UNIVERSITY SENATE
Sixth Meeting, Monday, 23 March 2015, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AMENDED AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Patricia Hart

2. Approval of Minutes of 16 February 2015

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson
   Professor Patricia Hart

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

6. Question Time

7. Senate Document 14-6
   Classroom Improvement Resolution
   For Action
   Professor Michael Fosmire

8. Senate Document 14-7
   Nominees for Senate Vice-Chair
   For Action
   Professor Michael Hill

9. Senate Document 14-8
   Electronic Student Evaluations
   For Action
   Professor David Sanders

10. Senate Document 14-9
    Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy
    For Action
    Professor Levon Esters

11. (Updating Purdue’s Policy on Intellectual Property)
    For Information
    Research Integrity Officer Peter Dunn

12. Senate Document 14-10
    Resolution Supporting Creation of an
    English Language Center for Incoming International Students
    For Discussion
    Professor April Ginther

13. UCC Revisions to Senate Document 11-7
    Embedded Outcomes of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum
    For Discussion
    Professor Hal Kirkwood

14. Senate Document 14-4
    Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits for Senators
    For Discussion
    Senator Christopher Kulesza

15. Senate Document 14-12
    Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits for Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate
    For Discussion
    Senator Kulesza

16. New Business

17. Memorial Resolutions

18. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Sixth Meeting, Monday, 23 March 2015, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center


Guests: Leslie Charters, Dan Howell, Audeen Fentiman, Jessica Teets, Matthew Allen, Steve Abel, Joseph Paul, Stan Jastrzebski, Trent Klingerma, Christopher Munt, Ken Sandel, Brent Drake

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson Patricia Hart.

2. The minutes of the 16 February 2015 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

3. Senator Christopher Kulesza made a motion to amend the agenda to include an additional Senate document; Senate Document 14-12, Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits for the Chair and Vice-Chair. His motion was seconded and approved. The agenda was accepted as amended.

4. Professor Hart presented the remarks of the Chairperson (see Appendix A). Provost Debasish Dutta responded to Professor Hart’s remarks (see Appendix B).

5. Professor David Sanders 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.

6. At Question Time, Provost Dutta entertained questions from the floor.
Professor Kirk Alter critiqued the information on salaries and compensation provided by Provost Dutta. Provost Dutta replied that it is worth mentioning and reminding ourselves that we are investing in faculty. This represents a reaffirmation that the institution is reinvesting in the mission of the University. Provost Dutta explained that we compare ourselves with the AAU public universities and not only the members of the Big 10. This presents a broader picture that is better when comparing salaries and total compensation.

Professor Alan Friedman asked about the status of the restoration of the Common Reading Program that was approved by the Senate last year. Vice Provost Frank Dooley said that at this point, the Common Read is not intended to be part of BGR for 2015. As part of the reorganization of Student Academic Affairs, we are evaluating the concept of theme years as programs that are more extensive than a common read. For example, the /If/Then/ series which was launched through the efforts of Todd Wetzel and Purdue Convocations and will bring noted speakers to campus and classrooms.

Senator Kulesza asked if there had been any additional developments concerning graduate student salaries. He noted that West Lafayette has a cost-of-living that is among the highest in Indiana. In addition, the rental rates are also very high compared with other cities in Indiana. He mentioned this information as a response to data provided by Provost Dutta’s suggesting that the cost of living in West Lafayette was low and the low cost-of-living compensates, in part, for the lower salaries paid to Purdue academic employees. Provost Dutta said that graduate student salaries will be part of the ongoing discussion of salaries for academic employees.

Professor Joe Sinfield asked for data on full-time faculty numbers versus those who also have some administrative duties to determine if there is a boost in salary associated with added administrative duties. He would also like to see data comparing salaries for new hires versus salaries for professors who have been at Purdue for some time. He would like to see the data going back 5 to 10 years. Provost Dutta stated that those data can be obtained.

Professor Michael Fosmire asked for clarification of information on staff and faculty increases and decreases that were presented on one of the Provost’s slides. Chief Data Officer Brent Drake provided clarification of the numbers associated with the observed increases and decreases in staff and faculty. For example, the increases in faculty numbers are due primarily to an increase in the number of clinical faculty on campus. Professor Stephen Martin asked about the numbers for adjunct faculty members. Dr. Drake said that there has been an increase in the number of adjunct faculty, but he did not have an exact number at this time.

Professor Michael Fosmire, Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), introduced Senate Document 14-6, Classroom Improvement Resolution, for Action. A motion was made and seconded to approve this document. Professor Fosmire explained the rationale for the document and noted that changes had been made based on the discussion at the February Senate meeting. Professor Yuehwen Yih expressed a concern that increasing the active-learning classroom spaces will lead to a reduction in large classroom spaces. Vice Provost Dooley said that the active-learning center is not focused on large lecture classes, but is more concerned with classes where students and instructors are interacting more throughout the class time. Professor Fosmire emphasized that the University is trying to decrease the use of large
lecture halls when and where possible. However, this resolution does not deal with her concern about a decrease in large lecture spaces. The large lecture halls will probably remain as they are for now. Professor Evelyn Blackwood noted that one of the statements in the resolution was vague in that it does not specify which faculty and students will be consulted moving forward. Professor Fosmire said that this was more a statement of principle than something designed to specify who should be consulted. Professor Fosmire accepted a friendly amendment from Professor Evelyn Blackwood to recommend the following: “and it further be recommended that the University Resources Policy committee, the faculty and students are consulted to determine the most effective use of resources for transformation of the physical learning environment”. The discussion ended and the vote was taken. The motion to approve the document passed with 48 votes in favor of the document, 5 votes in opposition and 1 abstention.

8. Professor Michael Hill, Chair of the Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 14-7, Nominees for Vice-Chair of the Senate, for Action. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. Each candidate was provided several minutes to speak to the Senators. During his allotted time, Professor Stephen Beaudoin withdrew his name from consideration. Professor Ralph Kaufmann was not in attendance and his comments were read by Professor Hill. Professors Steven Collicott and David Sanders presented their comments to the Senate. In the initial vote, none of the three remaining candidates had a majority of the votes and a runoff was held between the top two nominees, Professors Collicott and Sanders. The initial runoff resulted in a tie vote. A second runoff vote was taken and Professor Sanders garnered the most votes and was declared the next Vice-Chair elect of the Senate.

9. Professor David Sanders introduced Senate Document 14-8, Electronic Student Evaluations, for Action. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. Professor Sanders accepted a friendly amendment from Professor Patrick Kain on a minor change in wording. During the discussion, several Senators expressed concerns about the document should it pass and be put into practice as an official University policy. For example, there could be potential issues with a violation of the contract should a syllabus get changed during the middle of the semester. As in the February Senate discussion, issues related to promotion and tenure also remain problematic. Professor Stephen Martin did speak in favor of the document. Following the discussion, the vote was taken. The motion to approve the document was defeated by a vote of 19 votes in favor of the document, 25 in opposition and 2 abstentions.

10. Professor Levon Esters, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented Senate Document 14-9, Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy, for Action. Professor Kain stated that he could not endorse the document in its current form in spite of productive conversations with Vice Provost Alyssa Panitch. Senators also expressed concerns about that academic freedom was not included as a major component of this document. Provost Dutta noted that the policies and procedures have been worked on for quite a while. He assured the Senators that when the academic freedom document is revised it will be no less than it is today. He also said that the promotion and tenure documents under consideration today doo have a statement about academic freedom. Vice Provost Panitch urged approval of this document an noted that the policies and procedures can still be worked to address concerns even after they are approved. Professor David Pick commended Vice Provost Panitch for her efforts on these documents but expressed a concern with the change in the appeal process. The old appeal process involved faculty members, but the new process only involves
administrators. Vice Provost Panitch said that the old process with a panel of three full professors to review appeals was opposed by many people on campus and so the new administrative review process for appeals was created. However, she does understand the concerns of Professor Pick’s colleagues on the Purdue Calumet campus. Professor Michael Zoltowski asked what is discoverable by a candidate if an appeal is filed. Vice Provost Panitch said that the entire document is not offered to the candidate. However, the candidate can get information from the department head and Dean about why they were not put forward for promotion. Professor Linda Prokopy spoke in support of Senate endorsement and noted that the documents were not perfect, but could be changed when needed are better than what we currently have for policies and procedures. The discussion ended and the vote was taken. The motion to approve Senate endorsement of the promotion and tenure policies and procedures passed with 32 votes in favor of the endorsement, 17 in opposition and 2 abstentions.

11. Research Integrity Officer Peter Dunn updated the Senate on Purdue’s policy on intellectual policies and recent changes made to the policy (see Appendix D). Following his presentation he entertained questions from the floor. Dr. Dunn said that additional questions can be sent to Executive Vice President for Research and Partnerships Suresh Garimella.

12. Professors Sandra Rossie, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), and April Ginther, SAC member, presented Senate Document 14-109, Resolution Supporting Creation of an English Language Center for Incoming International Students, for Discussion. Several Senators made suggestions to improve the wording of the document and Professor Rossie and Ginther said they will take these suggestions under consideration. In answer to a question from Professor Friedman, Professor Ginther said that the classes will be administered by the Center and this is explained in a supporting document that can be found on the Senate web site. Professor Kain noted that the proposal does not include a list of specific courses. Professor Ginther acknowledged that fact and said that our limit of 120 credit hours for graduation places constraints on specific offerings. Other universities require the courses, but do not count them towards graduation and do not have the constraints that have been imposed by our state legislators. Professor Shawn Whiteman asked about the use of USC and UIUC for comparisons of similar programs. Professor Ginther said that these institutions have large, well-established programs that have been successful. Professor Blackwood asked who will teach these courses. Professor Ginther said that the current plan is to have the courses taught by continuing term lecturers who have earned ESL Master’s degrees, at least in the pilot program. There is no current academic home for the program.

13. Professor Ryan Cabot from the Educational Policy Committee introduced Senate proposed revisions to Senate Document 11-7, Embedded Outcomes of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum, for Discussion. Professor Cabot highlighted the main points of the current 11 embedded outcomes and the amount of feedback that has been received since the policy was first put in place. The proposed revisions will streamline the embedded outcomes by repackaging them into three primary areas. The proposed changes will allow academic units flexibility while reducing the paperwork burden for all involved. The proposed changes are primarily administrative and do not change the substance of the existing requirements.

14. Senator Kulesza introduced two proposals for amendments to the Senate Bylaws:
Senate Document 14-4, *Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits*, and Senate Document 14-12, *Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate*, for Discussion. Senator Kulesza entertained questions from the floor concerning compensation for Senate leaders, the lame-duck nature of the current Senate Chair position and plans for transition. Senator Kulesza maintained that he is open to other suggestions for improving the proposed amendments.

15. No New Business was brought to the Senate floor.

16. One Memorial Resolution had been received for retired Clinical Assistant Professor of Management and Coordinator of the Management Communication Program, Bonnie L. Blake. Out of respect for their departed colleague, the Senators stood for a moment of silence.

17. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
Welcome to the March meeting of the University Senate
23 March 2015

We have a packed agenda, but there are several very important matters that must be addressed first. I’d like to start by saying that although the President and the Treasurer are not able to be with us today, I sent them my remarks in advance, as has been my custom all year, and we discussed them by email.

In late February, we saw a remarkable series of events. When the unveiling of a new leaves policy caused consternation, the chair of the Leaves Committee and the very top Human Resources people, who had just finished laboring for over a year and a half in private, were willing to stand up publicly in the PMU and explain it to 750 people who were very unhappy. They took criticism for over two hours. Through all of this, they have been tireless advocates for us as they have labored to carry out administrative directives in the best possible way.

That meeting was very powerful as we saw 500 staff members from all around campus, many of whom stood up and said their names to talk about how the policy affected them. But I was also happy to see several hundred faculty people there, including many of you.

We were there to reaffirm our long-revered values that the staff members are fundamental to our academic mission. People—both faculty and staff—don’t just work for Purdue; we are Purdue. Without all of us, the university does not exist.

If we don’t convey that loudly and clearly, what are we teaching our students?

Pushing the pause button to reconsider the leaves policy for rollout in 2016 was a good stopgap solution, but where do we go next?

We believe that all major budgetary and academic decisions should be done by inclusive and transparent procedures. This is a pivotal time in the life of Purdue, and everything needs to be out in the open. We need to make sure the entire budget is open so that the Budget Interpretation Evaluation and Review Committee (BIER), can examine it and see the evidence that we are financially sound and that the decisions we make today are good for the university of tomorrow.

Former senate chairs, Joan Fulton, Howard Zelaznik, Morry Levy, Ray Decarlo, David Williams, and others worked hard and made great strides toward building a practice of dialogue and transparency, and this is what we think should continue.

We in the senate leadership do not believe that simply reconvening the leaves committee and repeating the previous procedures—even with the addition of several staff and faculty members—is likely to yield good results. We are looking for
transparent and collaborative decision-making. Appointing one person from APSAC, one from CSSAC and one from the faculty to represent the complex work situations of everyone in the entire university to a committee that is otherwise made up of top administrators, where the plan was designed by a small subcommittee and where virtually all of the meetings were considered confidential, did not suffice, and was a clear departure from previously-respected procedures. Doubling or tripling the staff and faculty representation would still not recreate the process that has been respected in the past.

We recommend that the committee should operate openly, take minutes and post them on a website, and invite testimony. The committee should hold open forums at which all the proposed changes are known and can be discussed. That way, the process would be available for scrutiny in the Compensation and Benefits Committee, the University Resources Policy Committee, the Budget Interpretation Evaluation and Review Committee (BIER), and the entire joint Councils of the Administrative, Professional, Clerical, and Service Staffs. Questions can be put to the president and the treasurer at senate meetings along the way. Because the previous plan was announced in February for a July 1 roll-out, we think that this process could continue into next fall without creating any undue burden.

When the University Reduced retirement contribution by 29%, Rebalanced salaries with a one-time bump, and Required employee retirement contributions, the process was public. When they switched from TIAA-CREF to Fidelity, and when medical benefits were changed, a philosophy of transparency and dialogue was pursued, and that is what we would like for the Leaves Committee 2.0.

We need to know the motivations and goals for this change. The administration has told us that the new plan does not save money, and instead actually costs the university money, which puzzles us. For example, streamlining should theoretically lead to greater efficiency and long-term savings. But there is also the question of unfunded liability that needs to be discussed frankly and openly. This is the only way to rebuild trust. The current theme from the administration is two-fold: student affordability and cost-cutting. It doesn’t make sense to us that the administration would introduce a new policy that would cost, rather than save money, but if that is so, then we would like to understand how and why. We think a public discussion will be healthy.

No one would deny the basic premise that an institution must live within its resources, but the way we spend shows our institutional values.

The next item that I would like to bring up is of considerable importance to our ability to carry out our academic business, and should closely involve the University Resources Policy Committee and the Senate.
We have all read recently in *Purdue Today* that the management of academic space is scheduled to be moved out from under the Provost’s aegis to the Treasurer’s office. The Senate leadership requests that before this move occurs, the reasons for the change be discussed openly with the URPC and the whole Senate, and that the goals and procedures be transparent. From our vantage point, we think that the Provost, working in harmony with the deans, is best positioned to make smart use of the space we need in order to go about our basic business.

Because both the Treasurer and the President are in their first position in higher education and are not teachers, we remind them that they need to involve the academic side of campus in major decisions that affect teaching and learning. Ensuring a good match between course objectives and the physical classroom environment is critical to successful learning outcomes—and to meeting the Gallup metrics that bear our name. The physical classroom DOES make a difference for student learning.

We must have an open discussion of the reasons for this major shift. People have asked if this has to do with a desire to raise enrollments, or if there is a plan to commercialize some spaces, as was done when the Amazon store was opened in the Krach Leadership Center. We caution the administration that classroom occupancy is not like airline seats, where you overbook.

The initial public statements by the President and Treasurer do not demonstrate an understanding of the need of each unit to have flexibility. We need to be able to do a wide variety of things that are inconsistent with having every seat in every classroom filled at all times. All of us know that we need to be able to locate places to hold faculty and section meetings, job candidate presentations and teaching demonstrations, visiting speakers, workshops, grad conferences, and a wide variety of other things. We are concerned that those who are new to the academy may not fully understand the specific needs for certain kinds of spaces, and may not place the data collected into the correct context. What is more, a number of you have told me that not only are you not wasting space; some of your existing spaces are inadequate because they need substantial renovation and rehabilitation that will only become more and more expensive the longer it is put off. Collecting data about what spaces need renovation is an excellent idea. We think it is essential that some spaces continue to be managed within units. The fact that those spaces are not always filled to the limit is not evidence of waste and inefficiency, but rather of the bare minimum of flexibility that we need in order to operate as a top university. The Provost and Deans are best-positioned to take data generated and put them into context. Therefore we think that the transfer of space to the treasurer’s office should be postponed until these important questions can be answered openly and transparently so that the faculty can be a key part of such a major initiative in a collaborative and public way.

Finally, I would like to speak to you once more about raises and salaries. As we said in February, the 2012 COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey listed salary as the top faculty
concern, and the upcoming COACHE survey will be able to show us whether this concern has gone up or down.

The Senate leaders encourage a vigorous, data-driven conversation on all aspects of this important subject. The January Presidential Briefing stated, “overall, our faculties’ median salary is higher than our comparison group.” Many of you have written me to say that this statement does not tell the whole story, and that you believe that this matter deserves a more nuanced discussion. You tell us that the data provided by central administration over the past several years as a basis for guiding equity adjustments have tended to show that our average faculty salaries lag behind those of our peers. The OIR report of several years ago showed us at 11th place in comparison to our 14 peers, and we have seen data that seem to show us very low in the Big Ten.

We have seen what we believe to be reliable metrics that indicate that salary increases have not kept pace with inflation, and we would like a chance to compare figures. Reliable studies of programs all around campus demonstrate lagging salaries. The out-of-pocket expenses for healthcare have been increasing here at Purdue. This certainly has the effect of reducing spending power and in essence is a reduction in salary. We are told over and over that, because the cost of living is low in our area, our salaries are competitive. This overlooks several facts. One is the reality that the percentage amount contributed to retirement is in actual dollars. People who work at lower salaries have less real money saved for retirement (and they might not want to live in Lafayette when they retire). Another is that the “low cost of living” is already being used as an argument to offset the fact that Purdue is not located in an urban area where partner hires are more readily available, particularly in faculty positions. What’s more, with no ocean, no mountains, and no big-city excitement, we have to try harder to convince prospective hires. Since the contribution at Purdue toward retirement was decreased by 27-29% in 2008, we have also lost the argument that our salaries were much larger than they looked. We think this is a good time to ask if salaries have really kept pace with the promise to stay up with the market after that one-time bump.

The Senate reiterates that we ask the Provost’s office to assemble reliable data to paint a more nuanced picture of Purdue’s salaries in all parts of campus relative to our peers. It would also be relevant to look at is what longitudinal data tell us about whether the salary gap between Purdue and peers is growing or shrinking, by discipline. All of these data should be easy to find in one place, and should be updated regularly. Please refer to the handout on Faculty Salary Increases at the Big 10 Public Institutions for the past 5 years. It is pretty hard to argue with these numbers. We need faculty raises to be competitive. At this moment, we are only ahead of Wisconsin, and I doubt there is a single person here today who sees the Badgers’ current situation as ideal. We will need a 4-5% raise pool for each of the next two years to begin to climb back to the middle of the pack.
The staff need raises too. It is not possible to maintain excellence without recognizing the value of the human beings who work here.

There are other pressing budgetary items that time does not permit me to address. The graduate stipends are extremely low, and our needs and merit-based scholarships for underrepresented minorities fall far vastly below those of our peers. Lecturers are undercompensated and overburdened, with limited decision-making powers—but those are topics for another day.

Now I’d like to ask the Provost to take a few minutes to respond.

Provost Dutta?

Memorial Resolution March 23, 2015

Bonnie L. Blake
Retired Assistant Clinical Professor of Management and Coordinator of the Management Communication Program
Salary and Wage Costs

When you exclude athletics:

- **Faculty** are 23% of the workforce but 43% of salary and wage costs

- **Staff** are 77% of the workforce but 57% of salary and wage costs
## Headcount Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>8,107</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Staff</td>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Staff</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Staff</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Service</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research / Visiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IPEDS

- Excludes department heads and clinical faculty

Purdue | AAU Publics

$124,589 | $129,393
$89,946 | $90,000
$80,910 | $78,192

AAUP

- Excludes library faculty; includes visiting faculty and department heads
- Weighted to match Purdue’s headcount in each rank
  - Weights raise peer salaries

Purdue | AAU Publics Weighted to Purdue FTE

$130,600 | $139,600
$91,400 | $94,700
$80,700 | $82,900
AAUP adjusted or cost of living

- Purdue ranks 7th in AAU for salaries: 5th for compensation
- Without adjustment, 25th for salaries: 23rd for compensation

Based on Runzheimer Report of Living Costs Standards
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Alberto J. Rodriguez, Chairperson alberto-rodriguez12@purdue.edu
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CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email/Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Clarification</td>
<td>Senior IP Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Specific Questions</td>
<td>Calumet and North Central: Campus IP Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Wayne: Campus IP Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lafayette: Senior IP Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Identification of Purdue Intellectual Property
Intellectual Property that arises in any part in the course of employment or enrollment at the University, or in the course of a work-for-hire relationship or visiting scholar relationship with the University, is Purdue Intellectual Property, except as follows:

- The University permits authors to retain and manage the copyright to Instructional Copyrightable Works and Scholarly Copyrightable Works, subject to a license in favor of the University as set forth below.

- The University permits a student to retain title to Intellectual Property that the student creates for credit and without compensation in a University course through the use of course-wide resources, provided that the Intellectual Property is not burdened by any pre-existing contractual obligation of the University.

- The University permits software code to be contributed to open-source projects upon (1) the authorization of the funding sponsor and principal investigator (if any) for the coding project and (2) the consent of the University administrator(s), if any, who request or direct the coding project.

- Intellectual Property from research directed and funded under a work-for-hire contract administered by the University’s Sponsored Program Services is not Purdue Intellectual Property.

- Intellectual Property from research performed pursuant to a University contract that expressly exempts the research from the application of this policy is not Purdue Intellectual Property.

- Intellectual Property generated solely in the course of an Outside Activity without the use of University Resources or pre-existing Purdue Intellectual Property is not Purdue Intellectual Property.

Purdue License to Scholarly Copyrightable Works and Instructional Copyrightable Works

Each Instructional or Scholarly Copyrightable Work is, by operation of this policy, subject to a perpetual nonexclusive, royalty-free license from its University author(s) to the University to use, duplicate and distribute the Instructional or Scholarly Copyrightable Work for all research and educational purposes of the University.

Incorporation in Contracts and Permissions

This policy is deemed 1) a term and condition of employment for every employee of the University, 2) a term and condition of enrollment and attendance at the University by students, and 3) a term and condition of permission to participate in any University research or other academic activity by any person (whether or not employed by, compensated by or enrolled at the University). All such individuals are required to adhere to this policy and its supporting Procedures on Disclosure, Assignment and Commercialization of Intellectual Property.
REASON FOR THIS POLICY

Inventions, Copyrightable Works and other creative products of scholarship that have the potential to benefit the public through practical application may result from the activities of University employees in the course of their employment or through the use, by University students or by any person, of University Resources. The purpose of this policy is to provide the necessary incentives and protections to encourage the discovery and development of new knowledge, and its application and transfer for the public benefit. In so doing, the University is guided by the following goals:

- To optimize the environment and incentives for research and scholarship, and for the creation of new knowledge at the University;
- To enhance and protect the discovery, learning and engagement missions of the University;
- To recognize and protect the interests of the public; of individual creators of novel concepts, Inventions and materials; of the University; and of sponsors of research and scholarship;
- To bring the fruits of scholarship into practical use for the benefit of society as quickly and effectively as possible;
- To protect the traditional freedom of its faculty and staff to publish pedagogical, scholarly or artistic works.

INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES AFFECTED BY THIS POLICY

All individuals involved in the creation of Intellectual Property and the personnel responsible for administering the disclosure, assignment and/or commercialization of Purdue Intellectual Property.

EXCLUSIONS

None.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Creators of Intellectual Property

- Familiarize themselves with the definitions and requirements of this policy.
- Disclose Purdue Intellectual Property in accordance with this policy’s supporting procedures.
- Comply with instructions regarding custody and protection of Purdue Intellectual Property.
• Execute a general assignment of title for Purdue Intellectual Property in accordance with this policy’s supporting procedures.

**EVPRP**

• Provide oversight for the Senior IP Officer’s direction of disclosures of Purdue Intellectual Property.
• Make a determination, in consultation with University Legal Counsel, on the disposition of Purdue Intellectual Property in which a Supporting Organization determines not to invest.
• Determine, in accordance with this policy’s supporting procedures, the distribution of Net Proceeds.
• Convene an advisory committee as needed to address concerns arising from this policy or its supporting procedures.

**Senior IP Officer**

• Assist University researchers and Supporting Organizations in compliance and implementation of this policy.
• Direct disclosures of Purdue Intellectual Property and oversee applicable custodial arrangements.
• Recommend appropriate disposition of Purdue Intellectual Property in which a Supporting Organization determines not to invest.

**Campus IP Officer**

• Assist University researchers and Supporting Organizations in compliance and implementation of this policy.
• Oversee custodial arrangements for Tangible Research Properties and Research Data as directed by the Senior IP Officer.

**DEFINITIONS**

All defined terms are capitalized throughout the document. Additional defined terms may be found in the central Policy Glossary. Some of the terms defined below may be used only in the supporting procedures on Disclosure, Assignment and Commercialization of Intellectual Property.

**Campus IP Officer**
The person jointly designated by the Senior IP Officer and the Chancellor of a campus to lead the implementation of this policy on that campus.

**Commissioned Copyrightable Work**
A Copyrightable Work that is commissioned by the University or a funding sponsor. The following are specifically included within this definition if authored in connection with University teaching duties: curriculum designs and networked instructional resources.
Copyrightable Work
An original work of authorship which has been fixed in any tangible medium of expression and is eligible for protection under the copyright laws of the United States. Software code is a Copyrightable Work.

Instructional Copyrightable Work
A Copyrightable Work, other than a Commissioned Copyrightable Work, that is authored by a University faculty member or instructor primarily for the instruction of students.

Intellectual Property
The following types of property recognized under applicable law:

- An Invention and any associated patent application or patent
- A Copyrightable Work and any associated copyright or copyright registration
- A Trademark and any associated registration
- Research Data
- Tangible Research Property or other evidence produced in the course of research
- A trade secret
- An integrated circuit mask
- A plant variety protection certificate

Invention
An inventive conception and reduction to practice that is patent-eligible under the patent laws of the United States.

Net Proceeds
The gross cash royalties and other payments from the commercialization of Purdue Intellectual Property (whether by license or sale) less legal fees and any other out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the University or the Supporting Organization in connection with the legal protection and commercialization of the Purdue Intellectual Property.

Outside Activity
Activity of a University employee that (a) occurs entirely outside of his or her University employment and entirely without use of University Resources and (b) is authorized in accordance with the University policy on Conflicts of Commitment and Reportable Outside Activities (III.B.1).

Proprietary Software Code
A Copyrightable Work in the form of software code that is (a) either a Commissioned Copyrightable Work or authored in any part by University researchers with the aid of University Resources and (b) not contributed to an open-source coding project.

Purdue Intellectual Property
Intellectual Property in which the University or one of its Supporting Organizations asserts a right to own pursuant to this Policy.
Research Data
The recorded factual material commonly accepted in the research and scholarly communities as necessary to validate research findings, but not any of the following: preliminary analyses, drafts of scholarly manuscripts, plans for future research, peer reviews or communications with colleagues.

Scholarly Copyrightable Work
A Copyrightable Work created by any person subject to this policy primarily to express and preserve scholarship as evidence of academic advancement or academic accomplishment. Such works may include, but are not limited to, scholarly publications, journal articles, research bulletins, monographs, books, plays, poems, musical compositions and other works of artistic imagination, and works of students created in the course of their education, such as exams, projects, theses or dissertations, papers and articles.

Senior IP Officer
The person jointly designated by the University’s Executive Vice President for Research and Partnerships and the President of Purdue Research Foundation to lead the implementation of this policy system-wide.

Supporting Organization
Either of the following:

- Purdue Research Foundation (incorporated in Indiana)
- Boilermaker Health Innovations, Inc. (incorporated in Delaware)
- Purdue International, Inc. (incorporated in Indiana)

Tangible Research Property
Items produced in the course of research, such as compositions, biological materials, materials, drawings, devices and equipment.

Trademark
Any word, name, symbol or device, or any combination thereof, whether or not registered as a trademark, that is used to identify goods or services and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others.

University Resource
Any research support administered by or through Purdue University, including but not limited to funds, facilities, equipment or personnel.

RELATED DOCUMENTS, FORMS AND TOOLS
Procedures for Disclosure, Assignment and Commercialization of Intellectual Property: [URL]

Related Policies:
- Conflicts of Commitment and Reportable Outside Activities (III.B.1): www.purdue.edu/policies/ethics/iiib1.html


WEBSITE ADDRESS FOR THIS POLICY

www.purdue.edu/policies/academic-research-affairs/ia1.html

HISTORY AND UPDATES

[Date TBD]: Policy brought up to date and reformatted into current template with supporting procedures.

November 18, 2011: Policy number changed to I.A.1 (formerly VIII.4.1).


APPENDIX

There are no appendices to this policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-1 Reapportionment of the Senate</td>
<td>Steering Committee Professor David A. Sanders</td>
<td>*Approved 17 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-2 Evening Examinations Conflicts</td>
<td>EPC Professor Hal Kirkwood</td>
<td>*Approved 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-3</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-3 Proposed CSDR Regulation Changes</td>
<td>EPC Professor Hal Kirkwood</td>
<td>*Approved 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-4</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-4 Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits</td>
<td>PGSG President Christopher Kulesza</td>
<td>Removed 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-5</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-5 Beaudoin Senate Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor Levon Esters</td>
<td>*Approved 26 January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-6</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-6 Classroom Improvement Resolution</td>
<td>URPC Committee Professor Michael Fosmire</td>
<td>*Approved 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-7</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-7 Nominees for Senate Vice Chair</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professor Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Approved 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-8</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-8 Electronic Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Steering Committee Professor David Sanders</td>
<td>*Defeated 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Committee/Coordinator</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-9</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-9 Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-10</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-10 Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>For Discussion 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-7</td>
<td>UCC Revisions to Senate Document 11-7</td>
<td>EPC Professor Hal Kirkwood</td>
<td>For Discussion 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-12</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-12 Amendment to Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits for Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate</td>
<td>Senator Christopher Kulesza</td>
<td>For Discussion 23 March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>