AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

2. Approval of Minutes of 25 January 2016

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

5. Remarks of the President
   President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.

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

7. Question Time

8. Senate Document 15-6 Endorsement of the IFC Resolution on Collaborative Decision-making
   For Action
   Professors Duzinkiewicz, Niser, Wang and Watt

9. Senate Document 15-7 Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility
   For Discussion
   Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

10. Senate Document 15-8 Proposal Regarding Transcript Notations
    For Discussion
    Professor Ryan Cabot

11. Senate Document 15-9 Minimum Wage Resolution
    For Discussion
    Professor Russell Jones

12. Senate Document 15-10 Vice-Chair Nominees
    For Discussion
    Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

    For Discussion
    Professor Alberto Rodriguez

14. Evaluation of Women & Men STEM Professors: Possible Role of Gender Scripts
    For Information
    Professor Chris Sahley

15. New Business

16. Memorial Resolutions

17. Adjournment
1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson Kirk Alter.

2. The minutes of the 25 January 2016 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

3. The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Professor Alter presented the remarks of the Chairperson (see Appendix A).

5. President Daniels presented the remarks of the President (see Appendix B).

6. Professor David A. Sanders, Chair of the Steering Committee, presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix C). The Chairs or designees of the Senate standing committees briefly described the current activities of their respective committees.

7. At Question Time, President Daniels answered questions from the Senate floor.

- Professor Laurel Weldon asked why are seeing flat or reduced enrollment of international students. President Daniels suggested that the biggest factor is that we have raised the TOEFL score requirements. This has diminished the number of international students that are enrolled. We have seen an increase in the number of Indiana students enrolled and we have a strong applicant pool from other U.S. states.
- Professor David Sanders asked why the Recovery Act funds were omitted in previous years when calculating the research funding received. Presidents Daniels said that
in the business world this would be referred to as normalizing. If included in the total, these non-recurring funds would have raised the number to a target level that would be hard to achieve in succeeding years.

- Professor Charles Ross noted that the plans for the Innovation District to be developed to the southwest of campus will increase the distances traveled by people who come to campus. Have there been any plans for a light-rail system to transport these commuters? President Daniels said there had been no thoughts on building such a system. It is hoped that the businesses that locate in the development will employ the people who live in the planned housing close to the businesses. The airport’s location near this development should also prove beneficial.

- Professor Levon Esters asked if there were plans for graduate student and post-doctoral research housing in the Innovation District. The President said there are plans to have such housing, which is long overdue.

- Professor Kristina Bross asked if there were concrete plans to bring the airport back online, i.e. to get a regional carrier operating again. President Daniels answered that the University would like that to occur. In the past year, the University acquired the rights to run the airport. The airport was run by a private company until about a year ago. The Purdue Polytechnic Institute may run it in the future. It is hoped that with the planned business and housing developments near the airport, there will be sufficient demand to justify locating a regional carrier at the airport.

8. Professor Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Co-Coordinator of the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) and Senator from Purdue North Central presented, for Action Senate Document 15-6, **Endorsement of the IFC Resolution for Discussion on Collaborative Decision-making**. He was joined at the podium by the other Regional Campus Senators; Professors John Niser, Feng-Song Wang and Jeffrey Watt. Professor Duzinkiewicz introduced the document with a statement (see Appendix D). Professor Michael Hill made a motion to approve the document which was seconded by several Senators. The Regional Campus Senators made brief statements in support of the document’s approval. During the Discussion period, several Senators spoke about concerns they had with the document. Professor Richard Cosier stated that the phrase “major changes” was ambiguous and asked if any thought was given to changing the wording. Professor Duzinkiewicz suggested that this is the sort of issue that people could resolve among themselves. Perhaps a survey could be distributed to determine what people define as “major changes.” Professor Wang stated that the unification of the Calumet and North Central campuses was a major decision that was made without faculty input. In addition, other changes made by administrators over the summer often have major impacts on faculty, students and staff. Professor Alter said that the ongoing issues at the IPFW campus are also major. Professor Jorge Rodriguez spoke against the proposal and suggested that it would slow down the development and promulgation of important initiatives and policies necessary for the functioning of the University and its Regional Campuses. He also suggested that we should not confuse the executive roles of the President and Provost with the roles assigned to the faculty. Professor Niser acknowledged the concerns of Professor Rodriguez and then articulated a distinction between shared governance and shared ownership. He envisions the document as a reminder to all that there exist appropriate mechanisms for the opinion of the faculty to be heard by the administration. Professor Duzinkiewicz said that this was not an attempt to encroach on the administration’s prerogatives. Professor Weldon stated that the proposed resolution does not get to the heart of the matter as the concern is about timing. Senator Andrew Zeller made a motion to amend the document as follows (amended wording in **bold blue font**):
“THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The President, the Provost, the Board of Trustees, Chancellors and the rest of the Purdue administration be sensitive to the rights and responsibilities of the Faculty and announce all major initiatives that affect scholarship, teaching, and organization of Purdue while the University Senate and the regional campus Faculty Senates are in session.

These initiatives should then progress openly through the appropriate committee and then be discussed on the respective Senate floors before they are adopted.

His motion was seconded. Following a brief discussion, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 21 in favor to 47 opposed with 3 abstentions. Professor Monika Ivantysynova proposed a second rewording amendment as follows:

“THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The President, the Provost, the Board of Trustees, Chancellors and the rest of the Purdue administration announce and initiate all major changes that affect scholarship, teaching, and organization of Purdue while the University Senate and the regional campus Faculty Senates are in session.

Her amendment was seconded. Following a brief discussion, this amendment was defeated by a vote of 14 in favor to 54 opposed with 2 abstentions. Professor Alter in his role as Presiding Officer brought the discussion on the main motion to an end and the vote was taken. The vote on Senate Document 15-6 was 53 votes in favor, 14 opposed with 2 abstentions and the document passed with a strong majority in favor. It should be noted that the resolution document is non-binding on the administration.

9. Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill, Co-Chairs of the Senate Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 15-7, Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility, for Discussion. Professor Hill explained the rationale for the proposed changes (see Appendix E). Professor Cosier opposed the ineligibility of Department Heads and Assistant Department heads as defined in the document. Other Senators questioned the wording in reference to the maximum length of service allowed. The current wording suggests 8 semesters of continuous service will be the maximum, but several Senators thought that should read 14 semesters of continuous service will be the maximum for an individual Senator. Professor Alter charged the Nominating Committee the task of clarifying the wording. The document will be voted on at the March Senate meeting.

10. Professor Ryan Cabot, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), presented, for Discussion, Senate Document 15-8, Proposal Regarding Transcript Notations. Currently, some regulations contained in the University Student Regulations are in conflict with each other. This document will help clarify the regulations. In addition, there is currently no notation on a student’s transcript pertaining to the reason(s) a student is expelled or suspended from the University. If the student applies to another university, that institution’s admissions office will not know the underlying reason for the student’s dismissal from Purdue University. A lively discussion concerning the pros and cons of adding the notation followed. Cases that can lead to expulsion or suspension are referred to the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR). The OSRR is headed by Associate Dean Jeffrey Stefancic. In a recent year, ~1,300 cases were referred to the OSRR. Of these, ~ 25 students were suspended and ~7 students were expelled. Suspension or expulsion can be due to repeated acts that violate University regulations
(such as extreme or repeated academic dishonesty), theft of property, violent acts and Title IX violations, among other violations. Professor Niser suggested this could be a deterrent to student misbehavior and it was acknowledged as part of the discussion of the document during EPC deliberations. Professor Weldon and Professor Blaisdell commented on wording that needed clarification. The document will be voted on at the March Senate meeting.

11. Professor Russell Jones, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), introduced, for Discussion, **Senate Document 15-9, Minimum Wage Resolution**. A study was commissioned to determine the effect of raising the student minimum wage from $7.25/hour to $8.25/hour. According to the study, it would cost the University approximately $7 million/year to raise the minimum wage. In response to a question from Professor Julie Mariga, Professor Jones said that the proposal was written only to cover part-time student employees, not non-student employees. Professor Niser inquired if it would a system-wide policy. Professor Jones was unsure. Professor Patrick Kain suggested the policy could work against students if non-student employees could be hired to do the same work at the current, lower minimum wage. Professor Wayne Campbell recommended softening some of the introductory wording. Professor Evelyn Blackwood asked if this would apply to graduate student employees. It will not apply to graduate student employees. Professor Alter asked the President if this would be considered a lot of money. President Daniels thought that, if implemented, the policy would cost less than $7 million. The single biggest group of student employees are in housing and food services and many of them are already paid $7.75/hour and are half way to the proposed $8.25/hour. President Daniels mentioned that market forces are pushing Purdue in this direction, too. It was noted that IU raised the minimum wage to $8.25/hour but followed that with two rounds of increases in housing costs totaling 6%. It is not the intent of Purdue University to follow suit. This document will be voted on at the March Senate meeting.

12. Professors Carroll and Hill introduced **Senate Document 15-10, Nominees for Vice-Chair of the Senate**, for Discussion. They noted that nominees are welcome from the floor prior to the vote at the March Senate meeting. The nominees will speak to the Senate prior to the vote.

13. Professor Alberto Rodriguez, Chair of the Equity and Diversity Committee (E&DC), introduced **Senate Document 15-11, Resolution on Freedom of Expression**, for Discussion. This document elicited significant discussion from the Senate floor. Overall, the Senators supported the resolution. However, some Senators, in particular Professor Kain, expressed caution about creating an “injunctive norm,” as in the current wording. There was some discussion about the resolution’s statement about which faculty governance committees reviewed the policy, with debate about when and how the Senate leadership learned of the Board of Trustees’ and Student Government’s processes to adopt the principles. President Daniels noted that there are many good things in the resolution. This document will be voted on at the March Senate meeting.

14. Professor Chris Sahley presented, for Information, **Evaluation of Women and Men STEM Professors: Possible Role of Gender Scripts** (see **Appendix F**). Preliminary findings suggest that measurable negative bias exists in student evaluations of female STEM professors. Following the presentation, Professor Sahley and Professor Bruce Craig answered questions from the Senate floor.

15. No New Business was brought before the Senate.
16. No Memorial Resolutions had been received.

17. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
RESOLUTION

To: Purdue President, Provost, Board of Trustees, Chancellors, and other administration
From: Senators Janusz Duzinkiewicz, John Niser, Feng-Song Wang, Jeffrey Watt
Subject: Collaborative decision-making while the University Senate and regional campus Faculty Senates are in session
Disposition: University Senate for Endorsement
Reference: Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) Resolution 15.6

WHEREAS: The Senates in the Purdue system have well-established mechanisms for examining, recommending, and approving initiatives, both large and small, and

WHEREAS: The representative structures within the Purdue system are the Senates, and

WHEREAS: The Senators on the various campuses are elected by the faculty and represent them, and

WHEREAS: The best way to institute major changes is to take full advantage of the opportunities afforded by true shared governance, and

WHEREAS: Using these established structures will give the administration the security that a legitimate, broad, and balanced voice of the faculty is being heard, and

WHEREAS: Shared governance will yield the most productive results and will help avoid unintended consequences in any part the Purdue system, and

WHEREAS: The open and transparent discussion of major issues in the Senates is likely to discourage haste in important matters, and

WHEREAS: The creation of ad-hoc committees with hand-picked faculty members who are designated to “vet” significant policy change is not sufficient, and
WHEREAS: Such groups can give insights, but cannot ever be said truly to represent the faculty, and

WHEREAS: A resolution to this end has already been approved by the Purdue Intercampus Faculty Council,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The President, the Provost, the Board of Trustees, Chancellors, and the rest of the Purdue administration develop and announce all major changes that affect scholarship, teaching, and organization of Purdue while the University Senate and the regional campus Faculty Senates are in session.

All major initiatives should then progress openly through the appropriate committees and then be discussed on the respective Senate floors before they are adopted.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Intercampus Faculty Council,

Janusz Duzinkiewicz, John Niser, Feng-Song Wang and Jeffrey Watt
TO: The University Senate

FROM: Natalie Carroll & Michael Hill, Co-Chairs of the Nominating Committee

SUBJECT: Bylaws of the University Senate

DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

RATIONALE: Recent questions to the Nominating Committee suggest that changes to the Bylaws would clarify policy:

- Two-term limit for a senator is serving as a replacement (while a senator is on sabbatical, for example)
- Eligibility for service as Senate Vice-Chair and Chair

We would also like to specify that elections of senators take place via secret ballot.

Current Bylaw text with recommended changes in red/strikethrough:

2.03 Election of Senators

The normal term of an elected senator shall be three years, beginning on the June 1 following his/her election. A Senator can serve no more than 2 consecutive terms (3 years each) on Senate, with the exception of one or two semesters served as a replacement, for a maximum of 8 semesters of continuous service, unless elected as PU Senate Vice-Chair. In the event a Senator does not complete his or her term, a replacement Senator shall be elected for the remainder of the original term. After reapportionment of the senate in November, the individual faculties (see Section 2.00 b 5) will complete the election of senators who are to assume office on the coming June 1, and report the results to the secretary of the senate by February 1. Each faculty unit will set up their own methods for nomination and election of senators. Election must be by secret ballot (paper or online). They may provide alternates to serve, if an elected senator is unable to serve temporarily, or to replace a senator recalled on request of the senate.

3.20 Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate

b) At the regular February meeting of the University Senate the Nominating Committee shall nominate at least two members of the University Senate for the office of vice chairperson. Additional nominations shall be accepted from the floor at any time before the election. Nominees must be elected senators and members of the voting faculty with professorial rank.
Submitted by Nominating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voted for:</th>
<th>Voted Against:</th>
<th>Did Not Vote/Abstained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Carroll</td>
<td>Wayne W. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ji-Xin Cheng</td>
<td>Rick Cosier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hill</td>
<td>Julie Mariga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Nowack</td>
<td>Rusty Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulma Mohammed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: The University Senate Educational Policy Committee  
FROM: Educational Policy Committee  
SUBJECT: Transcript notations  
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion  
CAMPUSES: System wide  
REFERENCES: Student Regulations- Scholastic Records

RATIONALE:
Review of University policies and regulations has revealed occasional statements that do not align. The office of the Registrar and the Educational Policy Committee would like to clarify these statements. One of the issues involves notations of disciplinary actions on a student’s transcript. For instance, the policy on Regulations Governing Student Conduct, Disciplinary Proceedings and Appeals, section A.5 (Definitions-Degree Revocation) reads: “Degree revocation means rescinding a degree previously awarded by the University. In cases where a degree revocation sanction has been issued, it will be noted on the student’s academic transcript on a permanent basis.” While the academic regulation on Scholastic Records, section E. (Record of Actions on Transcripts) reads: “No entry of disciplinary action shall be recorded on transcripts”. In the spring of 2015, the Office of the Registrar was authorized to add notations to the transcript regarding degree revocation. EPC would like to formalize this change by explicitly stating which categories of disciplinary action will be noted on the transcript.

CURRENT
From the Academic Regulation on Scholastic Records, copies below and found electronically at the following address:
http://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/regulations_procedures/scholrecords.html

A  Good Standing
For purposes of reports and communications to other institutions or agencies, and in the absence of any further qualifications of the term, a student shall be considered in good standing unless he/she has been dismissed, suspended, or dropped from the University and not readmitted.

B  Transcripts
Any student or former student of the University whose record is not encumbered for any reasons described hereafter shall, upon written application to the registrar, be entitled to receive (1) a transcript of his/her complete record and/or (2) a certificate of completion. The registrar is authorized to issue such records upon the written request of the student or former student. The transcript shall consist of a full and complete copy of the student's academic record.

C  The Certificate of Completion
The certificate of completion shall contain: (1) the dates of attendance; (2)
a summary of the courses successfully completed; and (3) a statement, "This is a summary of the courses successfully completed. An official transcript showing all courses taken may be obtained from the registrar, upon authorization by the student." The certificate of completion shall be issued only to students who have completed at least two semesters of resident work in the University. A certificate fee shall be charged for each copy of this certificate.

D Encumbrance
A student's official record may be encumbered:

1. By the comptroller for nonpayment of fees, deposits, residence hall charges, or any other sums owed to the University.
2. By the Business Office Student Organizations, countersigned by the dean of students, in the case of a responsible officer or officers of any student organization that has a delinquent account due to the University.
3. By the dean of students for disciplinary reasons.
4. By the director of the Student Health Center countersigned by the dean of students, for medical reasons. A degree candidate who is in arrears to the University may be denied his/her diploma until his/her financial record is cleared.

The request for the encumbrance of a student's record shall be filed with the Office of the Registrar and shall indicate whether either or both the registration of the student and/or the issuance of a transcript, certificate of completion, or diploma is to be encumbered. When the record is thus encumbered, no transcript or certificate of completion shall be issued. Such encumbrances shall remain until the registrar is notified to disencumber the record by the officer responsible. It is the responsibility of the officer lifting the encumbrance to immediately notify the registrar so as to clear the record of the student.

Students in arrears to the University shall not be recommended for degrees. The clearance of a student's financial obligation on or before the Friday before commencement, or by a corresponding date in the first semester or in the summer session, shall be essential
for graduation. If a student so delinquent clears his/her obligation later, his/her diploma may be released.

E Record of Actions on Transcripts
No entry of disciplinary action shall be recorded on transcripts.

F Replacement of Diplomas (Board of Trustees minutes, July 10, 1975)
A replacement diploma shall be issued to the original holder, upon his/her affidavit, certifying to the loss or damage of the original diploma and upon payment of the cost of reproducing the diploma in its original format.

G Duplicate Diplomas (University Senate Document 12-3, February 18, 2013)
A duplicate diploma shall be issued to the original holder of the diploma upon payment of the cost of reproducing the duplicate diploma. The duplicate diploma will be marked as "Duplicate," in plain sight.

PROPOSED

A Good Standing
For purposes of reports and communications to other institutions or agencies, and in the absence of any further qualifications of the term, a student shall be considered in good standing unless he/she has been dismissed, suspended, or dropped from the University and not readmitted.

B Transcripts
Any student or former student of the University whose record is not encumbered for any reasons described hereafter shall, upon written application to the registrar, be entitled to receive (1) a transcript of his/her complete record and/or (2) a certificate of completion. The registrar is authorized to issue such records upon the written request of the student or former student. The transcript shall consist of a full and complete copy of the student's academic record.

C The Certificate of Completion
The certificate of completion shall contain: (1) the dates of attendance; (2) a summary of the courses successfully completed; and (3) a statement, "This is a summary of the courses successfully completed. An official transcript showing all courses taken may be obtained from the registrar, upon authorization by the student." The certificate of completion shall be issued only to students who have completed at least two semesters of resident work in the University. A certificate fee shall be charged for each
copy of this certificate.

D  Encumbrance
A student's official record may be encumbered:

1. By the comptroller for nonpayment of fees, deposits, residence hall charges, or any other sums owed to the University.
2. By the Business Office Student Organizations, countersigned by the dean of students, in the case of a responsible officer or officers of any student organization that has a delinquent account due to the University.
3. By the dean of students for disciplinary reasons.
4. By the director of the Student Health Center countersigned by the dean of students, for medical reasons. A degree candidate who is in arrears to the University may be denied his/her diploma until his/her financial record is cleared.

The request for the encumbrance of a student's record shall be filed with the Office of the Registrar and shall indicate whether either or both the registration of the student and/or the issuance of a transcript, certificate of completion, or diploma is to be encumbered. When the record is thus encumbered, no transcript or certificate of completion shall be issued. Such encumbrances shall remain until the registrar is notified to disencumber the record by the officer responsible. It is the responsibility of the officer lifting the encumbrance to immediately notify the registrar so as to clear the record of the student.

Students in arrears to the University shall not be recommended for degrees. The clearance of a student’s financial obligation on or before the Friday before commencement, or by a corresponding date in the first semester or in the summer session, shall be essential for graduation. If a student so delinquent clears his/her obligation later, his/her diploma may be released.

E  Record of Actions on Transcripts
No entry of disciplinary action shall be recorded on transcripts. Disciplinary actions will not be recorded on transcripts unless disciplinary
actions involve involuntary separation from the University (e.g., suspension and or expulsion), or degree revocation. In these instances, the following notations will be added to the transcript:

1. Suspension

The following statement will be added to the transcript while the suspension is in place. Once the suspension ends, regardless of whether or not the student returns to the University, the statement will no longer appear on the academic record.

“The student has been suspended until [insert date] due to violations of University regulations.”

2. Expulsion

The following statement will be added to the transcript and remain a permanent part of the transcript.

“The student was expelled due to violations of University regulations.”

3. Degree revocation

The following statement will be added to the transcript and remain a permanent part of the transcript.

“The student’s degree has been revoked and the student has been expelled due to violations of University regulations.”

F Replacement of Diplomas (Board of Trustees minutes, July 10, 1975)
A replacement diploma shall be issued to the original holder, upon his/her affidavit, certifying to the loss or damage of the original diploma and upon payment of the cost of reproducing the diploma in its original format.

G Duplicate Diplomas (University Senate Document 12-3, February 18, 2013)
A duplicate diploma shall be issued to the original holder of the diploma upon payment of the cost of reproducing the duplicate diploma. The duplicate diploma will be marked as "Duplicate," in plain sight.

Submitted by Educational Policy Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voted for:</th>
<th>Voted Against:</th>
<th>Did Not Vote/Abstained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Nelson</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Bonnie Blankenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dooley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Katherine Sermersheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Cabot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Kaufmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Ragland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donnie Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Slamovich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaitlyn Steffus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Kirkwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney Walton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Kain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng-Song Wang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hrycyna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Verdin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: The University Senate  
From: Russell Jones, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, amended from an original draft by Harry Targ  
Subject: Statement in support of raising the minimum wage of all part-time Purdue student employees to $8.25 an hour  
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion

WHEREAS: It is widely documented that current minimum wage levels at the state and nation level ($7.25) are inadequate for sustaining the basic necessities of life, and

WHEREAS: College and university students are forced to incur enormous debts to complete their college educations and large numbers of them work to help defer expenses and reduce that debt, and

WHEREAS: Purdue university employees who are eligible for benefits and are mostly full-time employed earn at least $8.25 an hour while 1,650 to 2,847 student part-time and temporary employees were paid $7.25 an hour, and

WHEREAS: 91% of those earning the current minimum wage are students (1,494 students), and

WHEREAS: Indiana University has recently raised its minimum wage to $8.25 an hour.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Purdue University Senate recommends that the university raise the minimum wage for part-time student employees to $8.25 an hour.

Respectfully submitted,  
Russell Jones, Chair  
Student Affairs Committee

Approve:  
Pam Aaltonen  
Mary Comer  
Edward Fox  
Matthew Ginzel  
Chad Jafvert  
Russell Jones  
Robert Nowack  
Sandra Rossie

Abstain:  
Stan Gelvin
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate
REFERENCES: Bylaws, Section 3.20a, b and c
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slate to serve as Vice Chairperson of the University Senate for the academic year 2016-2017. The nominees for Vice Chairperson are:

Mary Comer  Electrical and Computer Engineering
Clifford Fisher  Management
Alberto Rodriguez  Curriculum and Instruction

Candidate résumés are attached.

Mary Comer

Mary Comer is an Associate Professor in the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Purdue. She joined the faculty at Purdue in 2005. Since then, she has conducted research in the area of image processing, and has taught classes on probability, random variables, and random processes at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and on digital video, at the graduate level.

Professor Comer’s research involves the development of image modeling and analysis methods that can be used for a wide variety of applications and imaging modalities. She uses probability theory to model complex systems, and uses these models to perform tasks such as segmentation and object detection in images. The ultimate goal is to quantify information from images that are random in nature, in order to characterize systems that are not well understood. She collaborates with researchers in materials science and engineering, geosciences, chemistry, and neuroscience, and loves to work with people who ask the question, “I’ve collected all of this image data, now what do I do with it?”

Professor Comer’s teaching currently focuses on courses in probability for engineering students. These courses, one at the undergraduate and one at the graduate level, teach students how to model a random system mathematically using modern probability theory. She has spent many semesters learning how to make very difficult material accessible to as many students as possible, and enjoys the challenge.

Professor Comer has served on several departmental committees, and is currently a member of the Student Affairs Committee of the Senate. She is active in the International Institute of Electrical Engineers (IEEE), serving on technical committees for several IEEE conferences, as General Chair of the IEEE Southwest Symposium on Image Analysis and Interpretation in 2012, and as Area Chair on Statistical Model-Based Methods at the 2015 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing.
Clifford Fisher

Clifford Fisher is a Clinical Professor in Krannert School of Management at Purdue. Professor Fisher joined the faculty at Purdue in 2005. He teaches on the West Lafayette campus, and has taught graduate and undergraduate courses, over eight summers, in Germany and Italy for Purdue. Before coming to Purdue, he taught at Hanover College for 14 years. Prior to full-time academic endeavors, he worked as an Assistant City Attorney for the City of Bellingham in Washington, and as a Risk Manager for the City of Fresno in California. He taught as an adjunct for Western Washington University, California State University, Fresno, National University, California School of Professional Psychology, and the University of San Francisco, while working as an attorney and risk manager. Professor Fisher has two masters and two doctorates. He has been the recipient of the Murphy Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award, and has received 36 other teaching awards while at Purdue. He teaches in both the graduate and undergraduate programs in Krannert. Professor Fisher has publisher 20 business and law journal articles, since 2012, in both domestic and international journals. On behalf of Purdue, Professor Fisher or one of his coauthors have presented 23 papers, since 2012, at conferences in the U.K., Italy, France, China, Indonesia, U.A.E., Thailand, Canada, and the U.S. His coauthors have been colleagues from Purdue, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, University College Dublin, Purdue undergraduate and graduate students. He is an editorial board member and peer reviewer on a number of domestic and international journals. Professor Fisher is the Assistant Dean for Online Programs and Instructional Excellence for Krannert, and prior to that administrative position, he served for five years as the Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs for Krannert, served for eight years as the Academic Director for Undergraduate Programs for Krannert, and has served as the Assistant Dean for German International Graduate School of Management and Administration (GISMA) for Purdue. Professor Fisher has served on many departmental committees, and is currently a member of the University Senate Resources Policy Committee. Clifford Fisher is an attorney, and hopes you will not hold that against him. He is licensed to practice law in Washington and Indiana, and is licensed to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Alberto Rodriguez

Dr. Rodriguez is the Mary Endres Chair in Elementary Teacher Education and Professor of Cross-Cultural Science Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Purdue University. His research focuses on the use of sociotransformative constructivism (sTc) as a theoretical framework that merges cross-cultural education (as a theory of social justice) with social constructivism (as a theory of learning). Thus, Dr. Rodriguez is investigating how teachers can make their pedagogy and curriculum more culturally and socially relevant to all students, as well as how teachers can better integrate STEM across all curriculum subjects.

Dr. Rodriguez’s work has been published in the American Educational Research Journal, the Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Research in Science Education, the Journal of Teacher Education, Theory into Practice, and several other research journals. One of his previously published article, Strategies for counterresistance: Toward sociotransformative constructivism and learning to teach science for diversity and for understanding, was selected for a special issue of the Journal of Research in Science Teaching (JRST, 2011) in which 9 of the most influential science education articles in the previous 30 years were re-published and made widely available to educators and policy makers. According to the ISI Journal Citation Reports (2014), JRST is ranked
4/222 education and educational research journals. Dr. Rodriguez has also edited and co-edited four research-based books. The co-edited volume with Rick Kitchen (math education) entitled, *Preparing Prospective Mathematics and Science Teachers to Teach for Diversity: Promising Strategies for Transformative Action* (2005), was selected as an Outstanding Academic Title in 2005 by Choice Magazine. Dr. Rodriguez received the *Kappa Delta Pi – Teaching and Teacher Education Research Award* from the American Educational Research Association in 2000, and the New Mexico State University’s *Award for Exceptional Achievements in Creative Scholarly Activity in 2002*.

At Purdue, Dr. Rodriguez was the co-founder of the Senate Equity & Diversity and Committee (E&DC), and he has been elected Chair of this Committee twice since it was established a year and half ago. This committee is actively exploring ways to increase the recruitment, retention of faculty, students and staff, and a sub-committee is currently preparing a set of recommendations. Dr. Rodriguez is a member of the newly established Provost’s Advisory Committee on Diversity, and he is also a member of the Senate Faculty Committee. In addition, Dr. Rodriguez is serving in several other departmental and college level committees.

At the national and international levels, Dr. Rodriguez served as a member of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST) from 2000-2003. NARST is the largest global organization for science education research, and he has been nominated for President-elect (elections results will be posted later this month). Dr. Rodriguez also served as Chair and Program Chair of the Science Teaching and Learning Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association.
TO: The University Senate

FROM: Senate Equity & Diversity Committee

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Interpreting the Board of Trustees’ Statement on Freedom of Expression

DISPOSITION: University Senate Vote

REFERENCES: Board of Trustees Resolution on the “Chicago Principles”

Whereas, the University Senate strongly affirms the importance of the Freedom of Expression to the mission and functioning of institutions of higher education in general and to Purdue University specifically.

Whereas, free speech frequently has more negative implications on already marginalized populations than on majority populations.

Whereas, it is imperative that freedom of speech be exercised by individuals in power to condemn hateful speech and acts.

And whereas, the Senate Equity and Diversity Committee completed a review of the Board of Trustees Statement of Freedom and all other relevant university policies (see review below).

Be it resolved that the University Senate adopts the recommendations listed below in the Equity and Diversity Committee’s review of the Board of Trustees Statement of Freedom.

Review of the Purdue Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy Statement
University Senate—Equity and Diversity Committee

We understood our task to be reviewing the new Commitment to Freedom of Expression Statement adopted as official policy by the Board of Trustees as of 5/15/15 in order to consider the:

• Process of approval
• Issues of clarity of content
• Possible conflicts with existing policies (e.g., Anti-Harassment)
• Recommendations moving forward
As a committee, we clearly confirm the importance of the Freedom of Expression to the mission and functioning of institutions of higher education in general and to Purdue University specifically. We are however troubled that free speech frequently has more negative implications on already marginalized populations than on majority populations. Given this reality, it is imperative that freedom of speech be exercised by individuals in power to condemn hateful speech and acts.

Process of Approval

During the Spring of 2015, the PSG and the PGSG approved parallel resolutions to modify five existing Purdue policies (see attached copy of the full Board of Trustees resolution including Exhibits B1-B5) in order to enhance freedom of expression on campus. These resolutions were then brought to the BOT. The Board of Trustees not only approved the requested changes but also chose to approve a broader Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy Statement.

It is our understanding that at no point were the original resolutions or a draft of the Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy Statement shared with members of the University Senate or with the campus at large. It seems ironic that the process of review and approval of the Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy statement was not consistent with the content in terms of soliciting involvement of the broader university committee.

Clarity

In careful review of the resolution to adopt the Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement and the text of the policy statement, it is important to note the following points:

- The Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement pertains only to members of the University Community and to invited speakers
- The Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement does not apply to uninvited speakers who choose to offer perspectives to members of the university community
- When the Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement was adopted there were five other campus policies that were modified (see attached copy of the full resolution including Exhibits B1-B5). The substance of each changes appears to be:
  - Exhibit B1—pertains to modified language in university regulations governing student conduct, disciplinary proceedings, and appeals.
    - “Conduct Subject to Disciplinary Sanctions. The following actions constitute conduct for which students may be subject to informal action or disciplinary sanctions”: Disorderly conduct or expression, lewd, indecent, or obscene conduct or expression on University property or in connection with a University Activity.
    - Change eliminated “expression” in the prior statement.
  - Exhibit B2—pertains to modified language in university regulations in the bill of student rights
Change involved:
- a) addition of language related to the freedom of inquiry, thought, and expression,
- b) deletion of “hostile”, demeaning, or intimidating”, and
- c) addition of language that narrows the verbal or physical actions (i.e., “targeted conduct that is so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive”) that may be considered as detracting from the educational experience of others.

Exhibit B3—pertains to modified language of guidelines for speech and expression on campus.
- Change involved a complete revision of this policy from one that described the areas wherein freedom of expression could be exercised to an emphasis on how spaces have been specifically designated to facilitate “robust debate and the free exchange of ideas.” In addition, the last paragraph highlights that the policy is not intended to limit the right of student expression in other areas of campus and lists actions related to student expression (e.g., obstructing building entrances, walkways, and rights-of-way, obstructing vehicular or pedestrian traffic, interfering with classes, meeting, events or ceremonies) that will be considered disruptive to the functioning of the University.
- This policy appears to protect Freedom of Expression for all individuals who elect to speak on campus—invited or uninvited.

Exhibit B4—pertains to modified language of the university residence guidelines for bulletin boards.
- Change involved significant revision of this policy including:
  - a) deletion of requirement for approval of all notices and posters and addition that the Office of University Residences has the right to reject any posting that is inconsistent with University policies and state, local, and federal laws.
  - b) deletion of the statement “signs or displays containing profane, lewd, or indecent expression will be removed.”
  - c) addition of statement “promoting the use of alcohol and/or illegal substances is prohibited.”

Exhibit B5—pertains to modified language of the violent behavior policy.
- Change involved significant revision of the definition of “threat.” Most specifically, language was deleted and added that resulted in a narrowing of what would be considered a threat.
  - a) deletion of “an expression of intent to cause physical or mental harm or damage to property. A threat may be direct, indirect, conditional or veiled. Any threat is presumed to constitute a statement of intent.”
  - b) addition “a serious expression of intent to commit an act of unlawful violence to a particular individual or group of individuals
or to cause damage to another person’s property, or other conduct which threatens or endangers the health and safety of another person or another person’s property.”

Connection with Existing Policies

We reviewed the following policies:


With regard to the Anti-Harassment Policy:

- Harassment is defined as (taken directly from Purdue policy):
  - Conduct towards another person or identifiable group of persons that has the purpose or effect of:
    - Creating an intimidating or hostile educational environment, work environment or environment for participation in a University activity;
    - Unreasonably interfering with a person's educational environment, work environment or environment for participation in a University activity; or
    - Unreasonably affecting a person's educational or work opportunities or participation in a University activity.
  - Use of the term Harassment includes all forms of harassment, including Stalking, Racial Harassment, and Sexual Harassment.

- It appears then that in order to be harassment, verbal conduct would need to be intended to create or result in the creation of an intimidating or hostile environment that affects individuals’ opportunities or participation. According to Purdue policy, harassment has a clear focus on the effects of verbal conduct.
  - Who is it that assesses these effects?
  - When do verbal statements go beyond free expression and become harassment?

- Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech section (taken directly from Purdue’s Anti-harassment Policy):

Freedom of thought and expression are the lifeblood of our academic community and require an atmosphere of mutual respect among diverse persons, groups and ideas. The maintenance of mutually respectful behavior is a precondition for the vigorous exchange of ideas, and it is the policy of the University to promote such behavior in all forms of expression and conduct. The University reaffirms its commitment to freedom of speech as guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Accordingly, any form of speech or conduct that is protected by the First Amendment is not subject to this policy. The University reaffirms its commitment to academic
freedom, which is essential to its educational mission and is critical to diversity and intellectual life.

  - Is the emphasis on mutual respect, indicated here, as clearly stated in the new Freedom of Expression Statement?
  - Can students be expelled for drawing racist symbols? For using derogatory terms?
  - Is it true that Freedom of Speech, as guaranteed by the First Amendment, only protects individuals from being arrested?

With regard to Nondiscrimination Policy Statement:

  - When does free speech become discrimination?

Recommendations

  - Establish an injunctive norm (i.e., perceptions of which behaviors are typically approved or disapproved) regarding the condemnation of hateful, racist, sexist, and discriminatory acts on campus. Such a norm would assist faculty, staff, and students in determining what is acceptable and unacceptable social behavior and communicate the morals of the Purdue community.
    - Freedom of Expression protects the University officials’ condemnation of acts that derogate individuals or groups.
    - Administrators, especially those highest up including the president and the provost, need to issue clear, strong, and direct statements condemning hateful, racist, sexist, and discriminatory acts that derogate individuals and groups.
    - The University needs to respond when hateful language arises via social media outlets and offer clear, strong, and direct statements condemning hateful, racist, sexist, and discriminatory acts that derogate individuals and groups.
  - Develop required educational modules/courses for first-semester, first-year students to educate them on the importance of the Freedom of Expression in higher education and the Purdue Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement. This module needs to be integrated into Boiler Gold Rush and include personal appearance by the president who sets forth the injunctive norms.
    - Training needs to emphasize skill building regarding perspective-taking and the critical importance of civility and mutual respect. Most particularly, students need to gain an understanding that they and each of their peers come to campus with distinct backgrounds, cultures, and experiences.
    - Training needs to empower all students to use their ability to express their perspectives and beliefs, as many students come to campus with no experience expressing their ideas. In fact, many come from backgrounds where the expression of their perspectives and beliefs have been directly and indirectly hindered and suppressed.
• Train faculty, staff, and paraprofessionals (e.g., residence assistants) regarding when verbal conduct goes beyond Freedom of Expression and becomes harassment or discrimination. Training needs to be integrated into faculty training through online modules.
  o Training needs to educate faculty regarding how to effectively teach students about these distinctions and also regarding best practices in negotiating situations of harassment when they arise in the classroom setting
  o Training also needs to include educating faculty on how to foster an inclusive classroom where all perspectives and beliefs can be expressed and heard.
• Include direct links to Anti-Harassment Policy and Nondiscrimination Policy Statement to the left of the Statement of Freedom of Expression webpage.
• Delete the newly added statement to Exhibit B4: University Residence Guidelines for Bulletin Boards that indicates “promoting the use of alcohol and/or illegal substances is prohibited.” This statement limits freedom of speech.
• Revert back to the prior language for Exhibit B5: Policy on Violent Behavior:
  o “an expression of intent to cause physical or mental harm or damage to property. A threat may be direct, indirect, conditional or veiled. Any threat is presumed to constitute a statement of intent.”
• Add (in CAPS) the following language to the Violations of Policy and Sanctions section of the Anti-harassment Policy:
  o “PENALTY for conduct that constitutes Harassment as defined by policy are subject to enhancement when such conduct is motivated by bias based on a person’s legal protected status as defined by THE MOST INCLUSIVE of federal law, state law, or PURDUE POLICY (e.g., race, gender, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, color, age, national origin or ancestry, genetic information or disability.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SENATE DOCUMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>TITLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ORIGIN</strong></th>
<th><strong>SENATE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for the West Lafayette Campus</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor J. Stuart Bolton</td>
<td>*Approved 14 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-2</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-2 Revised Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for the West Lafayette Campus</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor J. Stuart Bolton</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-3</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-3 Reapportionment of the University Senate</td>
<td>University Steering Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-4</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-4 Statement of Support for the Faculty of the University of Iowa</td>
<td>University Senate Professor David A. Sanders</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-5</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-5 Public Statement in Support of Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>University Senate Equity and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-7</td>
<td>Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*For Discussion February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Committee/Group</td>
<td>Person(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-8</td>
<td>Proposal Regarding Transcript Notations</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Ryan Cabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-9</td>
<td>Minimum Wage Resolution</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Professor Russell Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-10</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Professors Natalie Carroll and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-11</td>
<td>Freedom of Speech Resolution</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Professor Alberto Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No remarks received.
Total Giving

Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Today - June</th>
<th>July - Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$159</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$106</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$222</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# of Individual Donors

- Today - June
- July - Today

Year:
- 2006: 47,905
- 2007: 49,383
- 2008: 46,746
- 2009: 44,892
- 2010: 46,826
- 2011: 44,838
- 2012: 44,909
- 2013: 44,435
- 2014: 43,982
- 2015: 49,412
- 2016: 49,448
# of Million Dollar Gifts

- **Today - June**
- **July - Today**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovation District

Goals:

• Work, live & play community within walking distance
• Make West Lafayette a national lifestyle showcase
Innovation District
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

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Kirk Alter, Chairperson of the Senate alterk@purdue.edu

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Michael A. Hill, Chairperson hillma@purdue.edu

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Ryan Cabot, Chairperson rcabot@purdue.edu

1. Provost’s procedures on minimum section and course enrollment
2. Concept of measuring critical thinking skills of Purdue students
3. Academic integrity at Purdue
4. Working with the Office of the Registrar to clarify student regulations and academic policy

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Alberto J. Rodriguez, Chairperson alberto-rodriguez12@purdue.edu

1. Completed review of BOT’s statement on freedom of expression.
2. Ad Hoc committee reviewing Affirmative Action Report and trends on recruitment and retention across campus.
3. Reviewing findings from COACHE survey.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Levon Esters, Chairperson lesters@purdue.edu

1. Teaching Evaluation
2. Minimum Class Size Policy

STUDENTAFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Russell Jones, Chairperson russjones@purdue.edu

1. We are presenting a resolution on a Student Wage Proposal at today’s Senate meeting.
2. We presented a statement of concern regarding The Forecast App to the Steering Committee relative to student privacy. This has resulted in the formation of a new task force which is studying the issue, and a delay in the release of the app.
3. We are discussing the need for increased staffing at Counseling and Psychological Services [CAPS].
4. We continue to work jointly with the EPC on the issues of academic dishonesty and the potential for a new grading policy.
5. We are working on a resolution for increased funding for the ESL Learning Center.
6. We are investigating the potential for a policy related to Student Leaves of Absence.

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
William Hutzel, Chairperson hutzelw@purdue.edu

1. Working through URPC’s Sustainability Subcommittee to update Purdue’s Sustainability Plan
2. Discussing the State Street Project with the Physical Facilities Office of Asset Management
3. Learning about a possible replacement to the Coeus Research Grant Management tool from Sponsored Programs

Chair of the Senate, Kirk Alter, alterk@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, David A. Sanders, retrovir@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
University Senate, 15 February 2016

Last month you were presented with a resolution authored by Prof. Patricia Hart (past chair of the Senate) and approved unanimously by the Intercampus Faculty Council. University Senate Chair Prof. Kirk Alter emphasized the significance of the proposal for fostering greater collaborative decision-making on each of the Purdue campuses and across the Purdue System. This month we ask that the Senate adopt this resolution.

At a time when, as President Daniel showed us last month, the value of a college education is being widely questioned, we need, more than ever, to work together to assure the health and relevance of higher education. As a community, we are devoted to expanding knowledge, deepening wisdom, sharing our understanding and experiences with our students, and no less is it our mission to teach these students how to think independently to better themselves and to contribute to the wellbeing of their local communities, our State and ultimately all of humankind. We, too, take seriously this obligation to serve our concentric communities. As a university we endeavor to make our decision making processes as efficient as possible and the decisions themselves as far-sighted as possible. This requires taking into consideration numerous stakeholders and innumerable factors. Experience has shown that collaborative decision-making can produce optimal results. Two of the groups essential to such collaboration are the administration and the faculty. We believe that cooperation will be strengthened by the adoption of Senate Document 15-6

The document is not perfect. The IFC considered the questions, observations and cautions raised at the Senate last month but decided to leave the wording as is. Collaborative decision-making depends not so much on texts as on habits and attitudes that grow organically over time. The present document should encourage such growth and, with time and practice, its role as a catalyst should pass as greater collaborative decision making within the established faculty governance structures becomes routine.

Janusz Duzinkiewicz,
University Senator (Purdue North Central)
Intercampus Faculty Council Co-Coordinator
Proposed By-law Changes

TO: The University Senate

FROM: The Nominating Committee

SUBJECT: Bylaws of the University Senate

DISPOSITION: University Senate Document 15-7 for Discussion

RATIONALE: Recent questions to the Nominating Committee suggest that changes to the Bylaws are needed to clarify senator elections

Presented by: Natalie Carroll & Michael Hill, Co-Chairs
Bylaw changes recommended:

- Two-term limit for a senator serving as a replacement for another faculty member (for example, while a senator is on sabbatical)
- Eligibility to serve as faculty representatives on the PU Senate
- Eligibility for service as Senate Vice-Chair and Chair
- Specify that elections of senators must take place via secret ballot of the faculty

Note: The Nominating Committee voted 5 to 4 in favor of these changes. The major concern of those voting against the document was with respect to the eligibility of faculty to serve on the senate.
Recommended Bylaw changes:

2.03 Election of Senators

The normal term of an elected senator shall be three years, beginning on the June 1 following his/her election. A Senator can serve no more than 2 consecutive terms (3 years each) on Senate, with the exception of one or two semesters served as a replacement, for a maximum of 8 semesters of continuous service, unless elected as PU Senate Vice-Chair. In the event a Senator does not complete his or her term, a replacement Senator shall be elected for the remainder of the original term. After reapportionment of the senate in November, the individual faculties (see Section 2.00 b 5) will complete the election of senators who are to assume office on the coming June 1, and report the results to the secretary of the senate by February 1. Each faculty unit will set up their own methods for nomination and election of senators. Only faculty in the categories of Tenure track and Clinical Track are eligible for election to the Purdue University Senate. Only faculty with a rank less than Department Head, or Associate or Assistant Department Heads with less than 50% commitment to academic administrative duties, are eligible to serve as senators. Election must be by secret ballot (paper or online). Faculty units may provide alternates to serve, if an elected senator is unable to serve temporarily, or to replace a senator recalled on request of the senate.
Recommended Bylaw changes:

3.20 Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate

b) At the regular February meeting of the University Senate the Nominating Committee shall nominate at least two members of the University Senate for the office of vice chairperson. Additional nominations shall be accepted from the floor at any time before the election. Nominees must be elected senators and members of the voting faculty with professorial rank.
Change 1

Proposed:
• The normal term of an elected senator shall be three years, beginning on the June 1 following his/her election. A Senator can serve no more than 2 consecutive terms (3 years each) on Senate, with the exception of one or two semesters served as a replacement, for a maximum of 8 semesters of continuous service, unless elected as PU Senate Vice-Chair.

Why?
• If someone serves the remaining 2 semesters of a Senator’s term, shouldn’t the individual be allowed to stand for elections as if the remaining term didn’t occur?

Why not?
• Because the senate voted on a 2-term rule, limiting total semesters to 6.
  • But the issue of completing terms of other Senators was mute in the By-laws
Proposed

• The individual faculties will set up their own methods for nomination and election of senators. Each faculty unit will request nominations – either self-nominated or by a nomination by a colleague and agreement by the nominee.

• Election must be by secret ballot (paper or online). Faculty units may provide alternates to serve.

Why?

• Some Senators were concerned that administrators in a few colleges appointed Senators.
  • In a simple Qualtrics survey of Senators, Hill found that among the respondents, 18% indicated that they were nominated by Department Heads.

• The objective is to ensure that the non-administrative faculty nominate Senators, making it a democratic process across the board.

• For volunteers, we believe that a secret ballot conforms to the developing process of secret votes in the Senate.
How were you nominated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>By colleague(s)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>By department head</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>By your Dean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change 3

• Only faculty in the categories of Tenure track and Clinical Track are eligible for election to the Purdue University Senate. Only faculty with a rank less than Department Head, or Associate or Assistant Department Heads with less than 50% commitment to academic administrative duties, are eligible to serve as senators.

Why?

• At what point does administrative duty supersede simple responsibility as a Senator, representing the general faculty viewpoint?

Vote:

• Majority for change as presented
  • Minority was for only barring faculty with administrative responsibility of Dean and above
Concerns with Possible Conflict Of Interest:

• If a line manager (involved with the Senate) and a Senator from the same institutional unit vehemently disagree with proposed upper administrative changes in a public forum
  • Might the Senator be put at risk of reprisal?
  • What impact might that have on promotion, tenure, salary increases etc?

• One Assistant Department Head, who had served as a Senator, considered that there was conflict of interest

• One Department Head, when promoted, admitted that they did not have the time to devote to Senate duties (should include involvement with Senate Standing Committees) and regretted that they did not resign when appointed as Head
Change 4

- Nominees must be elected senators and members of the voting faculty with professorial rank.

Why?
- The By-laws could be interpreted in various ways as written
  - For example, should a representative of the student body be able to serve as chair of the Senate?
The revised Bylaws would read (1):

2.03 Election of Senators

The normal term of an elected senator shall be three years, beginning on the June 1 following his/her election. A Senator can serve no more than 2 consecutive terms (3 years each) on Senate, with the exception of one or two semesters served as a replacement, for a maximum of 8 semesters of continuous service, unless elected as PU Senate Vice-Chair.

In the event a Senator does not complete his or her term, a replacement Senator shall be elected for the remainder of the original term. After reapportionment of the senate in November, the individual faculties (see Section 2.00 b 5) will complete the election of senators who are to assume office on the coming June 1, and report the results to the secretary of the senate by February 1.
The revised Bylaws would read (2):

2.03 Election of Senators

Each faculty unit will request nominations – either self-nominated or by a nomination by a colleague and agreement by the nominee. Only faculty in the categories of Tenure track and Clinical Track are eligible for election to the Purdue University Senate.

Only faculty with a rank less than Department Head, or Associate or Assistant Department Heads with less than 50% commitment to academic administrative duties, are eligible to serve as senators. Election must be by secret ballot (paper or online). Faculty units may provide alternates to serve, if an elected senator is unable to serve temporarily, or to replace a senator recalled on request of the senate.
The revised Bylaws would read (3):

3.20 Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the University Senate

b) At the regular February meeting of the University Senate the Nominating Committee shall nominate at least two members of the University Senate for the office of vice chairperson. Additional nominations shall be accepted from the floor at any time before the election. Nominees must be elected senators and members of the voting faculty with professorial rank.
Questions?  Comments?
ADVANCE-Purdue

Center for Faculty Success

February 15, 2016 – Presentation to Purdue Senate
NSF ADVANCE: Institutional Transformation

– To stem the leaks and eradicate the barriers, in 2001 NSF initiated the ADVANCE Institutional Transformation (IT) program for increasing the participation and contributions of women in the S&E workforce (www.nsf.gov/advance)

– ADVANCE IT award goal: to result in the “full participation of women in all levels of faculty and academic administration through the transformation of institutional practices, policies, climate and culture” (National Science Foundation, 2005)
ADVANCE-Purdue

Received NSF-ADVANCE grant in October 2008 (5-years, $3.9M) – now supported by the Office of the Provost

Goal is to transform the institution to create a more diverse science and engineering workforce.
Course Evaluation – Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses

Multidisciplinary Team:

Mary Ellen Bock, Professor, Statistics
Hao Ai, Graduate Student, Statistics
Elizabeth Hoffmann, Associate Professor, Sociology
David Nelson, Center for Instructional Excellence
Chris Sahley, Professor, Biological Sciences
The Data

Selection Criteria:
1) Undergraduate STEM Courses at the 100-400 level
2) Fall 2008 – Spring 2011- quantitative - 178,313 evals
3) Spring 2011 – qualitative – 13,428 evals
4) At least 10 students evaluated the course
5) Taught by non-tenured faculty; at least 5 course ratings

focus on question C2: “Overall, I rate this instructor as ...” (scale is 1-5)
Data Analysis

• Quantitative - a linear mixed model was used – average instructor rating across genders

• Qualitative - open ended answers were analyzed using the data software program Nvivo.
Quantitative Analysis Results: overall score was -0.467 that of men
Results: overall score was -0.467 that of men
Additional Insights

• The proportion of ratings below “3” among females is 8.05% while the proportion of ratings below “3” among males is 1.58%. (Ratings below 3.0 are usually a source of concern to Promotion and Tenure Committees.)

• The proportion of ratings of at least “4” among females is 48.85% while the proportion of ratings of at least “4” among males is 68.04%. (Ratings of at least “4” are usually reassuring to a Promotion and Tenure Committee.)
Qualitative Analysis - Gender Scripts

• Socially constructed – learn them as we are socialized into our societies

• One “performs” a particular script in reaction to the expectation of one’s social situation.

• Performance of gender scripts may include vocal tone, posture, and facial expressions, as well as actions and words.

• Includes the display of specific emotions in reaction to certain situations.
Emotional Labor

• Emotional labor: when the performance of certain emotions is part of one’s job

• Occupations that have traditionally been held by women (e.g., nurses), often require stereotypic “feminine emotional displays” (e.g., nurturing, soothing)

• Emotional labor is as essential to job as mental or physical labor.
Findings

Students wrote positive and negative reviews for both women and men professors.

However, women professors received far more evaluations about their emotional labor than male colleagues.
Both men and women professors: Comments about the course

• “The in-class writing assignments based on the readings help my writing ability.”

• “Exams should all be worth the same amount of points.”

• “Altogether I felt like I learned a lot from this class. Certain sections were better but all together it was a good class.”
Both men and women professors: Comments about the person

“Answers emails quickly.

“I learned a lot from him.”

“The professor was available frequently and stressed the importance of grammar. [sic]”
Women Professors: Emotional Labor

• In addition to what students wanted from men professors, students wanted women professors to perform on-going emotional labor.
  – Friendly and likeable
  – Encourages and enables students
  – Understanding, caring, and kind
Friendly and Likeable

“She provides useful feedback and is very nice and easy to talk to.”

“Always nice, friendly, accessible, and always laughing which helps relax classroom.”
Understanding, caring, and kind

“She cared about each one of her students, in class and out.”

“She makes everyone feel like their opinion is valued.”

“Very polite and understanding. EverReady to answer all types of questions.”
Must be pretty (only from male students)

“Be less beautiful so I can focus.”

“She is beautiful and she is very kind to everybody in our class. She smiles all the time.”

“You are a beautiful woman and I can see that you get flustered in class. If nothing else, I loved having you lecture the class and would enjoy being a personal friend of yours outside the class.”

“She had some really long legs she flaunted a lot, it was nice.”

“She’s hot! Smoking hot”
Criticism

“Be outgoing and happy, I think it makes the class fun and people want to learn more and worker harder when someone is fun to be with.”

“I think it would have killed her to smile just once.”

“Try to be attractive.”
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Barriers to women’s leadership

• unlike the explicit limitations on women that occurred under first-generation bias, the current form “erects powerful but subtle and often invisible barriers for women that arise from cultural assumptions and organizational structures, practices, and patterns of interaction that inadvertently benefit men while putting women at a disadvantage.”

• Resulting in environment that subtly discourages women and places them outside leadership paths.

• Such discouragement usually arrives in disguise: in an executive’s expression of frustration that, while the institution wants to promote women, only men can be considered for a position because all the women lack the “right” skill set;

Ibarra, Ely & Kolb 2013