced herself to one of the students, and I tried to introduce myself to the other. I knew from the expression on his face he had not understood me. So I tried again. Still the same smile on his face. He then reached in his pocket, got out his cell phone, and motioned for me to type what I was saying. He showed this to his friend, who read it and spoke to him in Chinese, and his face lit up.

On our walk back home, I asked myself, how did this student get admitted to Purdue, and what will happen to him? At that point I knew what I was going to say to the Board of Trustees at their August meeting. Not only did I tell them this has become a huge problem at Purdue, but if it continues it will damage our reputation in the long run. We need a centralized English language support program for our international students. That evening Mike Berghof, the vice chair of the Trustees, emailed me for more information. Shortly after that President Daniels formed a Task Force to study this issue. The group grew to more than 40 faculty and administrators, several are here in this room as senators and advisors, and six focus groups were formed. Did everyone agree on everything? Of course not, but we did agree the problem needed a big solution rather than the band aide approaches that have sprung up across campus.

As you will hear from April and Joe Potts later in the meeting, Purdue now has the second largest international enrollment of any university in the country, yet we lag way behind our peers in what we do for these students, except take their money. After presenting a well thought out proposal to President Daniels a week ago, I am very pleased to announce this will change in a very significant way by the Fall Semester of 2014 with the formation of the English Language Support Program at Purdue University.

That, my friends, is how shared governance can, should, and does work at Purdue University. This initiative has been faculty driven from the beginning. The Board of Trustees and the President listened, and responded. I thank each of you who participated, and in particular President Daniels for his support.
There is another issue on this campus that is equally important and needs our undivided attention, and this is our declining black enrollment. I have visited with Christine Taylor and Pam Horne about how to fix this. This problem is far more complex and nuanced than our problem with our international students.

So how to fix this?

More money for scholarships would help, but more money is not the full answer. As with the international students, we first need to admit we have a problem, and then get to work on fixing it.

Once again, we have a packed agenda, so this concludes my remarks.

Thank you.

David J. Williams
Chair
Purdue University Senate
18 November 2013

TO: University Senate
FROM: David A. Sanders, Chairperson of the Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
David A. Sanders, Chairperson
retrovir@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
David J. Williams, Chairperson of the Senate
djw@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
Michael A. Hill, Chairperson
hillma@purdue.edu

The Nominating Committee is responsible for presenting nominations for the University Senate and University committees. In filling committee vacancies the Nominating Committee seeks to have all interested Senators serve on at least one committee.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Hal P. Kirkwood, Chairperson
kirkwood@purdue.edu

1. Academic Standing & GPA Requirements
2. Armed Services Excusal Policy
3. Transfer Credit
4. Comprehensive Student Policy Revision

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
A. Charlene Sullivan, Chairperson
sullivaa@purdue.edu

1. On-line Course Evaluation
2. NSF ADVANCE Initiative- policies to reduce unintentional bias in faculty hiring

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
April J. Ginther, Chairperson
aginther@purdue.edu

1. Student Conduct
2. Purdue Student Creed

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
Richard Johnson-Sheehan, Chairperson
rjohnso@purdue.edu

1. Resources for Student Growth assessment
2. Resources for online courses

The University Resources Policy Committee shall be concerned with, but not limited to, consideration of the following matters: planning optimal utilization of the physical facilities of the University, including buildings, the library, scientific and equipment and educational aids; studies of staff needs, utilization, and planning; interdepartmental cooperation for improved facilities and staff utilization; and nonacademic planning, including architecture, landscaping, parking, and traffic.

Chair of the Senate, David J. Williams, djw@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, Patricia Hart, phart@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
Section D 3.00 of the University Code, and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred two members. Eleven of these are specified in the items 1 through 11 below. The other slots will be apportioned among the West Lafayette faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two Senators. There are 2017 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette campus. When this number is divided by ninety-one the result is 21.92. Therefore, to qualify for more than two senators, a faculty unit should have 44 or more voting faculty members. Since no faculty unit can have fewer than two Senators, the Libraries unit qualifies for two Senators. The remaining units have a total of 1975 voting faculty members with eighty-nine senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The apportionment of Senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 21.92. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 13.56; Education, 2.92; Engineering, 16.10; Health & Human Sciences, 9.58; Liberal Arts, 13.18; Management, 4.29; Pharmacy, 3.47; Science, 13.91; Technology, 8.02; Veterinary Medicine, 5.11. In order to achieve the desired 89, the College of Agriculture was closest to being less than 0.50 and thus was assigned a value of 13 Senators. The remaining faculty units were rounded to the nearest integer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. President</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chief Fiscal Officer</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chairperson of the Senate</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vice-Chairperson of the Senate</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Calumet Campus</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fort Wayne Campus</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. North Central Campus</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. IUPUI Campus</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Graduate Student</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Faculty Units</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approving

Kirk D. Alter
April J. Ginther
Patricia Hart
Michael A. Hill
Sandra S. Liu
David A. Sanders
Hong Holly Wang
David J. Williams
To: The University Senate  
From: David A. Sanders  
Subject: The Purdue University Senate Expresses Public Opposition to the Amendment to the Indiana Constitution Concerning Marriage (HJR-6)  
Disposition: University Senate for Approval  

WHEREAS: “Purdue University is committed to maintaining a community which recognizes and values the inherent worth and dignity of every person; fosters tolerance, sensitivity, understanding, and mutual respect among its members; and encourages each individual to strive to reach his or her own potential. In pursuit of its goal of academic excellence, the University seeks to develop and nurture diversity. The University believes that diversity among its many members strengthens the institution, stimulates creativity, promotes the exchange of ideas, and enriches campus life;”* and  

WHEREAS: “Purdue University does not condone and will not tolerate discrimination against any individual on the basis of … sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression;”* and  

WHEREAS: Purdue University has extended benefits to same-sex domestic partners of University employees and their eligible children since 2003; and  

WHEREAS: The amendment to Article 1 of the Indiana Constitution concerning marriage (referred to as HJR-6) is contrary to the values and policies of Purdue University and will harm employee recruitment and retention.  

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:  
The Purdue University Senate opposes the Indiana State Constitutional amendment concerning marriage (HJR-6) and therefore strongly urges the Indiana General Assembly and the Governor of Indiana to oppose adoption of HJR-6.  

Respectfully submitted,  
David A. Sanders  

* Purdue University Faculty & Staff Handbook Equal Opportunity Policies
Rationale for The Purdue University Senate Expresses Public Opposition to the Amendment to the Indiana Constitution Concerning Marriage (HJR-6)

The Indiana General Assembly is projected to be in session before the January meeting of the Purdue University Senate and will be confronting HJR-6 early. If the sentiment of the Purdue University Senate is to be heard, it must be at our November 18, 2013 meeting.

It is the second sentence of the amendment that is relevant to the benefits offered to employees at Purdue University.

Text of the proposed amendment to the Indiana Constitution:

“Only a marriage between one (1) man and one (1) woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Indiana. A legal status identical or substantially similar to that of marriage for unmarried individuals shall not be valid or recognized.”

Alysa Christmas Rollock
Vice President for Ethics and Compliance

Presentation to University Senate
November 18, 2013
Background

• Charge from President Daniels

• Endorsement by the Executive Policy Review Group

• Project Team
  – Jessica Teets, University Policy Office Coordinator
  – Steve Schultz, University Legal Counsel
  – Alysa Christmas Rollock, Vice President for Ethics and Compliance

• Scope: 127 system-wide administrative policies
Policy Hierarchy

Board of Trustees Code

System-Wide Policy
- System-Wide Standard
- System-Wide Guideline
- Campus Policy

Operating Procedure

Unit-Level Standard
Needs Assessments

• Key Questions

1. Is the policy necessary to promote the university's mission or relationships with stakeholders?

2. Is the policy necessary to advance a university-wide risk management or operational efficiency objective?

3. Is the policy necessary to implement a legal requirement?
Needs Assessments

• Recommendation for Disposition
  1. Retain the policy in its current form.
  2. Retain the policy, but make revisions.
  3. Consolidate the policy with another.
  4. Rescind the policy and manage the issue through other means (e.g., standard, guideline, procedure, training).
  5. Rescind the policy.
Review Process

Comprehensive Policy Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Responsible Offices (21 total)
  - Completed needs assessments if <=5 policies (May 15)
  - Completed needs assessments if 6-10 policies (May 31)
  - Completed needs assessments if 11-20 policies (June 14)
  - Completed needs assessments if >20 policies (June 28) |

Project Team

Reviewed assessments and added comments (completed Aug. 19)

University Policy Committee

Reviewed assessments and added comments (completed Sep. 18)

Executive Policy Review Group

Reviewed assessments and approved final disposition (completed Sep. 24)
University Policy Committee

- APSAC: Robin Cunningham
- CSSAC: Gary Carter
- Faculty, Calumet: David Pick
- Faculty, Fort Wayne: Robert Barrett
- Faculty, North Central: Janusz Duzinkiewicz
- Faculty, West Lafayette: Patricia Hart, University Senate Vice Chair
- Business Services: Sharon Steen
- HR, Calumet: Michelle Clauss
- HR, Fort Wayne: Rose Costello and Carolyn Ladd
- HR, North Central: Sue Miller
- HR, West Lafayette: Trent Klingerman and Sharon Williams
- IT: David Shaw
- Student Affairs: Jeffery Stefancic
- University Policy Office: Jessica Teets
Executive Policy Review Group

• Al Diaz, Executive Vice President for Business and Finance and Treasurer
• Laurel Weldon, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (designee for the Provost)
• Thomas Keon, Chancellor
• Vicki Carwein, Chancellor
• James Dworkin, Chancellor
• Luis Lewin, Vice President for Human Resources
• David Williams, University Senate Chair
• Alysa Christmas Rollock, Vice President for Ethics and Compliance (Chair)
Recommendations

- Revise: 58
- Retain As Is: 55
- Rescind: 8
- Consolidate or Recast as Standard, Guideline and/or Procedure*: 6

* Net number of Policies = 10
Results

*Policies to be recast as standards may also have associated guidelines and/or procedures, but are counted only in the standards category.
Questions?
Below are the working definitions of the terms referenced in Vice President Rollock’s presentation at the 18 November 2013 Senate meeting.

1. Board of Trustees Code
   A statement of value, principle, direction and/or expectation.

2. System-Wide Policy
   An official, defined University principle or directive that:
   - Mandates requirements of or provisions for members of the Purdue University community.
   - Implements compliance with a law, regulation, or Board of Trustees Regulation; advances a key aspect of the Purdue University mission or its relationship with its stakeholders; mitigates institutional risk; and/or promotes operational efficiency.
   - Has broad application throughout the Purdue University system.
   - Has been reviewed by legal counsel and approved by the Executive Policy Review Group (EPRG) and/or the President.

   a. System-Wide Standard
      - An expression of the provisions or requirements of a System-Wide Policy as they pertain to a specific topic or demographic or an expression of the provisions or requirements of two or more System-Wide Policies in relation to each other.
      - Adherence to System-Wide Standards is required.
      - Standards must be reviewed by legal counsel and be approved by the Vice President for Ethics and Compliance.

   b. System-Wide Guideline
      - Non-mandatory expectations and/or best practices provided in support of a System-Wide Policy.
      - Guidelines must have the approval of the Responsible Executive(s) of the policy they support.

3. Campus Policy
   - An official, defined principle or directive that mandates requirements of or provisions for members of a specific university campus.
   - Campus Policies either address an issue not defined in a System-Wide Policy or provide further articulation of a System-Wide Policy to the relevant campus.
   - In the event of apparent conflict between a Campus Policy and a System-Wide Policy, the provision(s) of the System-Wide Policy prevail.
   - Campus Policies may have supporting standards, guidelines, and/or Operating Procedures.
   - West Lafayette Campus Policies must be reviewed by legal counsel and approved by the EPRG.
   - All other Campus Policies must be reviewed by legal counsel, approved by the Chancellor, and presented to the EPRG for information prior to being issued.

4. Operating Procedure
• The steps to be followed as a consistent and repetitive approach to fulfill a policy or a specific provision/requirement of a policy.
• Operating Procedures may evolve over time as new tools emerge, new processes are designed, or the risks associated with a subject change in response to internal or external environmental changes.
• Operating Procedures must have the approval of the Responsible Executive(s) of the policy they support.
Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange

April Ginther, Director, OEPP
Joe Potts, Associate Dean, ISS

University Senate
November 18, 2013
Thirty years ago the presence of international students at North American universities was described as “vital to certain institutions and whole fields of study” (Goodwin and Nacht, 1983).

Syverson (2002) commented “There is ample evidence that many of the best graduate students are international students. They complete their doctoral degrees at higher rates than the average [domestic] student and finish their doctoral degrees more quickly.”
The Association of International Educators reported in 2003 that international students contributed 11.95 billion dollars to the national economy.
Global economic benefits

With respect to the global economy and international development worldwide, Kotkin (1993) argued “America’s key technological trump card is its intrinsic appeal to the world’s best scientific and technical minds. By luring such talent to our shores, America’s universities are simply helping the nation play its strongest hand in global economies.”
Syverson (2002) remarked that international students who graduate and remain “continue to contribute to the national economy, and those who return often become ambassadors for U.S. universities and industry, providing linkages for research and trade.”
Yue-Kong Pao had two daughters who graduated from Purdue. Anna Pao Sohmen graduated in 1966 with a degree in psychology and sociology, and Bessie Pao Woo, graduated in 1971 with a degree in interior design. In recognition of an anonymous 4 million dollar gift, and at the request of the donor, Pao’s name was given to the visual and performing arts center.
A shift from grad to undergrad

In the past six years, Purdue has experienced a sea change in terms of the international population, and we now are considering best practice in terms of support for all our international students – but particularly for the growing population of international undergrads.
2008-13 grad, undergrad, and total international enrollment

Graduates: 3119, 3341, 3588, 3721
Undergraduates: 3172, 3390, 3420, 4544
Total: 4974, 4981, 5479, 5990, 6761, 7934, 8562, 8702

Increase in enrollment 2008 - 2013

Graduate: 602 (19%)
Undergraduate: 2621 (81%)
Total Increase: 3223 (100%)
Why open undergrad doors?

For the same reasons we have such a substantial international graduate population:

- International students enhance our profile
- Revenue
- Internationalization
- The end of the echo boom
Shifting demographics --

In Australia: 25%-40% international

In Europe: Scandinavian countries have already shifted grad programs to English medium instruction and are beginning to shift undergrad instruction as well; Germany is close behind. International enrollments in the UK are falling.
A recent article in Inside Higher ED (Grove, 2013) quotes Daniel Stevens, international students officer at the National Union of Students who states:

The traditional destinations to study in English, [Australia, Britain and the United States] are no longer a given. Other countries are realizing the benefits of attracting international students and, crucially, their governments are behind them, offering visas that include the chance of working afterwards.
The majority of international grads and undergrads are from East Asia, primarily from China, and many of these students (70%) are accepted despite relatively low writing and speaking skills.

--- despite there being millions of eligible international students, many have not had the opportunity to develop speaking and writing skills.
International students present unique instructional (not remedial) challenges:

-- we are finding that many of our students struggle once in the program and in the job market due to written and oral communication skills, Purdue Engineering Professor.
Why not just raise admission standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univ./Score</th>
<th>TOEFL IBT</th>
<th>Post-entry</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(79-102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(79-104)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan St.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(79-100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn St.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purdue</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(80-92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISS has raised admission standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univ./Score</th>
<th>TOEFL IBT</th>
<th>Post-entry</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(79-102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(79-104)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan St.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(79-100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn St.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>77 → 88</td>
<td>(77-100)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(80-92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current TOEFL IBT Total Score Distribution:

- 77 (B1/B2)
- 90 (B1/B2)
- 99 (B2/C1)
- 120 (B2/C1)
Two courses in English for academic purposes (700 students)

Prerequisites for Engl 106 and Comm 114

Language/conversation partners (ISS)

Disciplinary language-intensive upper division capstones

Greater integration into the larger L1 English undergrad population (learning communities and housing)

An English language certificate for successful completion
Questions, comments

aginther@purdue.edu
jpotts@purdue.edu


### TOEFL Subscale scores and 1st year GPA

#### Management (N=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toefl</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>91.17</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>107.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; sem</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; sem</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; sem</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A: ETS TOEFL Score interpretation guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0–30</td>
<td>Low (0–14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate (15–21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (22–30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0–30</td>
<td>Low (0–14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate (15–21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (22–30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0–4 converted to 0–30</td>
<td>Weak (0–9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited (10–17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fair (18–25)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (26–30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0–5 converted to 0–30</td>
<td>Limited (1–16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fair (17–23)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (24–30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>0–120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TOEFL Speaking, OEPT and CEFR Level Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IBT Total</th>
<th>IBT Speaking</th>
<th>OEPT</th>
<th>CEFR</th>
<th>CEFR Level Interpretations for Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110-120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1 is a level at which a student can <em>comfortably participate in all post-graduate activities including teaching</em>. It is not required for students entering university at undergraduate level. <em>Most international students who enter university at a B2 level would acquire a level close to or at C1 after living in the country for several years, and actively participating in all language activities encountered at university.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-109</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>B2 High</td>
<td>B2 was designed as the level required to participate independently in higher level language interaction. It is typically the level required to <em>be able to follow academic level instruction and to participate in academic education, including both coursework and student life.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-99</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B2 Low</td>
<td>B2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 High</td>
<td>B1 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 is <em>insufficient for full academic level participation in language activities</em>. A student at this level could ‘get by’ in everyday situations independently. To be successful in communication in university settings, <em>additional English language courses are required</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 or below</td>
<td>18 or below</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>A1-A2</td>
<td>A1 and A2 are <em>insufficient levels for academic level participation</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Council of Europe Estimates of Formal ESL instruction and CEFR Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEFR</th>
<th>Estimated in-class instructional hours to CEFR levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Approximately 90 - 100 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Approximately 180 - 200 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Approximately 350 - 400 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Approximately 500 - 600 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Approximately 700 - 800 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Approximately 1,000 - 1,200 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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