UNIVERSITY SENATE
Second Meeting, Monday, 20 October 2008, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order  
   Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo

2. Approval of Minutes of 8 September 2008

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the President  
   President France A. Córdova

5. Report of the Chairperson  
   Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo

6. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees  
   For Information
   Professor Joan R. Fulton

7. Question Time

8. University Senate Document 08-2 Change to Section C of the University Code  
   For Discussion
   Professor David J. Williams

9. Faculty Representative Update on OnePurdue
   For Information
   Professor Howard N. Zelaznik

10. Issue Prioritization by Electronic Voting
    Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo

11. Report of the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee
    Professor David J. Williams

12. Report from the Budget Transparency Committee

13. Policy on Amorous Relations
    Vice President Alysa Rollock

14. New Business

15. Memorial Resolutions

16. Adjournment


Guests: Richard Buckius, Sara Conn, Dan Howell, and Brian Wallheimer.

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

2. The minutes of the meeting of 8 September 2008 were approved as distributed.

3. The agenda was presented and accepted by acclamation.

4. President France A. Córdova was not present at the meeting and no remarks were submitted.

5. Professor DeCarlo presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix A).
6. Professor Joan Fulton's presented, for information, the Résumé of Items under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix B). Professor Fulton asked for questions from the Senators, but none were forthcoming.

7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and no questions came from the floor.

8. Professor Williams asked for suspension of the rules in order to consider and vote on Senate Document 08-2, Change to Section C of the University Code. His request was seconded. There was no discussion and the motion to suspend the rules was passed by majority voice with two votes in opposition. Professor Williams then made a motion to approve this document. His motion for approval was seconded. Professor Williams asked Secretary of the Senate, Professor J. Camp to briefly describe the purpose of the document. Professor Camp explained that the document acknowledges the reality of the North Central campus academic autonomy. In addition, the document corrects the names of the governing bodies of the regional campuses. No discussion took place and Professor J. Paul Robinson called for the vote. The motion to approve the document passed by unanimous voice vote.

9. Professor Howard Zelaznik gave a brief report to the Senate as the faculty representative to the OnePurdue project. (See Appendix C) He invited the Senators to send any concerns and comments to him. He will ensure that these concerns are passed to the OnePurdue Applications Steering Committee when it meets.

10. The Chair indicated that the Senators would be voting on the importance of 18 issues, called the “DeCarlo 18”, but in truth were issues discussed with other senators, administrators and colleagues. At this time a discussion of each topic, its importance, lobbying for a particular issue, will be postponed till the November meeting. The voting at this Senate meeting was simply to get a sense of the Senate on the relative importance of these issues. The voting took place using clickers and the Senators voted four times on the issues to establish the first, second, third, and fourth priority. One could of course vote for the same issue four times in the true style of Chicago politics. Prior to voting, Hans from ITaP gave a quick tutorial on the use of clickers. After the brief explanation of the use of the clickers, the chair indicated how the weighting of the votes would take place (See Appendix D) and proceeded with voting process. Seventy votes were given for each priority. Voting results for each priority were illustrated as a bar graph for all to see. Budget transparency and Faculty/Staff compensation were high priorities. Results will be tabulated and sent out to the senate.

11. Professor Williams introduced a report from the ad hoc Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee (See Appendix E). The report is entitled Report of the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee. Professor Williams described the genesis of the report as follows:

"Last March the Steering Committee asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to look at the University-wide perceived difficulty by primary committees in evaluating interdisciplinary activities for promotion and tenure and make recommendations for how this can be better accomplished at Purdue University. An ad hoc committee was formed which consisted of some of the most experienced Purdue faculty in this matter. Professor Alan Beck served as the chair. You have in your material for today’s meeting a copy of this committee’s findings and recommendations, which are presented to you for information.
This report was unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and will be sent to the Provost for his action.”

Professor Alan Beck, *ad hoc* committee chair, then presented a brief background for the report, which was made available to all Senators a week before the October meeting. He suggested that all review the report and send any feedback to him. He will share any feedback with the *ad hoc* committee and a final version will be presented to the Provost in the near future.

Finally, Professor Williams commented that interdisciplinary activity is what makes up the great universities in the world and that we are behind our peers in recognizing and rewarding this activity.

11. Professor Charlene Sullivan presented an update on the Budget Transparency Committee. The members of the committee are Marilyn Hirth, Larry DeBoer, Dan Schendel, and Charlene Sullivan. The committee will have a report for the Senate by January 2009.

12. Vice President Alysa Rollock presented the draft of the University’s Policy on Amorous Relationships (See Appendix F). Following the introduction of the policy, Vice President Rollock took questions from the floor. Most of the questions dealt with clarification of the wording of the document and the thrust of the policy. In summary, Vice President Rollock emphasized that the policy does not prohibit amorous relationships between consenting adults unless one of the individuals is in a supervisory, instructor or other position of power. In those cases, the evaluative or supervisory relationship must be severed if the amorous relationship is to continue.

13. There was no new business.

14. No memorial resolutions had been received.

15. The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.
REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR RAYMOND A. DECARLO

Hello Everyone, Welcome to the second senate meeting of the 08-09 academic year.

Thank you for attending on this beautiful autumn day.

In the book, “If Aristotle Ran General Motors” Tom Morris quotes Kenneth Burke who I would like to paraphrase: if leadership were a choice between alternatives, leadership would be easy. Leadership is the formulation and selection of alternatives.

Along these lines, the senate officers will be asking for senate input on the selection of issues to be considered over the coming months. Specifically, later in the meeting we will be asking you to anonymously rank a variety of issues (also in the materials at your places), affectionately known as the DeCarlo 18. We will be using the “clickers” also at your places—if all clicks tee off smoothly, our hope is a par for the course. You will be able to tee off four times on each issue in the true style of Chicago politics; thank you Shawn for the suggestion.

At the November meeting we can have a dialogue about the issue ranking and the formulation or reformulation of the issues.

In addition to clicker voting, from the agenda you can see we will have reports today on (i) interdisciplinary initiatives, (ii) senate interaction with the OnePurdue team, (iii) budget transparency, and (iv) the new amorous relationships policy.

Given the President’s letter in this morning’s Purdue Today about the economic downturn potentially affecting our university funding, I think it all the more timely for budget transparency, again to have a senate-administration dialogue about the distribution of resources on this campus.

In terms of news items:

(i) With regard to the recent Board of Trustees meeting, the board passed a parental leave policy & approved strategic plans for Purdue Cal, Purdue Ft Wayne, & Purdue N. Central. Their strategic plans, as does ours, echoes aspirations to quality and excellence in education and research. The board also approved several professorial honors: Ed Delp was named the Silicon Valley Distinguished Professor of ECE, Charlie Bowman as Michael J. and Katherine R. Birck Professorship in ECE, Michael Zoltowski as the Thomas J. and Wendy Engibous Professor of ECE, Dr. Karen L. Fingerman to the Berner-Hanley Professorship in CDFS, and Professor Jeff Reuer to the Blake Family Endowed Chair in Strategic Management and Governance in the Krannert School.

(ii) As an update, the old policy on research misconduct, C22, went through its final stage of revision and is now in effect. To summarize the revision history, a rough draft was circulated for senate input. The Faculty Affairs Committee looked at the doc and endorsed a continued role of the chair of the faculty affairs committee in the investigative process. The Steering Committee simultaneously created an ad hoc committee to evaluate the document; a subcommittee of which worked with interim provost Victor Lechtenberg and Peter Dunn to incorporate committee input. This document came before the senate for an email vote to endorse or not endorse last April/May. During the voting process a variety of issues were raised. Peter Dunn noted the
issues and circulated the document to the other Purdue campuses. Due consideration was
given to the comments and suggestions that were raised through senate interaction. A group of
senate officers then met with Randy Woodson and Peter Dunn to go over what was changed
and why certain suggestions were not incorporated. After a lengthy discussion we agreed on a
finalized document. There were many hours of work and interaction by senate members and
our administration – it represents in my view a much improved set of procedures that we hope
will not have to be employed. The importance of the document lies in its setting forth
boundaries of conduct in the pursuit of “discovery” and thus protects “us” who make up this
community we call Purdue. Peter Dunn and our provost are present today to answer any
questions you may have with regard to the document.

If at all possible, I would ask your indulgence to postpone any lobbying or discussion of the
relative importance of the issues listed until the November meeting. Our hope is to get a sense
of the senate at this meeting.
TO: University Senate  
FROM: Joan R. Fulton, Chairperson, Steering Committee  
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE  
Joan R. Fulton, Chairperson  
mailto:dirus@purduecn.edu fultonj@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  
Raymond A. DeCarlo, Chairperson of the Senate  
decarlo@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  
William D. McInerney, Chairperson  
bmcinern@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  
Andrew Luescher, Chairperson  
Luescher@purdue.edu

1. Implementation of +/- grading  
2. Implementation of OnePurdue/Banner  
3. Forgiveness policy  
4. Course repeat policy  
5. Internationalization initiative  
6. Limit on credits for students on probation  
7. Remedial 1-credit course for students on probation

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
David J. Williams, Chairperson  
djw@purdue.edu

1. Interdisciplinary Research  
2. TIAA-CREF Task Force

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
H. Lee Weith, Chairperson  
weith@purdue.edu

1. Review of the Student Bill of Rights  
2. Follow-up concerning the Student Conduct Code  
3. Follow-up with Student Services Office concerning disciplinary process

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE  
Morris Levy, Chairperson  
levy0@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budgetary process: enhancing excellence in research and graduate education  
2. Review of campus energy sufficiency, safety, and other Physical Facilities operations  
3. Review of Faculty Committees

Chair of the Senate, Raymond A. DeCarlo, Decarlo@purdue.edu  
Vice Chair of the Senate, Howard N. Zelaznik, hnzelaz@purdue.edu  
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu  
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/usenate
**CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-1</td>
<td>Nominee for University Senate Student Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Professor William McInerney</td>
<td>Approved 9/8/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-2</td>
<td>Change to Section C of the University Code</td>
<td>Professor David J. Williams</td>
<td>Approved 10/20/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approved*
To: The University Senate  
From: University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Subject: Change to University Code  
References: University Code Sections C 2.00 & C 3.00  
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion  
Five-year Review Date: October 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SECTION C**  
COORDINATION OF UNIVERSITY FACULTIES | **SECTION C**  
COORDINATION OF UNIVERSITY FACULTIES |
| **C 2.00 Governing Bodies of the Faculties** | **C 2.00 Governing Bodies of the Faculties**  
The governing bodies of the faculties shall be the West Lafayette University Senate, the Calumet Faculty Senate, the Fort Wayne Faculty Senate, and the North Central Faculty Senate. The School of Engineering and Technology faculty and the School of Science faculty at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis are the governing bodies for their respective faculties. |
| **C 3.00 Composition of the Intercampus Faculty Council** | **C 3.00 Composition of the Intercampus Faculty Council**  
There shall be an Intercampus Faculty Council composed of:  
The chairperson and the immediate past chairperson of the University Senate as representatives of the West Lafayette and the North Central campuses; two representatives selected by the Calumet Council of Faculty Delegates; two representatives selected by the Purdue members of the Fort Wayne faculty senate; one member representing the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at Indianapolis and one member representing the Purdue School of Science at Indianapolis, each selected by the respective faculty governing bodies; the President of the University or his/her designee who shall serve as the coordinator of the council; the registrar of the West Lafayette campus; and the secretary of faculties who shall serve as secretary of the council.</td>
<td>Indianapolis and one member representing the Purdue School of Science at Indianapolis, each selected by the respective faculty governing bodies; the President of the University or his/her designee who shall serve as the coordinator of the council; the registrar of the West Lafayette campus; and the secretary of faculties who shall serve as secretary of the council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approving:**

A. Beck  
S. Bolton  
R. Plante  
A. Rollock  
C. Roper  
J. Story  
C. Sullivan  

**Absent:**

D. Buskirk  
W. Zinsmeister
FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE UPDATE ON ONEPURDUE
PROFESSOR HOWARD N. ZELAZNIK

I would like to thank Jim Almond, Lucia Anderson, John Beelke, Peg Fish, Lerry Halliday, Gerry McCartney, John Shipley, Jeff Whitten, and especially Larry Pherson for taking the need for faculty input so seriously.

There also were many business professionals involved in working with faculty to improve OnePurdue over the past two months.

In May, Ray Decarlo, along with Dan Leaird, Jim Braun, and me, met with the above thanked individuals to describe several crucial shortcomings with OnePurdue as it pertained to faculty productivity.

In September 2008 two meetings were held with business professionals and about half-dozen faculty.

First, was a meeting to help design the final form for excel downloads for grant reporting. This improvement in grant reporting was implemented with the September grant reports.

Second, a meeting facilitated by the Shelby Consulting group, with business and faculty resulted in a prioritized list for SRM (Purdue online shopping system) improvements. That list is still being finalized.

Third, Mike Ludwig, Director of Sponsored Program Services, has set up a new faculty driven AIMS (grant reporting system) users group, to help develop a new, more useful, and faculty friendly interface.

Finally, I am in regular meetings with Jim Almond concerning financial, reporting, grant issues related to faculty productivity, and therefore, I need to hear from faculty. Please talk with your faculty colleagues, and communicate with me about issues of that are important to all of us. I will get that information to the right person and report back to the Senate on a regular basis.

Thanks for your time.
ISSUE PRIORITIZATION BY ELECTRONIC VOTING
PROFESSOR RAYMOND A. DECARLO

1. **Staff Voting Rights:** Currently there is one staff representative who has speaking but no voting rights on the senate floor. Should the staff representative have voting rights?

2. **Core Curriculum:** What are the issues involved with implementing a university wide core curriculum as per the strategic plan? What are the costs, advantages, disadvantages?

3. **Graduate Education:** What can the senate do to promote graduate education? For example, the quality environment, support activities, dollarship vs. scholarship, academic standards, etc.

4. **Budget Transparency:** How is the pie split among the academic and non-academic units? What are the 10 year trends? Obtain info so that we can talk rationally about the distribution of resources on the campus.

5. **Teacher Evaluations:** What is the value and appropriate use of anonymous teaching evaluations? Should such evaluations from individuals who are not accountable for any of the answers or comments made be used in P&T discussions?

6. **Quality of Life:** What is the proper campus environment relative to work, benefits, health & fitness, enjoyment, etc.?

7. **Code of Conduct Revision:** The University code of conduct has not been updated since 1970’s.

8. **Policy on Academic Integrity:** A university policy (generated by faculty and administration) on integrity in all scholarly activities associated with teaching, discovery, and engagement.

9. **Policy on Administrative Integrity:** How can the senate develop a university policy (generated by faculty and administration) on integrity and transparency in all administrative dealings with faculty and staff?

10. **Named Grad Fellowships and TAs:** an endowed approach to fellowships and TAs to support our graduate students and to provide the freedom to pursue the scholarly type of research associated with a pre-eminent university.

11. **Faculty/Staff Club:** a conveniently located facility for faculty and staff to visit with each other, and to entertain visitors without having to drive around town.

12. ** Civility and Collegiality Policy:** “Collegiality is a complex issue in any workplace. In academia, with its culture of academic freedom and tolerance for different modes of expression,
the appropriate role of collegiality in performance evaluations raises even more questions than usual. In my view, there are at least three important aspects to collegiality in academe. There is the ethical imperative that we face in our professional roles; there is the task of assessing the extent to which collegiality affects job effectiveness; and there is the question of boundaries on the academy’s tolerance for lack of collegiality.” Unv. of Wyoming, Office of Academic Affairs, Myron B. Allen, Associate Vice President.

13. Mentoring Asst Profs: What is the role of senior faculty in affirming and encouraging scholarship, research endeavors, teaching proficiency, engagement activities, and constructively helping present associated achievements to primary committees for promotion and tenure evaluation?

14. Student Retention and Graduation: Generate directions and mechanisms for improving student retention and graduation rates without sacrificing standards.

15. International Faculty Collaboration/Exchange: Should the Senate explore the establishment of more formal programs for visiting faculty from and to other international universities in the pursuit of scholarly research?

16. Student Study Abroad Programs: Should the Senate explore the development of targeted study abroad programs in selected countries to provide experiential international understandings and global cultural experiences for our students.

17. Faculty/Staff Success: sponsored (educational/development) programs for faculty and staff to grow as professionals in their chosen careers or to grow into other careers.

18. Faculty/Staff compensation: Should the Senate make a philosophic statement about salary and benefits? For example, should raises be based solely on a dollar system, or on a percentage system? Should part of a salary increase be based on cost of living, or should salary raises be purely merit based? What should the relation be between average raises for faculty/staff and for Dean’s and higher?
Appendix E
20 October 2008

REPORT OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY INITIATIVES COMMITTEE
PROFESSOR DAVID J. WILLIAMS

Committee Members: Alan Beck (Chair), Susan Curtis, Robert Geahlen, Klod Kokini, George McCabe, Robert Plante, Elizabeth Taparowsky, Val Watts, and David Williams (ex officio)

“Customary practices regarding tenure decisions that have existed for decades have become entitlements. The rigid departmental structure has become outmoded. Many of the best opportunities for significant scholarship lie in multidisciplinary areas. Yet a comment in the Kellogg Commission letter is to the effect that society has problems; universities have departments.”

Editorial: "Evolution of Higher Education" by Philip H. Abelson
Science; 277 (5327): 747, 8 August 1997

PREAMBLE:

Purdue University’s Strategic Plan “New Synergies” emphasizes interdisciplinary activity; “Purdue University will set the pace for new interdisciplinary synergies that serve citizens worldwide with profound scientific, technological, social, and humanitarian impact on advancing societal prosperity and quality of life.”

In response the University Senate Steering Committee requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee charge a subcommittee to propose guidelines for the consideration of Interdisciplinary activity in promotion cases—the Interdisciplinary Initiatives Committee (IIC). The committee also considered related issues that could be used to promote and encourage interdisciplinary activities.

Interdisciplinary efforts are needed to solve many of the most important problems faced by our society. These activities provide opportunities for faculty to move into new academic fields. Such activities can provide rich rewards because the scientific and curricular activities of faculty are not limited by a set of disciplinary boundaries (e.g., colleges, schools, departments). Among the richest of these rewards is the opportunity to learn new things while simultaneously contributing to new applications.

In addition to meeting the intellectual and educational needs of a university, facilitating interdisciplinary activities also enhances the university’s ability to compete for external research funding. This is especially true when federal funding priorities include initiatives that promote interdisciplinary activity.

As important as interdisciplinary activities are, the organizational structure of universities, and thereby colleges, schools and departments, often run counter to the facilitation of interdisciplinary activities in general. Universities are traditionally organized by discipline. Hence, any truly interdisciplinary activity is generally neither commensurate with the goals of a discipline-focused organization nor to the incentive/reward/promotion systems that support it.

How does one embed a culture supportive of interdisciplinary activities within a discipline-focused structure? Revising the structure or at least the incentive systems that support it seems prudent. Acceptance among the faculty is critical, and we must be cognizant of the “discipline-focused” environment within which we currently operate. With the current career risk posed to junior faculty, it is incumbent upon the senior faculty to assume leadership in increasing desired interdisciplinary activity. It is also incumbent upon each department, school, or college to
support and encourage senior faculty to do so. To that end, we make the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1:

University promotion and tenure policy should explicitly recognize interdisciplinary activities. The university promotion policy should contain guidelines for considering interdisciplinary activities in promotion cases. These guidelines should provide mechanisms by which the importance of interdisciplinary activities could be highlighted during the promotion decision process. The development of these guidelines should assist in initiating a dialogue that will eventually lead to the inclusion of interdisciplinary efforts as positive and serious components of a promotion case. To begin this process, the template for faculty promotion documents should include categories for “interdisciplinary discovery”, “interdisciplinary learning”, and “interdisciplinary engagement”.

Recommendation 2:

Candidates should also include a statement highlighting their interdisciplinary activities. This statement should include the candidate’s relative contribution to the projects that are listed. It should also describe how this work has led to new opportunities as well as how these efforts have influenced the candidate’s overall development as a faculty member.

Recommendation 3:

It is recognized that the primary committee may have difficulty evaluating the strengths and significance of the interdisciplinary efforts. Therefore, departments/schools may wish to ask for additional input on the interdisciplinary accomplishments. This could include review from both Purdue and non-Purdue faculty. It may also include a statement of work and responsibilities from collaborators named by the candidate.

Recommendation 4:

The annual faculty evaluation system (i.e., activity reports) should be revised to clearly highlight the positive impact realized from interdisciplinary activities. To align incentives/rewards consistent with the strategic plan, each department/school/college template for faculty annual activity reports should include categories for interdisciplinary discovery, interdisciplinary learning, and interdisciplinary engagement.

Recommendation 5:

In recognition of the current career risks of interdisciplinary activity, particularly for junior faculty, leadership should be provided for supporting interdisciplinary activity at the lowest possible cost/risk to the faculty member. In our opinion, the best way to do this is to develop a structure for recognizing and rewarding interdisciplinary learning. One potential benefit of such interdisciplinary teaching, especially via the interdisciplinary teaching of graduate seminars, is the initiation of interdisciplinary research/discovery opportunities.

Recommendation 6:

The advancement of interdisciplinary activities will only occur through the leadership of our senior faculty. Broad-based senior faculty acceptance of the importance of interdisciplinary activity and their leadership in such activities is vital to the realization and sustainability of successful interdisciplinary activities. To this end, senior
faculty should provide mentorship and advise junior colleagues about interdisciplinary activity.

**Recommendation 7:**

Consistent with Purdue University’s strategic plan (and those subsequently developed by departments, schools and colleges), it may be useful to **annually track the number of interdisciplinary efforts that faculty are pursuing.** Over time, this would help to assess whether actions taken to increase/improve interdisciplinary activities have proved useful or more needs to be done.

**Approving:**
A. Beck          E. Taparowsky
S. Bolton        V. Thomas
R. Plante        W. Walton
A. Rollock       V. Watts
C. Roper         D. Williams
J. Story         R. Woodson
C. Sullivan      Y. Yih

**Absent:**
D. Buskirk
W. Zinsmeister
Policy on Amorous Relationships
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Statement of Policy

Purdue University is committed to maintaining an environment in which learning and discovery take place in a professional atmosphere of mutual respect and trust. Amorous relationships can develop within the University community between faculty, students, and staff.

The disparity of power between persons involved in amorous relationships between a student and a faculty member, a graduate teaching assistant, or any other Purdue employee who has educational responsibility over the student, supervisor and subordinate, or senior and junior colleagues in the same department or unit makes them susceptible to exploitation. Amorous relationships that occur in the context of educational or employment supervision and evaluation between a student and a faculty member, a graduate teaching assistant, or any other Purdue employee who has educational responsibility over the student, or supervisor and subordinate undermine professionalism and hinder the fulfillment of the University’s educational mission. Relationships between faculty and students are particularly susceptible to exploitation. The respect and trust accorded a member of the faculty by a student, as well as the power exercised by faculty in giving grades, approvals, or recommendations for future study and employment, make voluntary consent by the student suspect.

Those who abuse their power in the context of an amorous relationship where there is educational or employment supervision and evaluation violate their duty to the University community. Voluntary
Policy on Amorous Relationships

consent by the student or subordinate in a romantic or sexual relationship is difficult to determine given the asymmetric nature of the power structure in the relationship. Because of the complex and subtle effects of the power differential in the relationship, the individual with power may perceive the existence of consent that may not exist or not exist at the level perceived by the individual with power. The possibility exists that, if the relationship sours, these individuals may be subject to a claim of sexual harassment.

Amorous relationships may have an effect on others in the course, department or unit. Others may perceive that the student or subordinate in the amorous relationship is favored and afforded undue access and advantage above others in the same course, department or unit. These individuals may perceive the environment created as a result of the amorous relationship to be hostile and/or perceive forward progress and benefits are obtained through engaging in a romantic or sexual relationship with the person in power.

Therefore, Purdue University prohibits amorous relationships between a student and any Purdue employee who has educational responsibility over the student, and supervisors and subordinates where there is a supervisory or evaluative relationship between the parties. Individuals engaged in an amorous relationship in violation of this policy are subject to disciplinary action ranging from a written reprimand up to and including termination.

Individuals engaged in an amorous relationship prior to the existence of a supervisory or evaluative relationship within the educational and/or employment context, or who find themselves entering into such a relationship, have a duty to report the existence of the amorous relationship to the department or unit head who must ensure that arrangements are made to sever the supervisory or evaluative relationship between the parties. The parties must abide by the University Policy Concerning Nepotism.

Responsibility for the interpretation and enforcement of this policy rests with the Vice President for Human Relations.

Reason for Policy

Purdue University is committed to maintaining an environment in which learning and discovery take place in a professional atmosphere of mutual respect and trust. Amorous relationships that occur in the context of educational or employment supervision and evaluation between a student and a faculty member, a graduate teaching assistant, or any other Purdue employee who has educational responsibility over the student, or supervisor and subordinate undermine professionalism and are disruptive to the educational and work environment. Ultimately, amorous relationships hinder the fulfillment of the University’s educational mission.
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Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amorous Relationships</td>
<td>Romantic or sexual relationships, without the benefit of marriage, between two individuals of the opposite or same sex who mutually and consensually understand the relationship to be romantic and/or sexual in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational or Employment Supervision and Evaluation</td>
<td>To (A) assess, determine or influence (1) one’s academic or research performance, progress or potential, (2) one’s employment performance, progress or potential, (3) one’s entitlement to or eligibility for any institutionally conferred right, benefit or opportunity; or (B) to oversee, manage or direct one’s academic, research, employment, co-curricular, athletic or other institutionally prescribed activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Should Know This Policy

- President
- Provost
- Chancellors
- Vice Presidents
- Vice Provosts
- Vice Chancellors
- Deans
- Directors/Department Heads/Chairs
- Principal Investigators
- Faculty
- Business Office Staff
- Administrative and Professional Staff
- Clerical and Service Staff
- All Employees
- Undergraduate Students
- Graduate Students
- All University Community Members

Related Documents

- Executive Memorandum No. C-33, Antiharassment Policy
- Procedures for Resolving Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment
- Executive Memorandum No. C-37, University Policy Concerning Nepotism
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Contacts

Vice President for Human Relations
Alysa Christmas Rollock
(765) 49-45830
vphr@purdue.edu

Human Resource Services
John H. Beelke
(765) 49-47395

Affirmative Action Office
Diana Prieto
(765) 49-47253
aao@purdue.edu

Procedures

Concerns related to harassment are governed by the Procedures for Resolving Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment.

Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Human Relations</td>
<td>Interpretation and Enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History

This Policy supersedes the provision on amorous relationships previously contained in Executive Memorandum No. C-33, Antiharassment Policy, dated September 16, 1994.