AGENDA as AMENDED

1. Call to order
   Professor David A. Sanders

2. Approval of Minutes of 19 October 2016

3. Acceptance Agenda

4. Remarks of the Senate Chair
   Professor David A. Sanders

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

6. Question Time

7. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees
   For Information
   Professor Gerald E. Shively

8. Senate Document 16-02 Bylaws Revision Section 5.30 Equity and Diversity Committee
   For Action
   Professor Heather Servaty-Seib

9. Senate Document 16-03 Reapportionment of the Senate
   For Action
   Professor Gerald E. Shively

10. New Business

11. Presentation by the Director of Governmental Relations
    For Information
    Director of State Relations & Policy Analysis Anthony Hahn

12. Honors College Presentation
    For Information
    Professor Servaty-Seib & Associate Dean Emily Allen

13. Update from the Latino Cultural Center
    For Information
    Director of the Latino Cultural Center Carina Olaru

14. Memorial Resolutions

15. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Third Meeting, Monday, 21 November 2016, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center


Guests: Dan Carpenter (Student Success), Josie Galloway (Registrar), Mike Brzezinski (International Programs), Brent Drake (OIRAE), Trent Klingerman (Legal), Steve Schultz (Legal), Carina Olaru (LCC), Vikas Tomar (AAE), Sarah Faulkner (LA), Denny Darrow, (HR), Meghan Holden (LJ&C).

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

2. The minutes of the 19 October 2016 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

3. In order to accommodate schedules, the Agenda was amended to move New Business, Item 13, into the slot for Item 10. The following items were moved down, accordingly. The Agenda was accepted as amended.

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

5. President Daniels presented the remarks of the President (see Appendix B). Following his remarks, President Daniels mentioned that the IPFW Faculty Senate had passed a vote-of-no-confidence in the Chancellor, Vicky Carwein. He noted that a news release was put out from Purdue West Lafayette commenting on this issue. President Daniels and the Board of Trustees (BoT) support Chancellor Carwein and they desire that she remain Chancellor of IPFW. Regarding the issue of the change in authority for the Nursing and other Health Sciences programs at IPFW, President Daniels said he could not stress enough that this was not Purdue’s idea. The IPFW Nursing Program is very successful and growing. He emphasized that the matter of administrative authority is still under vigorous discussion and may come to fruition at the same time as the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP).

6. Question Time
   - Professor Kristina Bross had submitted the following written question: “What are the
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Peter Hollenbeck answered this question. “This is similar to the process that the Colleges go through every year – that is, each Dean decides how many faculty lines each Department gets permission to search for in the next Academic Year. However, the Provost ultimately has responsibility for, and holds, all faculty lines, and in the past it has not always been made clear how the Provost decided how many lines to allocate to each College. This year, he is making the rationale explicit by discussing with each Dean what the appropriate faculty size is for the mission of each College. To guide this discussion, they are using a set of data for the past 5 years that includes enrollment, credit hours taught, size of research enterprise, faculty turnover, and number of faculty lines left unfilled. Other issues, both quantitative and less quantitative, are brought to the table by each Dean in the discussion of their College. An underlying issue is that, at present, Purdue has some Colleges whose enrollments are shrinking and others that are bursting at the seams.”

Professor Bross then asked: “Are there specific goals for the student-faculty ratios?” Vice Provost Hollenbeck stated: “There is not a specific goal for student-faculty ratio, although in general most of us would wish it not to be too high. It varies among classes, departments, and on average across colleges. Different kinds of teaching require different ratios: the class I am currently teaching has a student: faculty ratio of 412:1. When a student pilot in AAT goes up with an instructor, the ratio is 1:1. One can certainly look at its trend for a particular unit over time, and also compare it to that of peer institutions, to get a sense of what is a reasonable ratio. The College averages for undergraduate student-faculty ratios range from around 7 [Education] to just over 20 [Engineering, PPI, Krannert].” President Daniels added that in the faculty expansion of the College of Engineering, the goal was to bring down the student: faculty ratio from 22+:1 to 19:1. Vice Provost Hollenbeck mentioned that we also consider the data from our peers. He reiterated that Purdue’s information is in the Data Digest. Finally, he noted that he seeks the information from other institutions for comparison’s sake.

Professor Laurel Weldon asked: “Are the ratios for tenure-track faculty only or are instructors in other categories included.” Tenure-track and continuing lecturers are included in the calculations.

Professor Sanders noted that there were differences in his presentation (see Appendix A) vs. the presentation from President Daniels and Trent Klingerman (see Appendix B). In addition, it is hard to know what has happened in BoT executive sessions. For example, information provided by the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor from IPFW differs from information in a previous presentation on the issue. The IPFW Vice Chancellor said there was an intervention by the BoT and it was an acceleration of the process. The events that happened in September were superseded by the events that occurred in October. Professor Sanders said that there were four resolutions from the IPFW Senate concerning the matter. Professor Sanders stated that the standards of faculty governance have been breached, according to the Senate at IPFW.
• Professor Weldon asked if there would be any type of statement coming from Purdue similar to what has been put out by other academic institutions concerning recent events in the U.S. following the November election. President Daniels said: “Numerous statements have been made, but he will not make a statement as it would be viewed as a commentary on the election and that is not a precedent we want to set. If there is a breach of the strong policy on anti-discrimination and fairness around here, we will pounce on it as we have in the past. Although other universities have chosen to make statements, this is the right course for Purdue. We will not do so in an anticipatory way.”

7. Professor Gerald Shively, 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.

8. Professor Heather Servaty-Seib, Vice-Chair of the Equity and Diversity Committee (E&DC), introduced, for Action, Senate Document 16-02, Bylaws Revision to Section 5.30 Equity and Diversity Committee. She provided the rationale for the revisions and highlighted the textual changes. The revisions will put the E&DC in line with the other Senate Standing Committees. A motion to approve was made and seconded. No discussion occurred and the document was approved with 55 votes in favor and 2 in opposition with 2 abstentions.

9. Professor Gerald Shively introduced, for Action, Senate Document 16-03, Reapportionment of the Senate. A motion to approve was made and seconded. During a brief discussion period, questions about the numbers associated with the Colleges were answered. The document was approved with 52 votes in favor and 5 in opposition with two abstentions.

10. Under New Business, Professor David Sanders relinquished the podium to Senate Vice-Chair Alberto Rodriguez. This allowed Professor Sanders to ask the Senate to consider Senate Document 16-04, University Senate Resolution on IPFW Program Restructuring, as New Business with the possibility of voting on it at the November Senate meeting, assuming approval of a motion to suspend the rules. Professor Rodriguez asked for a motion to suspend the rules. The motion was made and seconded. Motions to suspend the rules require approval by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting at a Senate meeting. The motion to suspend the rules was approved with 48 votes in favor and 7 in opposition with 2 abstentions. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. Several questions arose during the Discussion period prior to the vote.

Professor John Niser, Senator from IPFW, submitted a statement that summarizes his interpretation of the recent events at IPFW (see Appendix D). Professor Steven Landry noted that the Senate had heard two presentations; one that said there was faculty participation in the USAP and a second which suggested faculty were not involved in the USAP. Professor Sanders provided his summary of the issues as follows: Those present in the first year of the USAP Committee thought it was not a consultative process. The recommendations in September of 2016 were not the same as the ones put out in October of 2016 and that has led to the strife. The October recommendations were imposed on the campus. The drastic change between September and October ignored faculty governance. The administration at IPFW did not know that structures existed in the University System for dealing with changes in academic organization. Professor Niser
both agrees and disagrees with this summary as he was on the USAP Committee. There has to be a clear separation between what the USAP Committee was doing and what the departments and programs were going to do to deal with the challenges. All departments had faculty involved, even if the faculty governance procedures were not followed. Professor Niser posed the following question and comments: “Are we a system or are we not a system? That is at the heart of this current resolution. Where does faculty governance reside if we are a system? We do not really operate as a system. We do not even share learning outcomes. Is the University Senate representing the whole system?”

Professor Feng-Song Wang asked if Professor Mark Masters from the IPFW Senate could make a statement to the University Senate. Professor Rodriguez recognized Professor Masters. Professor Masters said he wanted to correct a few inaccuracies in the previous statements (see Appendix E). “First, the money losses IPFW has are not as severe as presented because they include funds going into reserves. IPFW is still losing money, but not as bad as presented. Enrollment drops were presented from the peak recessionary enrollment of 2011. Compared with pre-recession figures, the drops are not as severe.” Second, he wanted to correct Dr. Niser’s statements on the operation of the USAP Committee. “In the first year of USAP, faculty leadership was asked to help select faculty members on the Committee. Faculty leadership tried to move the USAP into the usual faculty governance structures, but the Chancellor refused to allow this. In year two, the faculty leadership was not asked to help select faculty nor was there a strong attempt to recruit College of Arts and Sciences faculty. Again, faculty leadership strenuously objected to the process and avoidance of faculty governance. Saying USAP had strong and broad faculty input is misleading.” As there are concerns about tenure when faculty members are moved from one department to another, Professor Weldon commented that it may not matter to the process in that tenure is a campus-specific matter. This may allow us to make a statement supporting tenure, even if this is not the appropriate venue. Where do we stand on tenure guarantees in the system? The concept and value are shared throughout system. Professor Alan Beck said his understanding is that tenure is not protected if a program is closed. This can have an incredible impact. Professor Sanders said that the Senate at IPFW and the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) have urged the University Senate to pass this resolution. Professor Ralph Kaufmann proposed a friendly amendment to slightly revise the text, as follows: “The Purdue University Senate expresses its concern about a breach of the principles of shared governance with respect to IPFW and urges the Purdue Board of Trustees and the IPFW administration to allow sufficient time for the Purdue University and IPFW Senates to exercise fully their advisory rights on program restructuring.” The discussion ended and the vote was taken. The motion to approve the document passed with 50 votes in favor, 6 in opposition with 2 abstentions.

11. An update was provided to the Senate by Anthony Hahn Director, State Relations and Policy Analysis. Following the presentation, Director Hahn took questions from the Senate floor.

- Professor Alan Friedman noted that declining state appropriations have led to proposals to change the relationship with the state such as becoming a private-public institution or completely private. It has been done in other states. University of Illinois may be close to a deal for that type of arrangement. Director Hahn said that the legislators in Indiana truly value the higher education system in the state. They know that economic development will come from the educational institutions and are critical to the state. It would take getting used to a hybrid system.

- Professor Donna Fekete said that she knows Director Hahn is involved with legislation that has already passed, but might be considered again, such as the stem
cell bill. Director Hahn said that once litigation has been filed, he lets counsel handle that. Professor Fekete asked: “How do we get included in the appeal discussion?” This is an excellent question. Director Hahn will have to send the question to the general counsel. After that, it can be determined how to provide input to the appeal process.

- Professor Larry DeBoer asked: “How proactive is Purdue in pushing beneficial ideas?” Director Hahn stated that some suggestions have been successful. For example, the partnership between West Lafayette and Purdue on the State Street Redevelopment project. Purdue is constantly looking for cooperation with various agencies. Anything where we can make a good case, to make us flexible and save money will be good to attempt.

- Professor Alberto Rodriguez asked: “Why do the allocations drop even though we are very valuable to the economy of the State?” Director Hahn explained that the performance funding formula from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (ICHE) is based on metrics that determine the amount of money that is given to each campus. Metrics vary among the various types of campuses. Legislators give a lot of power to the ICHE. Purdue West Lafayette funding has remained stagnant, while the regionals have had increases in funding. Professor Shively suggested that the funding formula has disadvantaged the mature campuses and favored the regional campuses. He asked if there would be any changes in this formula in the legislative branch. It was explained that the formula takes two, three-year averages and the delta is the difference between the two. The recent years of recession are now leading to declines at Ivy Tech and at the regional campuses. This suggests the formula is too reliant on enrollment. The ICHE may take a look at this. Professor Steve Beaudoin noted that a desirable Purdue might be considered a low-cost diploma mill. Is there an opportunity to engage the legislators about quality and suggest that not all programs should be at 120 credit hours? Director Hahn encourages any dialog with the ICHE faculty representative as well as Associate Provost Candiss Vibbert in the Provost’s Office. In addition, there are Saturday morning meetings between legislators and their constituents to make opinions known.

- Professor Sanders stated that the ICHE members were here in October, but he did not know about it and will work to ensure future leadership members are notified. Elimination of college tax credit was noted and the rationale for this was questioned. It is part of a larger tax reform effort, but it also forgoes ~$9 million dollars to the general revenue fund. The proposal disadvantages smaller campuses and privates even more. The final discussion topic concerned the effects of the dual-credit issue on the regional campuses and their funding.

12. Professor Heather Servaty-Seib presented, for Information, an update on the Honors College. Accompanying Professor Servaty-Seib to the podium was Honors College Associate Dean Emily Allen (see Appendix F).

13. The scheduled update from the Director of The Latino Cultural Center was postponed as Director Carina Olaru had to leave prior to the end of the Senate meeting.

14. One Memorial Resolution had been received for Irwin Tessman, Professor Emeritus of Biological Sciences. To honor their departed colleague, the Senate members stood for a moment of silence.

15. Having no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
To: The University Senate  
From: Equity and Diversity Committee  
Subject: Changes to Purdue University BYLAWS section 5.30 The Equity and Diversity Committee (EDC)  
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

The proposed changes are to reflect the administrative structural change in the Office of Provost and align the EDC committee structure with the standing committees of the University Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.30 The Equity and Diversity Committee (EDC)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.30 The Equity and Diversity Committee (EDC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Equity and Diversity Committee shall consist of 13 Senators (including Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary), 3 advisors, and 3 students (two undergraduate students and one graduate student). Two established <em>ex-officio</em> members shall be the Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Additional <em>ex-officio</em> members shall be invited as deemed appropriate by the EDC. The Purdue Student Government shall recommend the undergraduate students and the Purdue Graduate Student Government shall recommend the graduate student. Each student so chosen shall serve for a term of one year. Any member absent for more than two meetings will forfeit her/his membership on the Committee.</td>
<td>The Equity and Diversity Committee shall consist of 13 Senators (including Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary), 3 advisors, and 3 students (two undergraduate students and one graduate student). Two established <em>ex-officio</em> members shall be the <em>Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion</em> of the University or designee and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Additional <em>ex-officio</em> members shall be invited as deemed appropriate by the EDC. The Purdue Student Government shall recommend the undergraduate students and the Purdue Graduate Student Government shall recommend the graduate student. Each student so chosen shall serve for a term of one year. Any member absent for more than two meetings will forfeit her/his membership on the Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted by  
Linda Prokopy, EDC Chair

Resolution approved at the September 21, 2016 EDC meeting
Approved
Stewart Chang Alexander
Bharat Bhargava
Tithi Bhattacharya
Mimi Boutin
James Mohler
Shankali Pradhan (PGSG rep)
Linda Prokopy (chair)
Catherine Fraser Riehle
Heather Servaty-Seib (vice-chair)
Tatyana Sizyuk
Tulika Wagle (PSG rep)
Feng-Song Wang
Kip Williams
Lowell Kane (advisor)
Loran Parker (advisor)
Alysa Rollock (advisor)

Abstentions/no votes: none

Resolution with minor edits approved via email by EDC Committee

Approved
Bharat Bhargava
Mimi Boutin
Linda Prokopy (chair)
Catherine Fraser Riehle
Julie Mariga
Heather Servaty-Seib (vice-chair)
Tatyana Sizyuk
Feng-Song Wang
Kip Williams
Lowell Kane (advisor)
Loran Parker (advisor)
Alysa Rollock (advisor)

Abstentions/no votes: none
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Reapportionment of the University Senate
REFERENCE: University Senate Document 90-5; University Code D 3.00; Bylaws of the University Senate, Items 2.00 and 2.01
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Approval and Faculty Units

Section D 3.00 of the University Code and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred two members. Ten of these are specified in the items 1 through 10 below. The other slots will be apportioned among the West Lafayette faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two Senators. There are 2196 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette campus. When this number is divided by ninety-two the result is 23.87. Therefore, to qualify for two Senators, a faculty unit should have at least 48 voting faculty members. However, since no faculty unit can have fewer than two Senators, the Libraries unit qualifies for two Senators with 41 faculty members. The remaining units have a total of 2155 voting faculty members with ninety Senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The apportionment of Senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 23.87. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 13.41; Education, 2.89; Engineering, 17.51; Health & Human Sciences, 9.34; Liberal Arts, 12.32; Management, 4.61; Pharmacy, 3.18; Science, 14.03; Purdue Polytechnic Institute, 8.21; Veterinary Medicine, 4.78. In order to achieve the desired 90 Senators the faculty units were rounded to the nearest integer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Voting Fac. Members</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>No. Voting Fac. Members</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 October 2015</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>31 October 2016</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Sciences</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Polytechnic</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas Represented
1. President
2. Chief Academic Officer
3. Chief Fiscal Officer
4. Chairperson of the Senate
5. Vice-Chairperson of the Senate
6. Purdue Northwest
7. Fort Wayne Campus
8. IUPUI Campus
9. Undergraduate Student
10. Graduate Student
11. Faculty Units

Approving
Jo Ann Banks
Alan Beck
Kristina Bross
Michael Hill
David Sanders
Gerald Shively
To: The University Senate
From: David Sanders
Subject: IPFW Program Restructuring
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

WHEREAS: Purdue University has a strong and abiding commitment to the value of the liberal arts and the principles of shared governance and

WHEREAS: Purdue University is associated with the Indiana University Purdue University campus in Fort Wayne (IPFW); and

WHEREAS: Faculty governance bodies at IPFW have protested the implementation of restructuring proposals, including the elimination of degree programs, on their campus as failing to abide by procedures for shared governance; and

WHEREAS: The Purdue University Code states, “Among other responsibilities necessary to meet the obligations of its general powers, the faculty Advise the president and the Board of Trustees concerning any proposed changes [emphasis added] in the academic organization of the University*;” and

WHEREAS: The charge to the Purdue University Senate Academic Organization Committee is that “the committee shall be concerned with changes in academic organization having a significant impact on the intellectual atmosphere and functioning of the university on all of its campuses, e.g., elimination or consolidation of existing departments [emphasis added] and schools; and the establishment of interdepartmental institutes and centers.”
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Purdue University Senate expresses its concern about a breach of the principles of shared governance with respect to IPFW and urges the Purdue Board of Trustees and the IPFW administration to allow sufficient time for the Purdue University and IPFW Senates to exercise fully their advisory rights on program restructuring.

*Purdue University Code Part II Section A 4.05 paragraph h.

Respectfully submitted by
David Sanders
STATE RELATIONS TEAM

Julie Griffith
Vice President
For Public Affairs

Susan Brock Williams
Director Governmental Relations

Tony Hahn
Director
State Relations & Policy Analysis
STATE GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS MAINTAINS A CONTINUOUS FLOW OF INFORMATION BETWEEN PURDUE AND STATE GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES

- Monitoring and affecting legislation of interest to the University
- Coordinating University-related contacts with elected officials and staff
- Working with the Indiana Commission for Higher Education
- Responding to requests for information from the legislature and executive branch
INTERACTION ACROSS STATE GOVERNMENT

• General Assembly, LSA
• Indiana Commission for Higher Education (ICHE)
• IDOE, IDEM, DNR, IDOR, DNR, ISDA, INDOT, OCRA, SBA, BMV, DWD, SBOA, INPRS, BOAH, OISC, IFA, Lt. Gov, OMB, National Guard
• Interim study committees
• State Budget Committee
• Capital project state approvals
LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

• Part-time legislature
• Biennial budget
• Wide ranging topics
• Construction delivery methods/public works
• Pension
• Dual Credit
• Veteran student issues
• Local Technical Assistance
LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

- Articulation agreements
- Tax Credits
- Teacher Prep Programs
- Ag issues affecting State Chemist
- State financial aid programs/ Student debt
- Patent Protection
- Unmanned Aerial Systems
- Degree Mapping
Questions???
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-13</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-13 Student Affairs Committee English Language Support Resolution</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee Professor Russell Jones</td>
<td>*Approved 19 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-19 Resolution on Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention</td>
<td>Professors Alberto Rodriguez</td>
<td>*Approved 19 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>Senate Document 16-01 Resolution on Immigrants, International Students &amp; Scholars and Visitors to Purdue University</td>
<td>Equity and Diversity Committee Professor Linda Prokopy and Professor Feng-Song Wang</td>
<td>*Approved 12 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-2</td>
<td>Senate Document 16-01 Bylaws Revision Section 5.30</td>
<td>Equity and Diversity Committee Professor Heather Servaty-Seib</td>
<td>*Approved 21 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-3</td>
<td>Reapportionment of the Senate</td>
<td>Steering Committee Professor Gerald Shively</td>
<td>*Approved 21 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-4</td>
<td>University Senate Resolution on IPFW Program Restructuring</td>
<td>Senate Chair – Professor David Sanders</td>
<td>*Approved 21 November 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorial Resolution for Irwin Tessman
Professor Emeritus of Biological Sciences
1929-2016

Irwin Tessman, 86, of West Lafayette, passed away on Friday, November 4, 2016. He was born November 24, 1929, in Brooklyn, NY, to the late Morris and Anna Tessman. He married Ethel Stolzenberg who preceded him in death. A son Adam was born to Irwin & Ethyl, and he survives.

Irwin Tessman received his PhD degree in physics from Yale University in 1954 and did postdoctoral research in biophysics at Cornell University. He continued his research at MIT before joining the Purdue Biological Sciences faculty with his wife, Ethel, in 1959. After a short respite at the University of California at Irvine, they returned to Purdue.

Professor Tessman studied the effects of radiation-induced mutations on bacterial cells and viruses and did careful, quantitative work. These studies on viruses gained wide recognition. A primary contribution was to provide convincing evidence for the existence of a bacterial virus that contained only one part of the genetic complement, i.e. a so-called “single-stranded molecule.” This was a major departure from the accepted dogma and extended the appreciation of the broad range of living material. He did further detailed research on the ability of cells to repair genetic damage. All of his biological research was basic to our fundamental understanding of living cells.

Irwin was a brilliant, eclectic scholar and set very high standards for his own research and that of others. He relished his role as a “feuilletonist,” a contributor of short essays on a variety of topics. Professor Tessman delighted in carefully analyzing the commentary and research of others and making detailed responses. He especially enjoyed uncovering the statistical flaws in arguments and exploring the influence of evolution on all aspects of life. He taught demanding and very interesting courses to upper-division biology majors. Irwin was well respected in academia, and his advice on a broad range of matters was often sought. He continually challenged the pronouncements of his friends who always appreciated his insight. In his later life Irwin devoted himself to creating works of art in a variety of media. He was also the most highly ranked senior tennis player in the Lafayette community. Professor Tessman will long be remembered for his very distinguished academic career.

Soller-Baker Funeral Home, West Lafayette Chapel in charge of arrangements. Interment will be at Temple Israel Cemetery.
Remarks of the Chair of the Purdue University Senate

November 21, 2016

It’s Our Fault

Academic Excellence

Unit Level Discussion

COACHE survey

Transparency/Responsiveness

Senate Document 16-01—in anticipation

Other documents circulating campus—I encourage you to consider adding your signature

All 13 other Big 10 Campus administrations issued campus-wide affirmations
Mostly Presidents—Some jointly with Senate leadership—I have indicated to President Daniels my willingness to participate in such a joint letter

I acknowledge that the Provost sent a letter to the directors of our cultural centers

IPFW

Visit
OVERVIEW

- Two sets of issues:
  - USAP initiative
  - Realignment of IU and Purdue missions

- Problems addressed by USAP need to be fixed irrespective of IU-Purdue decision
## Total Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>5-year change</th>
<th>5-year % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPFW Total</strong></td>
<td>10,983</td>
<td>8,531</td>
<td>-2,226</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PU Programs @ IPFW</strong></td>
<td>4,956</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>-679</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IU Programs @ IPFW</strong></td>
<td>6,027</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>-1,773</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2017 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2017 Budget</th>
<th>IPFW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$175 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>($4.5 M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IPFW Tuition & Fee Revenue:
- $7.8M from 2011-15
- $1.2M for FY16
Recent extraordinary funding arrangements:

- General Assembly special appropriation: $2M in each of last two biennial budgets

- FY16: WL provides $500K to fund 50% of a one-time $1000/employee salary increase

- FY17: IPFW projects a $2.8M operating budget shortfall, which assumes flat enrollment
  - Actual fall 2016 tuition receipts decreased further than anticipated; projected shortfall now at $4.4M
Established May 2014 to assess whether IPFW people, facilities, equipment and funding are matched to regional needs and campus priorities

Selection of USAP committee
- 12 faculty, 12 staff
- Entailed campus-wide nomination process
- Vetted by Senate leadership
- Included Faculty Senate members
First phase—2014-15:

- Data-gathering and identifying key themes
- May 2015 report raises key questions:
  - What academic programs should IPFW enhance, maintain, or close?
  - What new programs should IPFW initiate?
  - What role does the General Education program play in developing the academic identity of IPFW?
  - What is the appropriate academic organizational structure for IPFW?
  - Should some units be moved to different administrative units?

“We must rethink our structures throughout the entire organization.” p. 17
USAP INITIATIVE

• These (and other) questions put to academic units for responses
• Responses were gathered, published and evaluated via campus-wide feedback process
• August 2015: Chancellor Carwein, in academic year opening convocation, charges campus to:
  – Think outside of current structures
  – Identify programs/services poised for growth
  – Ask what new and innovative programming should IPFW be investing in
USAP INITIATIVE

• Second phase—2015-16:

• Two levels of analysis:
  – Unit-level
  – University-level

• USAP task force organized after another campus-wide call for nominations
  – Concerted efforts to urge faculty participation
  – Charged with developing assessment methodology, analyzing data, and making recommendations
USAP INITIATIVE

• May 2016 report makes recommendations
  – Build organizational structure focused on continuous improvement
  – Achieve cost savings and efficiencies
  – Invest to generate revenue
  – Identify high-potential areas for moving IPFW forward

• Recommendation 2.2 recognizes:
  “urgent need to employ viability standards for academic programs with the aim of reducing the number of programs” and increase support for those that remain.
USAP INITIATIVE

- Recommendation 2.3 identifies 13 departments for restructuring
- Restructuring performed in parallel with program viability analysis
- Opportunity to reinvent programs to better meet regional needs
- Charges VC Drummond to lead a process that produces an implementation plan by 5/2017
September 2016 – VC Drummond’s response to Report:

- Outlines proposed structural changes that are “subject to revision”
- Welcomes comments, criticisms and alternatives through November 15
- Final decisions by December 1
USAP INITIATIVE

- September 2016 – VC Drummond’s response to Report (cont’d):
  - Recommends:
    - suspension of admissions to undergraduate and graduate programs
    - Restructuring several departments by AY 2016/2017
    - Continued assessment of remaining programs
USAP INITIATIVE

• October 3, 2016
  – Special Senate Meeting to Discuss VC Drummond’s Report
  – Chancellor and VCs attend
    ▪ Summarize actions
    ▪ Answer Senate questions
USAP Initiative

- October 13, 2016 Trustees receive update regarding USAP implementation
  - One plan presented
  - Same plan announced by VC Drummond on October 18, 2016
  - Board reiterates its trust in Chancellor and her team to implement the plan
### Departments Eliminated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Degree Enrollment</th>
<th>Degrees awarded in 2015</th>
<th>Full-Time Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate Majors Eliminated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>Math Computing</th>
<th>Legal Studies</th>
<th>Biology Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Math Business</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>Chemistry Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Math Statistics</td>
<td>Pre-Dentistry</td>
<td>Foreign Lang Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Pre-Medicine</td>
<td>Physics Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• “As you know there is a letter of no confidence going around. I disagree with the letter and the process they are using to create it. I have not signed it and I do not desire to sign it. However, I am under considerable pressure from my colleagues to sign the letter. The organizers are reporting what percentage of people have signed the letter and it is easy to know exactly who has and who has not. I am certain I will face repercussions both professional and personal. My department was particularly affected by these cuts…”

• “I don’t have a safety net and my chair signed the no confidence document so I must be still and quiet.”

• “The most fear I have heard expressed is the fear of retaliation by these 'elite', who are Chairs and have daily, operational control over faculty careers.”
• Distinct from USAP initiative
• Subject of much study and discussion over last 5 years:
  – 2012 and 2013: General Assembly legislative study committees on IPFW governance and operations
  – 2013: Regional Campus Study Committee (CHORUS Report)
  – 2014: Policy Analytics Study (Sheldrake Report)
  – 2015: General Assembly designates IPFW a multisystem metropolitan university; prescribes advisory role of IPFW Community Council
  – 2015-2016: Legislative Services Agency Working Group Study (LSA Report, January 2016)
REALIGNMENT OF PURDUE AND IU MISSIONS

- LSA report and recommendations *not* initiated by Purdue or IU
- Loss of Nursing, in particular, not a favored outcome
- Current discussions based on June 2016 directive from IU and Purdue Boards of Trustees
- Realignment plan will represent parties’ best attempt to respond to recommendations
  - IU to focus on new health sciences initiative
  - Purdue will explore new programs that meet regional objectives
TO: University Senate
FROM: Gerald Shively, Chairperson of the Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
Gerald Shively shivelyg@purdue.edu

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
David Sanders senatechair17@purdue.edu

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Natalie Carroll ncarroll@purdue.edu

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Ralph Kaufmann rkaufman@purdue.edu
1. Assessment of critical thinking skills of Purdue students
2. Academic integrity at Purdue
3. Clarification of student regulations and academic policies

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Linda Prokopy lprokopy@purdue.edu
1. Exploring plus one benefits for domestic partners
2. Exploring housing recommendations for 2017 in regards to same sex floors
3. Implementing Senate Resolution 15-19 re: faculty retention and recruitment
4. Implementing Senate resolution 15-11 re: Freedom of Expression

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Levon Esters, Chairperson lesters@purdue.edu
1. Clinical Faculty Leaves Policy
2. Procedures for Reducing Teaching Duties in Cases of Child Birth, Adoption and Foster Placement
3. Course Evaluations
4. Student Success, Access, and the Disability Resource Center (DRC)
5. Limited Time Lecturers (LTL) Hiring Policy

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Russell Jones, Chairperson russjones@purdue.edu
1. Issues of academic integrity
2. Issues related to campus-wide participation in athletics programs
3. The proposal for changes to the course evaluation system

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
Alan Friedman afrried@purdue.edu
1. Resources to support continuing English language and culture training (Where should they come from?)
2. A tobacco-free campus? – Results of a poll.
3. Sustainability strategic plan (What’s the most sustainable we can reasonably achieve?)
4. Student and staff safety with regard to pedestrians, bicyclists, skateboarders, routes, signage, and rules.
5. Working with BIER to understand the university budget and increase transparency.

Chair of the Senate, David A. Sanders, senatechair17@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, Alberto J. Rodriguez senate-vice-chair@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
Senate meeting November 21st, 2016

I will be attending the PWL Senate as your representative this week, and am therefore unable to attend to IPFW Senate. For this reason, I wish to share my views as you deliberate.

The perception from outside this institution is that for two years this campus participated willingly in the University Strategic Alignment Process and before that in a comprehensive remodeling of the mission that involved a large spectrum of input. The mission, 20/20 goals and recommendations coming from USAP were widely available. It is difficult to argue against the fact that all these recommendations, goals and mission could have been vigorously opposed or endorsed by the Senate at the time but this did not happen as it is now. In fact, there is evidence that the Senate leadership endorsed the faculty members participating on USAP. The time for raising concerns may be a little late and may be perceived as opportunistic at best.

The administration and ultimately the Board of Trustees have taken action that will affect our institution there is no doubt about that.

Faced with the situation at hand, the IPFW Senate wants to make a point. However, it may be in our best interest for this action to take into account the perceptions born from the Senate’s previous behavior as well as that taken by our administration.

It is totally unrealistic to avoid taking into account the fact that declining enrolment and increasing costs demand some form of action. Failing to do this is failing to take a responsible attitude towards shared governance that will inevitably weaken any future position we take.

We cannot either ignore the fact that a national conversation is occurring that is questioning the value of higher education within a world where universities have lost their monopoly on the production, dissemination, storage and consumption of knowledge. Protecting the value of a comprehensive curriculum is important but may need to be rethought to save its perennity.

It would also be negligent to ignore that the current curriculum offered at IPFW has not attracted or retained enough students to secure our institutions long term sustainability. As faculty, and more particularly as Senators, I invite everyone to deeply consider what can reasonably justify maintaining a status-quo in the face of so many challenges.

While we can argue the validity of some data and point out procedural and data interpretation issues we would be missing the most important point. In a world where perceptions often replace reality, this institution is perceived as contracting, and not reacting to this contraction enough to balance its books. Whether this is true or not has little importance at this point in the game.

We need some iconoclastic thinking that redefines the role of a comprehensive education in its service to students’ success; not a dogged effort to keep things as they are. Concentrating our
efforts to save the order of things will appear more and more like protecting a fragile disconnected curriculum in desuetude that is meant to primarily serve the faculty interests.

Carrying on passing resolutions that push us ever further in a power struggle has to viewed in a world where power may have effectively shifted far from the debate we are having. Unfortunately, the battle field we are on may no longer be relevant to anyone else than us.

Years ago I participated in a conference at Harvard where we sought to define our understanding of an “educated individual”. The conversation was centered on why and how to engage, not on what to engage in. We should be the innovators, the thinkers, the ones that break the molds of the past and cast new ideas that shape the future of higher education.

It is my view that the difference between education and manipulation lies in that education increases the choices our students have to engage in their world and manipulation constricts their choices to our view of the world.

Dr. John Niser
November 16th 2016
Joe, I think this is more accurate, but I don't recall exactly:

“I want to correct a few inaccuracies in the previous statements. First, the losses IPFW has are not as severe as presented because they include funds going into reserves. IPFW is still losing money, but not as bad as presented. Enrollment drops were presented from the peak recessionary enrollment of 2011. Compared with pre recession the drops are not as severe.

“Second, I want to correct some of Dr. Niser’s statements. In the first year of USAP, faculty leadership was asked to help select faculty members on the committee. Faculty leadership tried to move the USAP process into the usual faculty governance structures, but the chancellor refused.

“In year 2 the faculty leadership was not asked to help select faculty nor was there a strong attempt to recruit College of Arts and Science faculty. Again, faculty leadership strenuously objected to the process and avoidance of faculty governance.

“Saying USAP had strong and broad faculty input is misleading”

Sent from my Windows 10 phone

---

From: Camp, Joseph W.
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Mark Masters
Subject: statement

Hello Mark,

At your convenience, please send me your statement wording, as you recall the words, for the Senate minutes. Paraphrasing is fine.

Thanks,

Joe
Forging the Future

VISION & MISSION

Vision – Foster innovative honors pedagogy and student achievement as Purdue’s academic residential college

Mission – Provide enriching living and learning experiences for high-ability students in a diverse, interdisciplinary community of scholars
PILLARS OF THE PURDUE HONORS COLLEGE

**INTERDISCIPLINARY ACADEMICS**
- Interdisciplinary Thinking
- Lateral Learning
- Collaboration
- National and International Scholarships

**COMMUNITY & GLOBAL EXPERIENCES**
- Community Engagement/Service Learning
- Global Learning
- Study Abroad and Study Away

**LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**
- Honors Activities
- Student Organizations
- Student Mentorship
- Living and learning in a diverse environment

**UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH**
- Opportunities and Experiences
- Interdisciplinary Teamwork
- Scholarly Project
HONORS COLLEGE PROFILE

2016 Freshmen
- 741 total students
- 370 women/371 men
- 353 residents/362 non-residents
- 26 international students
- 109 under-represented minority students
- 74% merit-based scholarships
- Average SAT: 1990 (Purdue 1782)
- Average ACT: 31 (Purdue 28)
- Average HS GPA: 3.8 (Purdue 3.7)

College Info
- Yield up from 56% in 2013 to 66% in 2016
- Average GPA over 4 years: 3.86
- Total enrollment: 2200
## Demographics at Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Honors College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFSA Completion:</td>
<td>1571 of 2200</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients:</td>
<td>274 of 1571</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>274 of 2200</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Medium to High” Unmet Need:</td>
<td>156 of 1571</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156 of 2200</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Need Groups:</td>
<td>430 of 1571</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430 of 2200</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2014 (N = 334)</td>
<td>Fall 2015 (N = 425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Honors College in Enrollment Decision</td>
<td>2.90 (1.40)</td>
<td>3.47 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Interdisciplinary Learning Environment</td>
<td>3.45 (.98)</td>
<td>4.04 (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Living with Honors Students (5-point scale)</td>
<td>3.10 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.86 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Rating (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>3.55 (0.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Experience Sought</td>
<td>3.29 (0.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Students Met Expectations</td>
<td>3.19 (0.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Support in Process</td>
<td>2.55 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Students as Different from Non-Honors</td>
<td>3.19 (0.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in Teaching Again</td>
<td>3.13 (0.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head Supportive</td>
<td>3.10 (0.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend to Colleagues</td>
<td>3.39 (0.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 31, 44% response rate; 4-point scale)
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

- Honors courses (H) offered across campus
- Undergraduate research
- Interdisciplinary collaboration

HONR Faculty Mixer

Interested in teaching a future Honors College course—or in contributing to one? Want to collaborate on an interdisciplinary course? Have a course you’ve always dreamed of offering?

We want to hear your course ideas, share ours, and put collaborators together.

Join us for hot drinks and conversation.

All Purdue faculty are welcome!

Monday, November 28, 2016
Honors College and Residences South 1060
Honors College Reading Room
4:00-5:00 p.m.

IGNITE YOUR IMAGINATION. FORGE THE FUTURE.
Purdue’s Newest College

OUR FIRST ACADEMIC RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE