AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

2. Approval of Minutes of 21 March 2016

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

5. Remarks of the Provost
   Provost Debasish Dutta

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

7. Question Time

8. Senate Document 15-17 Standing Committee Nominees
   For Action
   Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

9. Senate Document 15-21 Senate Advisor Nominees
   For Action
   Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

10. Senate Document 15-13 Student Affairs Committee English Language Support Resolution
    For Discussion
    Professor Russell Jones

11. Senate Document 15-14 Minimum Class Size Resolution
    For Discussion
    Professor Levon Esters

12. Senate Document 15-15 Resolution on Student Evaluations
    For Discussion
    Professors Krishnamurthy, Lelièvre, Duzinkiewicz & Sanders

    For Discussion
    Professors Sriramesh Krishnamurthy and David Sanders

14. Senate Document 15-19 Resolution on Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention
    For Discussion
    Professor Mimi Boutin

15. Senate Document 15-20 University Senate Mental Health Resolution
    For Discussion
    Professor Russell Jones

    For Information
    Faculty Athletic Representatives Chris Sahley and Jeff Bolin

17. New Business

18. Memorial Resolutions

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

2. The minutes of the 21 March 2016 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

3. The agenda was accepted as distributed.

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

5. Provost Dutta presented the remarks of the Provost.

6. Professor David A. Sanders, Chair of the Steering Committee, presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix B). The Chairs or designees of the Senate standing committees briefly described the current activities of their respective committees. Professor Sanders noted that there will be a change to the October Senate meeting date from 17 October (Monday) to 19 October (Wednesday). The location is to be determined. Finally, Professor Sanders commended the Chairs of the Senate Standing Committees for their efforts during this academic year.

7. Question Time.
   - Professor Richard Cosier, the presumed object of certain comments from the Chair, took issue with the Chair’s remarks. Professor Cosier stated that the Chair’s remarks were combative and reflected the assumption that administrators are enemies of the faculty. His view is that collaboration should be the way to move forward. If we move forward as a team, good things will happen.
   - Professor Laurel Weldon stated that she appreciated the Chair’s comments about
Senate attendance and agreed with them. However, it should be noted that some Senators had to leave the March meeting before its conclusion due to time sensitive issues. For example, several Senators left the meeting to pick up children from childcare facilities.

- Professor Weldon asked what will be done about interdisciplinarity now that the Study in a Second Discipline Program has been phased out. Provost Dutta explained that interdisciplinarity will be supported by each college. He said there is a need to review the success of the former program as it was not well-subscribed over the last few years. We are trying something new with limited resources and will determine if it successful. If not, we will consider other possibilities. Professor Weldon expressed concern about Deans supporting interdisciplinary programs. In addition, she was surprised that the program was not well-subscribed in recent years. Professor Steven Landry mentioned that awards seem to go to senior faculty and he is concerned that not enough is done for junior faculty. Provost Dutta said that junior faculty are supported in ways that enhance their scholarship and development at the college level. The Office of the Provost will support mid- and late-career faculty. The Office of the Provost will help junior faculty as and when it can.

- Following up on the Chair’s remarks about Senate attendance, Professor Linda Prokopy asked if there is a program that involves contacting department heads to notify them that their Senator has not been in attendance. Professor Alter stated that he prefers the personal approach where he takes responsibility to notify his fellow Senators. The Senate Bylaws allow removal of Senators who are not in regular attendance. Professor Sanders as Chair-elect of the Senate said that he has no innovative plans to contact Senators if they miss meetings on a regular basis.

8. Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill, Co-Chairs of the Senate Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 15-17, Nominees for Senate Standing Committees, for Action. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. There were no additional nominees from the floor and the document was approved by unanimous voice vote. The terms of those elected to the Senate Standing Committees will begin on 1 June 2016.

9. Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill, Co-Chairs of the Senate Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 15-21, Nominees for Advisors to the Senate Standing Committees and the Senate, for Action. The proposed slate of nominees was created based on the recommendations of the Chairs of the Standing Committees. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. The document was approved by unanimous voice vote. The terms of those individuals elected as Advisors will begin on 1 June 2016.

10. Professor Russell Jones, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), introduced, for Discussion, Senate Document 15-13, Student Affairs Committee English Language Support Resolution. Professor Sandra Rossie joined Professor Jones at the podium and explained the rationale for the continued support of the Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange (PLaCE) program. The PLaCE program is designed to help international students for whom English is a second language. Beginning 1 July 2016, the PLaCE program will be administered by the College of Liberal Arts. However, there is no funding for the program beyond 30 June 2017. Therefore, the Student Affairs Committee is in strong support of continuing the PLaCE program beyond June of 2017 for the reasons elaborated in this Resolution. Senate Document 15-13 will be an action item at the September 2016 Senate meeting.

11. Professor Levon Esters, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), introduced, for
Discussion, Senate Document 15-14 Minimum Class Size Policy Resolution. The intent of the Resolution is to ask for continuing discussion with the Provost concerning the proposed University Policy on class size. Professors Prokopy and Weldon made a motion to suspend the rules to allow a vote on the document during the current Senate meeting. This motion was seconded. The motion to approve the suspension of the rules was passed with 50 votes in favor, 2 in opposition with one abstention. A motion was made and seconded to approve the document. During the discussion period prior to the vote, several Senators expressed concerns about the potential negative impacts on curricula that would be imposed by limiting class sizes. Professor Michael Hill noted that the 4th-year curriculum in the College of Veterinary Medicine includes three-week block courses that have small enrollments by design and they would not meet the minimum class size requirement. In addition, he disagreed with the Provost that class size is not a curricular matter. Professor Prokopy also agreed that class size is a curricular issue. Professor Jones said that studio classes in the Theater Program would not meet the minimum size class requirement. Professor John Niser stated that some of the music program classes at IPFW have only one student per class, which would be well below the minimum class size requirement. Professor Evelyn Blackwood mentioned that the College of Liberal Arts already operates under a minimum class size policy. Several Senators were concerned that there was confusion about the implementation of the policy and what would happen if a class did not make the minimum class size requirement. What will the individual faculty members teach when a class does not “make”? Professor Weldon cautioned about placing University-wide minima on such a diverse group of disciplines as exist in the numerous curricula at Purdue. Hence, she opposes the policy. There is also a concern about the increased amount of paperwork required to get exemptions/waivers for classes that are required for degree completion, but that will not meet the class-size minima. Professor Alter said that in the Purdue Polytechnic Institute (PPI), specialty courses with small enrollments have been designed in collaboration with business and industry advisory committees. These specialty courses meet the training and education needs unique to these outside interests even though they have small enrollments. Again, these small enrollment classes would fail to meet the class-size minima. Professor Alter estimated that 90% of the soft money for the PPI is obtained through these specialty programs. Professor J. Stuart Bolton explained that the College of Engineering already has class size policies and adding another layer of paperwork at the University level would create a significant burden that could delay graduation for students. Professor Gerald Shively said that in his program students are recruited for small-size classes by design and the class-size policy would constrain their ability to recruit high-level students. Professor Niser expressed concern about the granularity of the policy and suggested it should be considered at the program level. The question was called and the motion to approve the document passed by a vote of 56 in favor and 2 in opposition.

12. Professors Sriramesh Krishnamurthy, Sophie Lelièvre, Janusz Duzinkiewicz and David Sanders introduced Senate Document 15-15 Resolution on Student Evaluations, for Discussion. Professor Sanders explained the rationale for the Resolution. Professor Cosier stated that he is strongly opposed to this resolution because it lets poor teachers “off the hook.” He considers the problem with the current system to be lack of student participation rather than the issues stated in the Resolution. In his classes, Professor Cosier emphasizes the importance of the evaluations to his students and encourages them to participate. As a result of his actions, he has seen increased participation by students in his classes. Professor Prokopy supports removing the overall student evaluations from promotion and tenure and salary considerations because numerous studies make it clear that the evaluations are biased, especially against female and under-represented minority faculty members. Professor Rebecca Doerge suggested that students should be told of the importance of student evaluations beginning with orientation.
programs prior to their first semester on campus. Professor Carroll noted that a lot of time is required for the evaluations and she does not find the current system to be particularly useful. Professor Joerg Appenzeller said that in his department (ECE) the highest marks on evaluations are for the female professors. He would like to learn more about the evidence that supports the point about discrimination/bias against female and under-represented minority professors. He was reminded that Chris Sahley had presented evidence from studies done at Purdue that clearly demonstrate such bias exists on this campus. In addition, there is an extensive peer-reviewed literature on the topic that is readily available. Professor Weldon reinforced these points. Professor Mireille Boutin is also from ECE and her experience with student evaluations suggests there is a problem for female professors. She is willing to share her data with her colleague, Professor Appenzeller. Professor Duzinkiewicz said that the current system is certainly broken and demonstrates laziness because a true, comprehensive evaluation of teaching is not done, only the numbers are used from the evaluations. Professor Esters noted that several changes were made to the document since March based on recommendations from Senators. Senate Document 15-15 will be an action item at the September 2016 Senate meeting.

13. Professor David Sanders presented Senate Document 15-16, Bylaws Changes Conforming to Current Practice, for Discussion. The suggested changes will update the Bylaws to reflect current practices. The specific changes are outlined in the document. Several Senators had additional suggestions for changes that will be considered by Professor Sanders. Professors Rossie and Duzinkiewicz suggested that a December meeting should be held, but there are pros and cons for holding such a meeting. The discussion will continue about having a December meeting. Senate Document 15-16 will be an action item at the September 2016 meeting.

14. Professor Alberto Rodriguez, Chair of the Equity and Diversity Committee (E & DC), presented Senate Document 15-19, Resolution on Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention, for Discussion. Professor Kristina Bross asked about the language used in the document and if benchmarking had been done. It was suggested that the Dean of the Graduate School, Mark Smith, would be the appropriate person to ask about the wording model that was used. Professor Ryan Cabot suggested that Item #6 should be worded to recommend that Deans and search committees be provided information about the market availability of candidates. Professor Patrick Kain found the goals to be laudable, but some of the suggestions may not fit well in every discipline. Disciplinary cultures vary and cover letters are written accordingly. A second concern is that adding another committee to the search process could slow it down leading to the loss of good candidates who take jobs offers from other institutions that make decisions more expeditiously. Professor Boutin supports the idea of flexibility in the wording of the Resolution. The Senators were asked to send wording recommendations to the E & DC. Professor Duzinkiewicz asked if there was a list of official minority groups and if there were placement goals for minority hires. Apparently such a list does exist. Professor Landry asked how the applicant’s diversity statement would be used in the hiring process, if used at all. It was suggested that it would be difficult to enforce a requirement for such a statement from a job applicant. It should be clearly stated whether it is a requirement, or not a requirement, for each applicant to produce a diversity statement. Professor Blackwood stressed the importance of this issue and suggested we (Purdue University) are not shooting high enough. These recommendations should be embraced and supported by the administration and not just fall back on the faculty. Senate Document 15-19 will be an action item at the September 2016 Senate meeting.

15. Professor Jones presented Senate Document 15-20, University Senate Mental Health
Resolution, for Discussion. Student Government members Daniel Romary and Mackenzie McDonald accompanied Professor Jones to the podium to speak in support of the Resolution and to explain the importance of mental health issues facing college students, including those at Purdue University. The students have worked with the University's administration in crafting their own resolutions and recommendations. In summary, Purdue University lacks sufficient resources in the form of personnel to handle the existing case load. The issues are detailed in the Senate Resolution as well as in supporting documents from Purdue Student Government (see Appendices C and D). Senate members were very supportive of the Resolution and a motion was made by Professor Prokopy to suspend the rules to allow a vote on the document at the current Senate meeting. This motion was seconded and passed with 50 votes in favor and 2 votes in opposition. Professor Jones made a motion to approve the document and his motion was seconded. Suggestions were made to ensure regular review of the demand for mental health services and it was noted that Dr. Beth McCuskey's office has a demand analysis group available to consider this very issue. Professor Hill made a friendly amendment to include wording in the Resolution asking for the hiring of additional clinicians as future needs demand. His amendment was accepted by Professor Jones. Following the discussion, the motion passed with 52 votes in favor and one in opposition.

16. Professor Jeff Bolin, Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA, presented, for Information, the Annual Report of the Athletic Affairs Committee (see Appendix E). Following the presentation (see Appendix F), Professor Bolin and Director of Athletics Morgan Burke answered questions from the floor. Several Senators were concerned that Athletics programs take monetary and other resources from the University but do not give back to the general student body. Director Burke emphasized that the Athletics programs are completely self-supporting and have given back in many ways including the following:

- The Natatorium used by swimming and diving teams is also available for student, faculty and staff use.
- The tennis complex was built with private funds and is available for use by the students, faculty and staff.
- The golf courses were built with private funds and are available to the wider University community.
- The track is available to the wider University community.
- $12 million of Athletics funding went to the Krach development center.
- Our Athletics program is one of 12 out of 351 Division 1 schools that is self-supporting and does not use University general funds.

Professors Bolin and Director Burke answered other questions concerning gifts to athletics, athletes' GPA and courses the athletes take.

17. There were no items of New Business

18. No Memorial Resolutions had been received.

19. Having no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

NB: The Annual Reports of the Senate Standing Committees are attached (see Appendix G)
To: The Purdue University Senate
From: The Student Affairs Committee
Subject: English Language Support for International Undergraduate and Graduate Students
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion

WHEREAS: Purdue University benefits greatly from the presence of international undergraduate and graduate students, but these benefits cannot be fully realized when international students experience language and cultural barriers.

WHEREAS: A major concern of the administration, student body and senate is better integration and cultural exchange between our international and domestic students, and the Student Affairs Committee has found that in surveys of international undergraduate students, their perception of their weak English skills is a major barrier to engaging in activities with domestic students.

WHEREAS: Excellent oral and written communication skills are considered foundational learning outcomes of Purdue’s undergraduate education experience (Senate University document 11-7). English language proficiency of graduating international students should be considered an integral part of how student success is measured.

WHEREAS: The current Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange (PLaCE) program (two 3-credit courses, GS 100 and 101: English Language and American Culture for International Students, I & III); Two additional integral components, the PLaCE Language Partner Program (LPP) and the Assessment of College English - International (ACE-In), has demonstrated significant gains in student oral reading fluency and in free-response speaking fluency, a requirement of University Senate Resolution 14-10.

WHEREAS: This program provides a strong English language and cultural support structure to ensure that Purdue remains a desired U.S. destination for international students.

WHEREAS: Faculty who have transformed their courses as part of IMPACT (Instruction Matters: Purdue Academic Course Transformation) are especially concerned with the English language skills of international students. As their redesigned courses anticipate significant group work and interpersonal interaction, English conversational skills are increasingly important to the student-engaged classroom. Thus, PLaCE is critical to the success of IMPACT.

WHEREAS: Many graduate programs require students to be a teaching assistant as part of their curriculum, and all graduate students must be certified for oral English proficiency before being assigned teaching assistantships. However, opportunities for the development of English language skills for graduate students are limited to English 620 (Classroom Communication for Graduate Students) and 621 (Written Communication for International Graduate Students), and these courses are oversubscribed.
WHEREAS: The PLaCE program is currently funded for the 2016-2017 school year to support instruction of approximately 500 International undergraduates with TOEFL Total scores below 100, and less than 25 on the TOEFL Speaking subsection.

WHEREAS: Most universities do not rely solely on TOEFL scores, but rather use an entry level test for the purpose of placing international students in appropriate support courses.

WHEREAS: The administration of PLaCE will move to the College of Liberal Arts, effective July 1, 2016.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The University Senate recommends that the highest priority be given to continued support and development of the PLaCE program for both incoming international undergraduate and graduate students who are admitted with a total score of 100 or less on the TOEFL (or an equivalent) and a speaking score of less than 25, and provide placement testing for them.

Respectfully submitted,
Russell Jones, Chair
Student Affairs Committee

Approve:
Pam Aaltonen
Mary Comer
Edward Fox
Stan Gelvin
Matthew Ginzel
Chad Jafvert
Russell Jones
Linda Mason
Carlos Morales
Robert Nowack
Sandra Rossie
Kipling Williams
University Senate Document 15-14
18 April 2016

To: The University Senate
From: Faculty Affairs Committee
Subject: Class Size Policy
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

WHEREAS: A uniform “minimum class size” policy infringes upon the autonomy of the colleges and ignores their individual objectives; and

WHEREAS: The “minimum class size” policy has been developed without meaningful participation of the faculty or the University Senate

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The University Senate opposes a University-wide minimum class-size policy as written (UEAC 01-02) and requests that the Provost’s office continue dialogue with faculty (including but not limited to University Senate Committees) to develop a mutually agreeable policy.

Respectfully submitted by

Levon T. Esters

Voted For:
Linda S. Prokopy (Acting-Chair)
Christian Butzke
Janusz Duzinkiewicz (via telephone)
Steven Landry
David Sanders
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh
Elizabeth A. Strickland
Paul Wenthold
M.J.T. Smith (Advisor)

Voted Against:
Did Not Vote/Abstained:
Levon Esters (Chair)
Fabrice Baudoin
Evelyn Blackwood
Stuart Bolton
Alberto J. Rodriguez
Alysa C. Rollock (Advisor)
To: The University Senate  
From: Linda Prokopy, Sriramesh Krishnamurthy, Sophie Lelièvre, Janusz Duzinkiewicz and David Sanders  
Subject: Student Evaluations and Promotion and Tenure  
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

WHEREAS: In the current online evaluation system at Purdue University there is poor and unrepresentative response from students and

WHEREAS: It has been documented, including recently at Purdue University, that in numerical evaluations there is bias against women and members of minority groups and

WHEREAS: Overall numerical assessments of instructors and courses provide no guidance in improving learning outcomes

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Beginning with the 2017-2018 academic year the overall instructor and course ratings from student evaluations of teaching will not be included on tenure and promotion documents.

Respectfully submitted by  
David Sanders
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: Sriramesh Krishnamurthy and David Sanders  
SUBJECT: CONFORMING UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS TO CURRENT PRACTICE  
REFERENCE: University Senate Bylaws

2.01 Reapportionment

The senate shall determine the apportionment of elected senators to the several faculty units (see Section 2.00 b 5) in December of each academic year on the basis of the current assignment of faculty to units.

Replaced by

The Senate shall determine the apportionment of elected Senators to the several faculty units (see Section 2.00 b 5) in November of each academic year on the basis of the current assignment of faculty to units.

2.03 Election of Senators

After reapportionment of the senate in December, the individual faculties (see Section 2.00 b 5) will complete the election of senators who are to assume office on the coming June 1, and report the results to the secretary of the senate by February 1.

Replaced by

After reapportionment of the Senate in November, the individual faculties (see Section 2.00 b 5) will complete the election of Senators who are to assume office on the coming June 1, and report the results to the Secretary of the Senate by February 1.

4.03 Voting

Any member of the senate may request that the vote on any issue be taken by secret written ballot. This request shall be granted without debate.
When two or more persons have been nominated for the same elective position, the vote shall be by written ballot.

**Replaced by**

Any member of the Senate may request that the vote on any issue be taken by secret electronic ballot. This request shall be granted without debate.

When two or more persons have been nominated for the same elective position, the vote shall be by secret electronic ballot.

5.11 *Duties and Responsibilities*

1) The Steering Committee may invite vice presidents, or others judged to possess information of special concern to the senate, to report annually on matters of general interest within their areas of responsibility, at which time members of the senate shall have the opportunity to put questions, whether or not related to the report.

2) The question period will provide ten minutes during which time members of the senate shall receive responses to questions regarding policies and actions of general interest previously submitted in writing to the chairperson of the senate.

**Replaced by**

1) The Steering Committee may invite vice presidents, or others judged to possess information of special concern to the senate, to report on matters of general interest within their areas of responsibility, at which time members of the Senate shall have the opportunity to put questions, whether or not related to the report.

2) The question period will provide at least ten minutes during which time members of the Senate shall receive responses to questions regarding policies and actions of general interest preferably previously submitted in writing to the chairperson of the Senate.
o) The Steering Committee shall ensure that information is prepared for the *Faculty Handbook* clearly stating how the faculty can express opinions to the senate or can request senate actions.

p) The Steering Committee shall have only the powers enumerated by these bylaws and nothing contained in the powers granted to it shall be interpreted to mean that it has any legislative authority.

**Replaced by**

o) The Steering Committee shall have only the powers enumerated by these bylaws and nothing contained in the powers granted to it shall be interpreted to mean that it has any legislative authority.

Respectfully submitted by David Sanders
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee  
SUBJECT: Nominees for University Senate Standing Committees  
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate  
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slates of nominees for service on the University Senate Standing Committees. The faculty members elected are to serve the period of years shown following each name.

A. Educational Policy Committee  
For the 5 vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees includes Professors:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Bross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dunn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Ferullo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen McNally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Rotar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Horticulture &amp; Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Equity and Diversity Committee  
For the 3 vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees includes Professors:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stewart C. Chang Alexander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consumer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Riehle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatyana Sizyuk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nuclear Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Faculty Affairs Committee  
For the 5 vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees includes Professors:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Blaisdell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aeronautics &amp; Astronautics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Ming Chiu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educational Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lucht</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnamurthy Sriramesh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Story</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nutrition Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. **Student Affairs Committee**  
For the 4 vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees includes Professors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad Alge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Clifton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenji Matsuki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Story</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nutrition Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **University Resources Policy Committee**  
For the 4 vacancies, the proposed slate of nominees includes Professors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Beck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comparative Pathobiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbert Neumeister</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghu Pasupathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approving in person or via email:**

Wayne Campbell  
Natalie Carroll  
Ji-xin Cheng  
Richard Cosier  
Michael Hill  
Russell Jones  
Julie Mariga  
Sulma Mohammed  
Robert Nowack
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: Senate Equity & Diversity Committee  
SUBJECT: Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention  
DISPOSITION: University Senate Vote  

Whereas, “Purdue serves diverse populations of Indiana, the nation, and the world through discovery that expands the frontiers of knowledge, learning that nurtures the sharing of knowledge, and engagement that promotes the application of knowledge” (University Mission).

Whereas, Purdue is committed to launching tomorrow’s leaders through characteristics such as: “A learning environment immersed in a rich and dynamic culture of diversity, equality, and inclusion for all people, with widespread support and a diverse educational climate for an evolving global society” (p. 6, New Synergies).

Whereas, Purdue University receives millions of dollars in federal contracts, and whereas, the University is required by federal law to develop and monitor a written affirmative action plan.

Whereas, it the responsibility of ALL faculty members to assist in the advancement of the university’s equity and diversity goals.

Whereas, it is a well-established concern that faculty from underrepresented minority (URM) groups often experience a “diversity tax;” that is, being expected to serve in more committees and/or being assigned additional duties due to the need to address diversity and equity issues and/or the need to have URM representation in various committees at the department, college or university level.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the University Senate as follows:

I. The University Senate receives the Equity and Diversity Committee’s recommendations for enhancing faculty recruitment and retention (attached)

II. The University Senate accepts the recommendations listed below and urges the university administration to support the implementation of these recommendations promptly:

A. Establishing and/or Activating Diversity and Equity Committees:

1. Each college should have an active Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC) or its equivalent.
2. Each DEC should review the yearly University’s Affirmative Action Plan and become aware of its unit’s **placement goals** and tenure and promotion trends. “In every job group where a deficiency is found, placement goals are set for the entire campus or, in the case of faculty, for each college or school. A placement goal is defined as the University established target, which the University makes a good faith effort to achieve. Separate placement goals are set for minorities and for women.” (Affirmative Action Report, 2015, p. 25).

3. Each DEC should review trends in graduate students’ recruitment and retention.

4. Each DEC should review the best trends in training of reviewers for graduate applicants compiled by the Director of Office of Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs.

5. Each Faculty Search Committee should identify one of its members to be a liaison with the unit’s DEC to share information about the pool of applicants, as well as the short list of applicants selected by the Search Committee.

6. The DEC should provide recommendations to members of Search Committees and Deans regarding the pool applicants and selected short list.

7. Each DEC should meet with applicants who have decided to leave their unit to gather information that could then be used for future recruitment and retention strategies.

8. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the University Senate Equity and Diversity Committee should organize meetings with the participation of all of the DEC’s chairs and vice-chairs from each college. These meetings should occur once a year with a focus on discussing each unit’s progress on placement goals, trends in tenure and promotion, and any other common issues associated with faculty recruitment and retention. These meetings could also be used to share best practices and ideas for improving recruitment and retention.

9. A summary of findings from these yearly meetings of DEC chairs and vice-chairs should be made available to the Senate and the Deans of each unit for information and action.

**B. Addressing diversity in all faculty hire advertisements:**

The University Senate recommends the inclusion of the statement below in ALL new faculty hire advertisements:

Purdue University’s School/Department of (insert name) is committed to advancing diversity in all areas of faculty effort, including scholarship, instruction, and engagement. Candidates should address at least one of these areas in their cover letter, indicating their experiences, current interests or activities, and/or future goals to promote a climate that values diversity and inclusion.

--

The successful candidate should have a commitment to diversity and promoting a multicultural environment for learning.
Respectfully Submitted,
Alberto J. Rodriguez, Chair
Equity & Diversity Committee

Approved:
Alberto J. Rodriguez,
Heather Servaty-Seib,
Mark Smith,
Mimi Boutin
Lowell Kane
Shana Hardy
T.J. Boisseau
Bharat Bhargava
Kip Williams
Feng-Song
Julie Mariga

Abstained: Linda Prokopy
Absent: Alysa Rollock, Paul Ebner, Miranda Campbell, Sheriff Almakki
Attachment

Senate Equity and Diversity Committee’s Recommendations for Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention – March 2016

Task

To investigate recruitment and retention trends across the university and to provide recommendations for improvement with a focus on long-term structural changes.

Process

Last year, the Equity and Diversity Committee established the Sub-Committee on Faculty Recruitment and Retention. During this time, we met several times to discuss relevant documents and the University’s Affirmative Action Report: Gender, Race and Ethnicity (2014-2015). This report is prepared every year by the Office of the Vice-President for Ethics and Compliance. We also met two times with Vice-President, Dr. Alysa Rollock to better understand various aspects of the report. The Sub-Committee’s recommendations were presented and debated in regular meetings of the Equity and Diversity Committee, and were approved to be submitted for consideration by the University Senate.

Summary Findings

It is important to note that all universities receiving federal funding are required by law to produce an affirmative action report and to demonstrate progress in achieving stated equity goals. Affirmative action programs can be described as “a management tool designed to ensure equal employment opportunity…[and] includes those policies, practices, and procedures that the contractor implements to ensure that all qualified applicants and employees are receiving an equal opportunity for recruitment, selection, advancement, and every other term and privilege associated with employment.” (41 CFR § 60-2.10), (Purdue Affirmative Action Report [PAAR], 2014-2015, p. 1.).

Affirmative action programs are often misinterpreted as just directly hiring members of underrepresented groups, but in fact, this practice is not permissible. The main function of affirmative action programs is well described in PAAR (2014-2015) as follows:

If it is found that the number of women and minorities employed at the University is less than the expected availability in the relevant labor market, the University must use its best efforts, in good faith, to develop and implement procedures that are designed to increase the number of qualified women and minority candidates in the applicant pool, which will lead to the establishment of placement goals for women and minorities in areas where they are needed. A complete affirmative action program also includes mechanisms that enable the University to continually monitor and evaluate its employment practices to ensure that they are free of bias and discrimination based on race, religion, color, sex, age, national origin, ancestry, disability, genetic information, veteran status, marital status, parental status, sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. (p. 1, emphasis ours).
Keeping these definitions in mind, according to the Purdue’s *Affirmative Action Report: Gender, Race and Ethnicity* (PAAR, 2014-2015), these are some key findings that require deserve further attention:

1. “Five of the 11 faculty job groups (Foreign Languages and Literature; Speech, Language and Hearing Science; Psychological Science; Libraries; and the College of Technology) with a placement goal in 2013-2014 to increase minority representation showed progress toward the placement goal. Progress toward minority representation was not made in six job groups.” (PAAR, p. 44).

2. “Eighteen of the 41 faculty job groups with a placement goal in 2012-2013 to increase female representation showed progress toward the placement goal. Progress was made in Agricultural Engineering; Biochemistry; Forestry; Human Development and Family Studies; Speech, Language and Hearing Science; Foreign Languages and Literature; Philosophy; Political Science; Sociology; Libraries; Civil Engineering; Mechanical Engineering; Other Engineering; School of Management; Biological Sciences; Geosciences; Health Sciences; and the College of Technology. Progress was not made in 19 job groups.” (PAAR, 44).

3. “The Office of Institutional Equity conducts an annual campus-wide Faculty Salary Equity Study. This multiple regression analysis considers rank, tenure, service time, department, and other variables to identify cases of possible salary inequity. The results are reported to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Vice President for Ethics and Compliance, and include recommendations for correcting any disparities that appear to be based on gender, race, or ethnicity. Adjustments will be made by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and/or by Deans, as appropriate. Findings: The 2013-14 Faculty Salary Equity Study indicates that there are academic units that have patterns of residuals for women and/or minorities that need to be scrutinized carefully.” (PAAR, p. 61, emphasis ours).

These highlights indicate that the University Senate should be paying closer attention to the trends reported in the federally mandated affirmative action reports and explore ways to monitor whether progress is being made across programs. To this end, the Equity and Diversity Committee makes the recommendations listed in the attached resolution. In addition, we believe that these recommendations will complement well those proposed recently by the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Diversity.
To: The Purdue University Senate  
From: Purdue Student Government Committee on Mental Health, The Student Affairs Committee, and The Equity and Diversity Committee  
Subject: Increased Mental Health Resources  
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Action  
References: PSG Senate Resolution 15-45, PSG Comprehensive Mental Health Report & Proposal  

WHEREAS: Purdue Student Government published the attached report regarding the need for increased mental health funding, as demonstrated by collected information about the need and potential solutions from Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) itself, Purdue administrators, student leaders, and fellow Big Ten Universities; and also passed a resolution recommending the University Senate’s attention to mental health and support of the report, and

WHEREAS: The demand for mental health resources at Purdue has gone up an average of 15% each of the past two years and is projected to continue rising as: more students are entering Purdue every year, more are needing mental health resources, the types of issues students are having are becoming increasingly more severe, and stigmas are beginning to be overcome, and

WHEREAS: According to the Director of CAPS, Dr. Prieto-Welch, CAPS is currently eight clinicians short of what the International Association of Counseling Services recommends, leaving Purdue behind other Big Ten universities in the area of mental health, and

WHEREAS: The lack of resources is causing long wait times for students seeking one-on-one counseling, with up to 107 students on the wait list for intake during the Fall 2015 semester, and

WHEREAS: The mental well-being of the student body is of paramount importance, as it impacts student performance, safety, and the entire Purdue University community.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Purdue University Senate supports the PSG Comprehensive Report on the Status of Mental Health Resources & Funding Options at Purdue University, and recommends that Purdue University hires eight additional clinicians, perhaps by utilizing one of the mechanisms brought forth in the PSG report.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Russell Jones, Chair  
Student Affairs Committee

APPROVED:  
Student Affairs Committee
Pamela Aaltonen
Mary Comer
Edward Fox
Stanton Gelvin
Matthew Ginzel
Chad Jafvert
Chuck Krousgrill
Russell Jones
Robert Nowack
Sandra Rossie
Kipling Williams

Equity and Diversity Committee
Bharat Bhargava
Mimi Boutin
Russell Jones
Alberto Rodriguez
Heather Servaty-Seib
Kipling Williams
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee  
SUBJECT: Nominees for Advisors to the Standing Committees and Senate  
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate  
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

On the recommendations from the Chairs of the University Senate Standing Committees, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slates of nominees for service on the Senate Standing Committees listed below. It is further proposed by the Nominating Committee, that these candidates serve as Advisors to the Senate. The Advisors selected are to serve for three-year terms as specified in the Senate Bylaws.

A. **University Senate Student Affairs Committee**  
   Caren (Hanley) Archer Assistant Dean, Office of the Dean of Students  
   Heather Beasley Director of Student Activities and Organizations  
   Linda Mason Associate Dean, The Graduate School

B. **University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee**  
   Peter Hollenbeck Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs  
   To be determined Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

C. **University Senate Educational Policy Committee**  
   Frank Dooley Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning  
   Jerry Ross Registrar  
   Katherine Sermersheim Dean of Students

D. **University Senate Resources Policy Committee**  
   Michael Cline Senior Vice President for Physical Facilities  
   Barbara Frazee Executive Director of University Residences

E. **University Senate Equity and Diversity Committee**  
   Lowell Kane Director, LGBTQ Center  
   Loran Parker Discovery Park Learning Center  
   Alysa Rollock Vice President for Ethics and Compliance

**Approving via email**

Wayne Campbell  
Natalie Carroll  
Richard Cosier  
Michael Hill  
Russell Jones  
Julie Mariga  
Robert Nowack
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENEATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for the West Lafayette Campus</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor J. Stuart Bolton</td>
<td>*Approved 14 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-2</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-2 Revised Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for the West Lafayette Campus</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor J. Stuart Bolton</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-3</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-3 Reapportionment of the University Senate</td>
<td>University Steering Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-4</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-4 Statement of Support for the Faculty of the University of Iowa</td>
<td>University Senate Professor David A. Sanders</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-5</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-5 Public Statement in Support of Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>University Senate Equity and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-7</td>
<td>Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Failed 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Committee/Individuals</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-8</td>
<td>Proposal Regarding Transcript Notations</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee Ryan Cabot</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-9</td>
<td>Minimum Wage Resolution</td>
<td>Student Affairs Professor Russell Jones</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-10</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-11</td>
<td>Freedom of Speech Resolution</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Diversity Committee Professor Alberto Rodriguez</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-12</td>
<td>Faculty Committee Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-13</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee English Language Support Resolution</td>
<td>Student Affairs Committee Professor Russell Jones</td>
<td>*For Discussion 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-14</td>
<td>Minimum Class Size Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor Levon Esters</td>
<td>*Approved 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-15</td>
<td>Resolution on Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Professors Krishnamurthy, Lelièvre, Duzinkiewicz &amp; Sanders</td>
<td>*For Discussion 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>Bylaws Changes Conforming to Current Practice</td>
<td>Professors Sriramesh Krishnamurthy and David Sanders</td>
<td>*For Discussion 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>Standing Committee Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Approved 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>Steering Committee and Nominating Committee Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>Resolution on Enhancing Faculty Recruitment and Retention</td>
<td>Senate Equity and Diversity Committee Professor Mimi Boutin</td>
<td>*For Discussion 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>University Senate Mental Health Resolution</td>
<td>Purdue Student Government Committee on Mental Health, The Student Affairs Committee and the Equity &amp; Diversity Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>Senate Advisor Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill</td>
<td>*Approved 18 April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greetings, and welcome to the final Senate meeting of the year.

Let me start by announcing in advance that we will not be having a break during today’s session, as that didn’t work out so well last month… and that was a shame.

Truly, as I reflected after our last meeting I reflected on our Senate… on its viability… its future… its participation, and its impact.

Last month we were reminded, yet again, by a high ranking, highly compensated former dean who is now “simply” a faculty member that the Senate is a University Senate, and is not a faculty Senate.

How I tire of that old canard. Yes, I get it… we are a University Senate, and not a Faculty Senate. Clearly that distinction is used by those who might prefer that faculty not hold significant influence in the governance of the university. But let us be certain of the numbers.

The University Senate has 102 members. The president, the chief financial officer, the undergraduate senator and the graduate senator are the ONLY non-faculty members of the senate. By my count that is four, just four, who are not faculty members, so we can be repeatedly reminded by administrators who constantly remind us that faculty only have part of the sway in the senate, but by my count that leaves 96% of the senators as faculty members. So yes Virginia, there is a faculty clause.

Yet while we truly are, or should be, a faculty-driven body, too often we act like distracted students, or worse, employee-sheep. In the apparently onerous schedule of seven faculty meetings held this year we have lost quorum at two different senate sessions… that, by my calculation, is 28.5% of our meetings, and that is shameful.

If you are senator you should attend the seven senate meetings, or you should resign your position and allow a faculty member who has the time, inspiration, willingness, and sense of obligation to those whom they are chosen to represent to attend and to participate. The minutes of each of our sessions show who attends, and who doesn’t, including those who are eager to point out that we don’t have a faculty senate. Listen to the scorecard for our sessions this year: September, 38 senators and advisors absent; November, 46; December, 51; January, 39; February, 35; March, 37.

Senators have an obligation to represent ALL of the faculty members of the university… we are failing in fulfilling that obligation. I encourage all senators to visit the minutes of the senate meetings and to look at the names of the absentees, and then encourage those who are repeatedly absent to step down. Further, as my successor will be addressing Bylaws changes it may be instructive to rethink apportionment of senators not by faculty size, but perhaps by faculty engagement as well. If we have units who elect or appoint senators who can’t be bothered to attend perhaps those units’ apportionments should be reduced. There may be trends that emerge in lack of engagement that would indicate that some faculty units may simply not elect to participate in faculty governance.

Regarding absenteeism, some will quickly argue that “things come up, and schedules change.” That is not true for the senate, nor for other boards on which I sit. The dates are established well in advance,
and board members are expected to be there. Absence is identified as lack of prioritization, and perhaps lack of interest.

I found it particularly sad last month, that when asked by one of our faculty colleagues to schedule a mid-session break, that enough senators elected to leave the session all together that the quorum was lost. We have only seven sessions. None of those sessions ever go more than three hours, with most lasting far less. All senators know that because of the nature of the process that the last several sessions of the year last longer than earlier in the senate year. As faculty, how would you feel about students who departed halfway through class? How would you evaluate them?

Sometimes you hear senators grousing about “how long sessions last.” Really? If discussing the shared governance of the university, and yes, the concerns and direction of the faculty, for less than 20 hours a year is burdensome, then by all means please excuse yourself from the process. In any organization if the purpose of the participants in meetings is to see how quickly they can get out of the meeting then you know that you have the wrong participants.

Returning to the matter of the university/faculty senate notion, I found it troubling at our last meeting to see a resolution which had been fully vetted by an appropriate Senate Standing Committee, and then approved by that committee, fail in its adoption when two senators who also are and were high ranking administrators spoke vehemently in opposition to it, while claiming that they are faculty – which they are – but who in no ways can demonstrate that they resemble the typical faculty member, not in position, not in rank, and not in compensation. No, I’m sorry, when a former dean and the provost whose combined salaries exceed a half million dollars argue that they speak for the faculty, then I’m afraid that we have neither read the COACHE survey nor mingled with very many Assistant or Associate professors lately.

Our Bylaws need to immediately be changed. As I articulated last month, they should not be changed in a piecemeal fashion, but rather in a constitutional convention-like manner. My successor may be right that that will never happen, as there are enough administrators nee faculty, and powerful advisors who would be successful in stopping wholesale change. None the less we must try.

I’ll close with a cautionary tale. We were told in our last session by the provost that faculty had no voice in class size decisions…period, and that “everyone else” is doing it this already. This sort of top-down, central government decision-making and control is decidedly non-entrepreneurial nor contemporary. I encourage our provost to examine 21st century models for governance and control in entrepreneurial exemplars functioning in society today. Check out Google and Tesla and IDEO and you’ll find that the smart-money is on decentralized decision-making and self-control. That’s where the game-changing is happening. Top-down centralized bureaucratic decision-making is an old model, and does not allow the “makers” the space and work environment they need to create the future.

I encourage all to pay attention. As enrollments increase, as is clearly articulated in our strategic plan, and as bottom-up pressure is successfully brought to bear in increasing graduate student compensation, and as we bump up against our senate restricted use of adjunct faculty, limited lecturers and the ilk, that there will be increasing pressure to revise the numbers of non-tenure track faculty upwards, and other “work-arounds” will be proposed which will result in larger class sizes, a smaller percentage of non-tenured/tenure track faculty amongst our ranks and the continued lessening of the voice of the traditional professoriate. Do not let this happen.
In closing I want to say that I have sought to find the middle path this year, and I have been successful at some of my initiatives, and have failed at others. I am worried about us, but I am ever hopeful that the faculty will awake before it is too late. After June 1st I will leave you in David’s capable hands, and I wish him the best, and offer my assistance in whatever way may be helpful.

Thank you for allowing me to serve you.

Now on to business.

Kirk Alter

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

STEERING COMMITTEE
David A. Sanders, Chairperson retrovir@purdue.edu

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

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

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Ryan Cabot, Chairperson rcabot@purdue.edu
1. 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
Alberto J. Rodriguez, Chairperson alberto-rodriguez12@purdue.edu
2. Continuing review of findings from COACHE survey and now focusing on climate mistreatment-related questions.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Levon Esters, Chairperson lesters@purdue.edu
1. Course Evaluations
2. Clinical Faculty Leaves Policy
3. Policy on Academic Freedom
4. Procedures for Reducing Teaching Duties in Cases of Child Birth, Adoption and Foster Placement
5. Annual Review (post tenure review)

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Russell Jones, Chairperson russjones@purdue.edu
1. We are presenting a resolution recommending continued funding of the PLaCE ESL learning center.
2. We are presenting a resolution recommending a funding increase to create eight new clinical staff positions at the Counseling and Psychological Services [CAPS] center.

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
William Hutzel, Chairperson hutzelw@purdue.edu
1. Investigating feasibility and options for utility scale solar photovoltaics at Purdue
2. Helping develop Purdue’s new Sustainability Plan

Chair of the Senate, Kirk Alter, alterk@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, David A. Sanders, retrovir@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., icamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
PURDUE STUDENT SENATE
RESOLUTION 15-45
"Recommendation for Increased Mental Health Funding"

Author: Daniel Romary, Mackenzie McDonald
Sponsor(s): Student & Academic Affairs Committee, Geri Denger, Jacob Goedde
Agenda Date: March 23rd, 2016
Assigned to: 
Recommendations: PASSED 28-0-0
Action: 
President Pro Tempore: Renner Winston
Student Senate President: Rebecca Wilmoth
Student Body President: Mike Young

Whereas, the Purdue Student Government Committee on Mental Health has been investigating the need for increased mental resources and options for obtaining those over the past five months, and

Whereas, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) provides much needed resources to available to all students, but is currently vastly underfunded, and

Whereas, the lack of funding inhibits students from fully utilizing these services and getting the most out of their current fees, and

Whereas, the demand for mental health resources at Purdue has gone up an average of 15% each of the past two years and is projected to continue rising as more students are entering Purdue every year, more are needing mental health resources, and stigmas are beginning to be overcome, and

Whereas, after compiling data from and having conversations with students, faculty, and administrators, the PSG Committee on Mental Health compiled and attached a comprehensive report on the need for more resources and the available means to obtain those;

Therefore, be it RESOLVED that Purdue Student Government adopts the attached report as its official stance on mental health services at Purdue, and encourages the University to take action to increase mental health funding.

Therefore, be it further RESOLVED that Purdue Student Government recommends that the University Senate address the matter and support the attached report.

Therefore, be it further RESOLVED that Purdue Student Government encourages Purdue Graduate Student Government to address the matter, provide feedback, and show support, seeing as mental health resources also impact graduate students.

Student Body President

Student Senate President
Comprehensive Report on the Status of Mental Health Resources & Funding Options at Purdue University

March 16, 2016

Prepared By:
Senator Daniel Romary
College of Engineering
djromary@purdue.edu

Senator Mackenzie McDonald
College of Health & Human Sciences
Chair, PSG Committee on Mental Health
mcdona45@purdue.edu
I. Abstract

The purpose of this proposal is to urge Purdue University administration to allocate necessary resources to the Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on campus. This report shows how underfunded the counseling services currently are, thereby demonstrating the high level of need for more mental health resources available to students. As this is a project that has been in place for some time, this document explains the progress that has been made on this initiative so far and outlines the work that needs to be done in the future. Nine different avenues for obtaining more funding are explored and the benefits and drawbacks of each option are objectively presented. We do not intend to lobby for one particular approach, but instead attempt to provide as much information as possible so that an informed decision can be efficiently reached. The overarching concern is that mental health is severely underfunded at Purdue and that all students would benefit from additional mental health resources through Purdue's Counseling and Psychological Services.

II. Background & Evidence of Need

Mental health has been and continues to be an enormous issue on college campuses. Based on a study conducted by the American College Health Association in 2014, we can estimate that 12,600 Purdue students have suffered from depression to the extent that it was difficult to function, 3,140 Purdue students are seriously contemplating suicide, and 504 Purdue students have attempted suicide at least once. That means that we could fill up the entirety of the Class of 1950 lecture hall just with students that are currently attending Purdue that have already attempted suicide at least once.

Recently, Dr. Prieto-Welch, Director of CAPS, stated "CAPS is experiencing insufficient resources, increased demand for service delivery, and increased severity and chronicity of mental health-related problems." In other words, not only is CAPS under-resourced as it is, but they are receiving an ever-increasing number of students who want to utilize CAPS, and the mental health problems for which they are coming to CAPS are becoming more and more serious. 7,238 students, almost 19% of the undergraduate and graduate student body, have utilized CAPS services just this year. Additionally, we know that there are more students who wish to use CAPS, but are unable to due to being waitlisted for weeks and then waiting weeks between appointments. When a student is having a mental health crisis, it is detrimental to their ability to do homework, go to class, and study for exams. Additionally, when a student is having serious mental health problems, they need to be seen by a clinician as quickly as possible. At one point during the Fall 2015 semester, CAPS had a waitlist of 107 students. 107 students came to CAPS because they felt that they were at a point where they needed assistance with their mental health, a step which takes a great deal of courage and self-awareness to begin with, and then were told that there simply was not enough room for them at the mental health services that is supposed to be provided to them through tuition fees. Based on a study done by the National Alliance on Mental Illness, of the students who dropped out of college, 64% said that they "are no longer attending college because of a mental health related reason". By increasing the level of mental health resources at Purdue, we can improve retention rates and heighten the quality of life for all Purdue students.

By the end of the 2014-2015 school year, CAPS had switched models from a triage system to a walk-in system to better handle an increase in the number of students seeking help. However, for the current school year, the weekly average number of patients visiting CAPS during the first five weeks of the year has increased by about 15% since last year (Figure 1). As
counselors to effectively meet student need. The International Association of Counseling Services evaluates counseling centers effectiveness and determines how many counselors they need based on population. They evaluated Purdue's CAPS and determined that CAPS needs at least 8 more counselors based on the size and characteristics of the university. This lack of clinicians causes some students to not be able to be accepted into intake for their second and subsequent appointment for a long period of time, in some cases the delay is weeks or longer. They are recommended to a variety of group therapy options, but if they wish to be seen individually, they are put on a waiting list. As stated previously, during the 2015 Fall semester, there were up to 107 students on the wait list for CAPS, meaning they had been seen initially but not been assigned an intake appointment. While this may seem alarming, the lack of mental health resources has been on Purdue Student Government's agenda for the past two years, as we see it as one of the biggest issues our university currently faces.

This project began through initiative taken from the 2014-2015 session of Campus Safety Task Force, led by Caroline McKinney, to pursue issues of mental health on campus. Dr. Susan Prieto-Welch, director of CAPS, met with the Campus Safety Task Force in February of 2015 to introduce PSG to mental health needs on campus. From these discussions, students Mackenzie McDonald and Daniel Romary obtained $43,400 from the Student Fee Advisory Board so that CAPS could implement a program called ProtoCall for the 2015-2016 fiscal year. This service makes CAPS available 24 hours a day by having a group of trained clinicians answering student phone calls during non-business hours and continually interfacing with CAPS. The funding also allowed for a graduate student to help implement this system.

Aside from ProtoCall, many students in PSG noted shortcomings with mental health resources on campus, and the incoming Young-Wilmoth administration made mental health a top priority in their campaign platform. After determining that the issue was too time-consuming for Campus Safety Task Force to tackle on its own, the Purdue Student Government Committee on Mental Health was created as an ad-hoc committee with Mackenzie McDonald as its chair on September 30, 2015 with the unanimous passing of Bill 15-01: Creation of the PSG Committee on Mental Health.

Figure 1: Increasing Number of Students at CAPS (S. Prieto-Welch, 2015)

of January, CAPS had already seen 64% of the number of patients that they saw last year, indicating that there is indeed increased demand. This new walk-in system guarantees students an initial appointment with a clinician, who evaluates the severity of the issue. After the initial visit, students are put into a pool where they will be assigned to a specific counselor in order of severity. Unfortunately, CAPS does not currently have enough resources assigned to effectively see all students.

...
III. Detailed Needs

Dr. Michael Drake, president of The Ohio State University, is a proponent of a “one day, one week” mentality in regards to mental health services. The idea is that any student seeking services can be seen within one day of the issue arising, and can be scheduled for a follow-up appointment within one week. This is a great mentality to adopt. To achieve this, Ohio State recently hired an additional 15 clinicians to the 25 that they already have for their 65,184 students. As a quantitative starting point here, Purdue needs the eight additional clinicians recommended by the IACS, bringing CAPS to 26 clinicians for 39,409 students, which is comparable to Ohio State, per capita. Therefore, the number ‘8’ is important in eliminating the waitlist and having enough resources to handle the current demand.

The level of experience of these eight clinicians, however, is a little more variable. It is essential that the clinicians are trained and competent, and ideally they are experts in their field. In reality, money is a large factor in the level of experience. Acceptable clinicians are those who have a PhD in fields such as clinical or counseling psychology, or a Master’s degree in social work (MSW). Their salaries vary based on degree level and years of experience, and can be found in Table 1. An additional 35% is also considered for benefits.

**Table 1: Salaries & Benefits for Various Types of Clinicians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>MSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$19,250.00</td>
<td>$16,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$74,250.00</td>
<td>$64,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$68,000.00</td>
<td>$52,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$23,800.00</td>
<td>$18,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$91,800.00</td>
<td>$70,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a sufficient estimate, we are proposing four entry-level PhDs and four mid-level PhDs to comprise the eight needed clinicians. In addition to the salaries and benefits, professional development for conferences and clinician trainings costs $1000 per year. Furthermore, four new offices would need to be set up between the two CAPS locations. These office set-up fees would be approximately $2500 per office. Lastly, ProtoCall, the after-hours, over-the-phone counseling service, should be funded by the University, assuming its trial on the Student Activity Fee is successful over the next three years. ProtoCall will cost $975 per month for the next contract period, but costs may increase slightly over time. Therefore, $1000 per month is estimated for ProtoCall. This brings the total cost for the first year to $694,200, with a recurring annual cost of $684,000, coming from the elimination of the one-time office set-up fees. Administrative rounding allocating for any cost fluctuations brings our proposal to $690,000 per year after the first year. These expenses can be seen clearly in Table 2 on the next page.
Table 2: Cost of Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry PhDs</td>
<td>$74,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid PhDs</td>
<td>$91,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Set Up</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProtoCall</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$297,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurring Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$367,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has also come to the attention of the Purdue Student Government Committee on Mental Health that a psychiatric option would also be worth considering. At this moment, we are only proposing eight new clinicians. This does not include an expansion of the psychiatric services that CAPS currently offers. The committee recognizes that for many students, particularly those with more serious mental health needs, counseling is not always enough to allow them to operate at an optimal level; medication that psychiatrists can provide is sometimes required. However, when speaking about this with Dr. Prieto-Welch, she urged us to focus more on increased funding for the clinicians. The reasoning behind this is that there are other ways of receiving assistance for psychiatric medication. CAPS currently offers one free psychiatric appointment to all Purdue students. From there, students can obtain psychiatric medication through their own insurance. If their own insurance is not an option, there is a state-run program that can give financial assistance for those than need medication based on an apparent level of financial need. Between these two resources, Dr. Prieto-Welch feels that psychiatric funding is not a priority for CAPS at this time. However, this is an issue that should be taken very seriously and is an initiative that the committee may look into in the future.

IV. Progress Thus Far

A. Band-Aid Solution

As previously discussed, the first step that was taken towards increased funding for mental health on campus was implementing ProtoCall through an allocation from the Student Fee Advisory Board. ProtoCall allows the Counseling and Psychological Services of Purdue to operate 24/7 through an over-the-phone counseling service. Daniel Romary and Mackenzie McDonald chose to pursue this program after conversations with Director of CAPS, Dr. Prieto-Welch. The initial allocation granted $43,400 from the Student Fee Advisory Board to CAPS with the purpose of implementing ProtoCall for the 2015-2016 fiscal year. The initial proposal asked for $11,400 for the service, $2,000 for marketing, and $30,000 to pay for a graduate student's salary and benefits. A graduate student was proposed because that student would be synthesizing ProtoCall's reports to CAPS every morning, and it was imperative that a graduate student was used to ensure student privacy with this sensitive information. After delays due to prioritizing student privacy, the contract with ProtoCall was finalized in November of 2015 and the service went live on December 20th, 2015. After the service began, Dr. Prieto-Welch was able to see for the first time the reports that ProtoCall gave to CAPS. She was pleasantly surprised to see that the reports were comprehensive and easily integrated into the CAPS system.
This meant that there was no need for the student employee to touch this information. This opened the door to utilize an undergraduate student instead of a graduate student. Daniel Romary and Mackenzie McDonald submitted a budget modification to SFAB after this occurred, as this change in employee level allowed them to cut costs by more than half of their original request (Table 3).

Table 3: Detailed Budget with Update for the 2015-2016 Allocation to ProtoCall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Service Expansion Proposal Budget</th>
<th>Original 2015-2016</th>
<th>Revised 2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProtoCall Service</td>
<td>$11,400.00</td>
<td>$11,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Student salary, benefits, etc. (20hr/wk)</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$3,888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$43,400.00</td>
<td>$17,288.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ProtoCall Itemized Expenses
- Set-Up fee: $1,200.00
- Monthly service fee: $850.00
- Total (First 12 months): $11,400.00

Although the Purdue Student Government senators were already aware of the need for more counselors at CAPS, this was the best plan of action for utilizing SFAB funds because SFAB funding is too variable and inconsistent to be used to pay a salary. This solution has been deemed "the band-aid solution" because it simply patches up the problem, assisting with short term needs and handling as much mental health traffic as it can, given its resources. The purpose behind the name is to demonstrate that ProtoCall is not enough to solve the mental health crisis at Purdue. ProtoCall is merely a first step to give CAPS a fraction of the additional funding that they need while progress in obtaining permanent funding continues.

Since the initial funding allocation from SFAB, Daniel Romary and Mackenzie McDonald have applied again for funding for the ProtoCall program. During this funding request, the senators asked for a three-year funding commitment to cover the undergraduate student's pay, marketing costs, and the ProtoCall service cost. Including the increase in cost for ProtoCall, this came out to $15,588 for the first year and $16,338 for the two subsequent years, making a total of $48,264 for all three years (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Services Expansion Renewal Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPS Ambassador Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPS Ambassador Costs Breakdown
$9.00 per hour 12 hours a week 4 weeks a month 9 months a year
Total: 3888

ProtoCall Cost Breakdown
6 months at $850, $975 per month after Dec 2016 12 months per year
Total: 10950

Marketing Cost Breakdown
1000 flyers: $130, 500 brochures: $200, 100 pens: $200, 5000 business cards: $160, miscellaneous marketing materials: $70
Total: 750

This proposal has passed through the initial phase of approval by the Student Fee Advisory Board and is currently awaiting approval from the Purdue Student Government Senate.

B. Permanent Funding Progress

Many members of Purdue Student Government are passionate about increasing mental health resources on campus. This past fall, the Campus Safety Task Force chaired by Becca Wilmoth put on a “Mental Health Awareness” week with the goal of informing students about the necessity of good mental health and the resources available to them. Mental Health has been stigmatized in the past, but through efforts like these, the stigma is slowly being reduced. However, if we are pushing for students to overcome the stigma and seek help when needed, but do not have the adequate resources for them to receive that help, then “shame on us” in the words of one Purdue administrator with whom we were discussing this.

Purdue Student Government has started many conversations this year with various administrators about this great need. The Committee on Mental Health has been working with Dr. Prieto-Welch, the Director of CAPS, and with the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate, who has been very receptive and supportive of our cause. The PSG Senate has passed two pieces of legislation this year related to mental health: Bill 15-01, which created the PSG Committee on Mental Health with its primary goal of obtaining more mental health resources on campus, and Resolution 15-20, which encouraged key Student Life administrators like Dr. McCuskey and Dr. Sermersheim to look into the needs and potential solutions to the mental health crisis as PSG did simultaneously. Dr. McCuskey has since submitted a budget request for funding additional clinicians after finding surplus funds in Student Life, for which we are extremely grateful. However, there were other requests submitted, too, for services in need such as Student Legal Services, and it is unclear if or how the money will be divided between the requests. The request would also not likely be enough to cover all eight needed clinicians, and the date for approval or denial of the request is unknown. Therefore, we are continuing to push for additional sources of funding.
Student Body President and Vice President, Mike Young and Becca Wilmoth respectively, had placed mental health on their platform prior to being elected. They have had numerous effective conversations throughout the year, most recently with President Daniels and the Board of Trustees. President Daniels seemed to be receptive and passed the project off to Provost Dutta to look into the matter further. The hope is that this report reinforces the need for the resources by providing an abundance of facts and data, in addition to providing our ideas for sources of that increased funding in a detailed manner.

V. Future Funding Options

There are many solutions available to provide more funding to mental health resources at Purdue. Conventional ideas, unique ideas, and solutions that are currently being implemented at other Big Ten schools were compiled and are listed below with accompanying research in an objective fashion.

A. Budget Reallocation

Details: This solution does not involve any additional money being brought into the University budget. Instead, the reallocation option proposes that funding can be moved from areas where there is excess funding or the funding is not as high of a priority in the area where it currently is and could be better spent in the area of mental health. This would require a review of the current budget and a re-prioritization of current funding initiatives at Purdue.

Benefits: There would be no need to receive funding from an outside source. All of the work done to achieve this option would be done internally and choices made directly at the discretion of the University. This option would not require an additional fee to be placed on students, as students are already burdened with the cost of tuition and an assortment of other fees. This option follows President Daniels' initiative to keep the cost of attending Purdue low for all students.

Drawbacks: Simply by the nature of a reallocation option, in order for funding to be given to CAPS, it must be taken away from another department or funding initiative. Additionally, the proposal is requesting nearly an additional $690,000 on top of what the University is already allocating towards CAPS, so it is possible that there just is not enough available funding that can be re-prioritized to CAPS to cover the entire funding request.

B. Student Services Fee

Details: This solution involves adding a small fee that students would pay each semester, similar to the technology fee or student activity fee. The fee would need to be approximately ten dollars per student per semester to cover CAPS' needs (Table 5). It has also been proposed that multiple under-funded organizations come together for this fee. The committee has discussed working with Student Legal Services (SLS), the Disability Resource Center, and the Center for Advocacy, Response, and Education (CARE). If other organizations were included, the fee, which we are calling the 'student services fee’, would be closer to twenty or twenty-five dollars per student per semester, but has the added benefit of funding multiple organizations that need it.
Table 5: Fee Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergrad Only</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester Fee</td>
<td>Annual Revenue</td>
<td>Semester Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 294,970.00</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td>$ 589,940.00</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>$ 884,910.00</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>$ 1,179,880.00</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Fall 2015 enrollment data

**Benefits:** This is by far the simplest solution we have to offer. This option allows for CAPS to receive all the funding it needs without having to appeal to an outside organization or by moving around any money in the current budget. This would mean that no organization would lose money to fund CAPS. In an informal survey conducted by the Student and Academic Affairs Committee in March of 2016, they found most students receptive of the idea of paying a small fee (defined as less than 25 dollars) per semester to improve student services like CAPS and SLS, suggesting student support for this option. Economically speaking, the marginal benefits of this fee could be worth it for students. Seeing as students currently pay a student health fee that covers six counseling sessions, but there are not enough counselors for most of them to be able to use those sessions, it may be more prudent to pay an additional $20 or so and be able to fully utilize those services.

**Drawbacks:** This method imposes a fee on students for a service that they are already paying for through other fees and their tuition. In order to keep the cost of attending Purdue low, it is not ideal to place another fee on students. It is important that other options are considered first before jumping to this solution prematurely. If this is deemed as the best solution, more data should be collected from student constituents, including graduate students, to ensure that they are informed and on board with this solution.

C. Embedded Counseling

**Details:** Embedded counseling is a different model of counseling services that some schools in the Big Ten utilize. In pure form, counselors are located in each college, specifically for students of that college. For Purdue’s purposes, a hybrid model would be that colleges hire additional clinicians for their students that would supplement the current clinicians at CAPS available to all students. Another possible modification would be to keep the centralized CAPS model completely, but have colleges proportionally pay into the service based on the population of the college.

**Benefits:** This solution is an alternative to the typical budget reallocations. The College of Veterinary Medicine has already moved in this direction by hiring a clinician exclusively for their students. This could cut some of the bureaucratic red tape and allow funding to move faster. By making mental health a college-specific issue, it will be closer to students and potentially allow more students to be aware of the mental health resources available on campus. With more people invested, a greater buy-in could result in better services. The cost would also fall proportionally.
**Drawbacks:** This model goes against the status quo in uniting all of the colleges under one university. Dean Leah Jamieson was intrigued by the concept but concerned for this reason. Colleges may have less room to adjust budgets for this additional expense than the university as a whole. Many people need to buy in. Additionally, some of the smaller colleges may not have the funding necessary to pay for this plan. Dean Christine Ladisch voiced this concern and was skeptical that all of the colleges would want to partake in this plan.

**D. State Government Funding**

**Details:** This option involves CAPS receiving funding for mental health through a grant provided by the state.

**Benefits:** Mental health has been a much higher priority at the state level recently compared to the attention paid to mental health in the past decades. This has been shown through the new mental health facility in Indiana that is being funded by the state. Additionally, PSG has the opportunity to lobby for student initiatives every year during Purdue Day at the Statehouse. This past February, mental health was a big point of lobbying by PSG and will continue to be in the future.

**Drawbacks:** There is no guarantee that we will ever receive funding from the state government, and if we do it is likely that it will take a very long time. We also cannot guarantee that we will receive enough to cover the full cost of expenses that we need.

**E. Federal Government Funding**

**Details:** The Association of Big Ten Students (ABTS) has recently put mental health on its platform. ABTS lobbies for its platform in Washington, and is therefore pushing for more federal funding for mental health throughout the Big Ten.

**Benefits:** Additional resources would be allocated to Purdue and other Big Ten schools as recurring income. There is no potential for harm in asking for this money.

**Drawbacks:** Working with Congress involves an enormous amount of red tape. Furthermore, in a time where the national debt is over $19 trillion and many are calling for budget cuts, it seems less likely that Congress will vote for spending increases to fund this. While the money stream would be recurring, it may not be constant: cuts for education consistently happen, and this would probably be no exception.

**F. Corporate Sponsorship**

**Details:** One school in the Big Ten has a beverage provider that has earmarked a certain portion of sponsorship money to mental health resources. This plan would do something similar here at Purdue, finding a partner corporation to provide the increased funding.

**Benefits:** Purdue has strong relationships with a handful of big-name corporations, such as Coca-Cola, Starbucks, and Amazon. This outside funding would not result in additional costs for
students. As a contractual agreement, this could be arranged to allow for steady, recurring annual income.

*Drawbacks:* It could be difficult to get a company to agree. If the sponsorship needed to change years down the road, there would be new strings attached.

G. Non-Profit Funding

*Details:* This idea came out of a conversation with the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate when the corporate sponsorship idea was being addressed. There are a number of charitable foundations that may have an interest in promoting mental health. For example, the Lilly Endowment has worked with Purdue before, is Indiana-based, and would have a vested interest in mental health. Other potential nonprofits include the Clinton foundation, who has previously partnered with the Jed Foundation in certifying universities for their mental health service quality, or the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which has focus areas in postsecondary success, communities, and family health.

*Benefits:* As this is a grant, no money would have to be paid by students. Mental Health seems to loosely align with many of these nonprofits’ goals. They have large sums of money to allocate, so the full funding could be reached. Some may have the possibility of offering the grant over a period of years, to allow for sustainability in funding.

*Drawbacks:* If the grant was only a one-time allocation, it could be difficult to use for salaries long-term.

H. Private Donations

*Details:* Funding through private donations would involve donors, likely Purdue alumni or individuals concerned with mental health, who would donate funds to be allocated to the mental health resources at Purdue. This would likely be a one-time donation sum from each donor.

*Benefits:* If funding for CAPS was provided through a private donation, no money would have to be reallocated from the University budget for CAPS and no students would have to pay an additional fee for CAPS to operate at an optimal level.

*Drawbacks:* Private donations are often given as a one-time gift, which is not sustainable for supporting clinicians' salaries. This method would be better geared towards new building development if needed.

I. Intra-Collegiate Fundraising: Purdue Athletics Alcohol Sales

*Details:* There are other unique options on campus that provide for a fundraising opportunity by pairing these mental health needs to something unrelated. One of Student Body President Mike Young’s proposed ideas is that Purdue Athletics sell alcohol at sporting events and the increased funds be allocated to this cause. The University of Maryland currently uses a similar system.
**Benefits:** This is an untapped market that would generate revenue. At the University of Maryland, it brings in about $500,000 per year.

**Drawbacks:** This method is a fundraiser, meaning the annual amount that it brings in could vary widely. If the average is similar to that at the University of Maryland, it is still short of the needed funds here. Furthermore, the idea of alcohol and mental health seem to be disconnected, or even contrary to one another, and have caused quite a bit of media backlash for that reason. Many student leaders and university members have not been very receptive of the idea. It also begins to muddle the distinct line between athletics and academics in terms of the business model that is currently in place.

**VI. Conclusions**

The one message that resonates within every part of this report is that mental health is a huge issue at Purdue. CAPS is seeing more students than ever before, for mental health issues of higher severity than they have ever seen before. Each semester, the number of students utilizing CAPS services continues to grow. Students cannot operate efficiently as students when facing some of the most difficult mental health problems they will face in their life during their time at Purdue. The mental well-being of the student body affects the entire university, which is why it is imperative that this problem is addressed and funding increased. This funding will give CAPS the ability to hire an appropriate amount of clinicians, and can be provided in a variety of ways, all resulting in better accessibility of mental health resources at Purdue.

It is time that Purdue follows in the footsteps of schools like Ohio State, Michigan, and the California schools that have made mental health, and therefore their students’ quality of life, a priority on campus. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions, concerns, comments, or suggestions.

**VII. Attachments**

A. **Bill 15-01 – Creation of the PSG Committee on Mental Health:** PSG legislation creating the committee

B. **Resolution 15-20 – Investigating Mental Health Needs and Solutions:** PSG legislation encouraging administrators to look into the needs and potential sources of increasing mental health funding

C. **Student Fee Advisory Board Report, 2015-2016 Fiscal Year:** SFAB report explaining the allocation of the student activity fee, including to ProtoCall (p. 11)
TO: The University Senate
FROM: Athletic Affairs Committee
SUBJECT: Athletic Affairs Committee Report to the University Senate, Spring 2015-16
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Information

Purdue University’s commitment to the academic and social well-being of its student-athletes is focused through the activities of the Athletic Affairs Committee (AAC) and Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA). This report covers the two regular semesters in the year that has passed since the last report from the AAC: the Spring Semester of 2014-15 and the Fall Semester of 2015-16.

FACULTY OVERSIGHT OF ATHLETICS

Faculty oversight of ICA continues to be exercised through the AAC. The membership of the AAC, listed in Appendix 1 of this report, includes representation from faculty, an appointed liaison from the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate, a liaison to the President, alumni, citizens from the local community, Purdue University students, and ICA senior staff. The AAC monitors the academic progress of the student-athletes and the efforts of ICA to provide outstanding opportunities to learn, compete, and develop personally. The AAC was briefed on the academic status of each sport program and received updates on the primary NCAA academic metrics, the Graduation Success Rate and the Academic Progress Rate.

At monthly meetings of the AAC the members hear reports and participate in discussions pertinent to their mandate. All minutes and supporting documents are filed with the University Senate, and thus are readily available for review. The AAC may be asked to study, review and approve changes in Purdue rules and regulations affecting intercollegiate athletics programs, and to formulate positions with regard to legislation pending before the NCAA. The AAC also discusses diverse topics related to Big Ten or NCAA matters, or national news/trends that may affect the status of both university sports programs and the eligibility of student-athletes. A characteristic agenda and a partial list of topics discussed during the current academic year are provided in Appendix 2.

The Vice President and Director of Athletics provides additional information related to the strategic plans of the department, including current goals, key progress measures, facilities projects, etc. Elements of the current plan, especially those that pertain to the development and welfare of the students are presented in brief below.

In addition to the AAC meetings, the senior associate athletics director for student services conducts two academic planning meetings each year at which plans and outcomes over a three-year period are discussed. The two faculty athletic representatives (FAR) participate in each meeting, along with members of the senior athletics administrative staff and the athletics student services staff. The purpose of the meetings is to update the FARs on the plans for the academic areas for the next three years. Academic information for the athletics department and for each sports program is reviewed during each meeting. Information from these meetings is conveyed to the AAC as appropriate.
OVERVIEW OF STUDENT-ATHLETE ACADEMIC DATA

Each semester the pattern of student-athlete choice of major, course selection and academic performance is assessed through data reported by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness and compared to comparable data for the remainder of the student body. This report is/will be sent to the President, Provost, Vice-Provost for Learning and Teaching, the Athletic Affairs Committee, FARs and Athletics Director for review. Data for the fall 2015 and spring 2016 is included in Appendix 3.

OVERVIEW OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The Director of Athletics and others from the department often share goals and metrics from the department's strategic plan with the AAC. Some elements of the plan, especially those related to the academic success of the students are reported for the Senate's review. Words in brackets replace personal pronouns that might be misunderstood in the context of this report.

A summary of the plan is also available on-line:

The foundation of the plan lies in the Vision, Mission and Goals of the department.

Vision: A championship-caliber athletics organization that is excellent in all respects and is a consistent member of the “25/85 Club.

The "25/85 Club" refers to a very small number of elite NCAA Division I institutions that consistently have their teams ranked in the top 25 while graduating their student-athletes at an 85 percent rate as measured by the NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The GSR is similar to the Federal Graduation Rate, but the yearly cohorts are adjusted as students transfer in or out of the university.

Mission: Developing Champions / Scholars / Citizens

[The department] will engage and inspire all constituencies to support the broader university pursuit of preeminence by attracting and retaining the very best student-athletes, coaches and staff while engaging former student-athletes in an effort to maintain their identity as part of the Purdue athletics family.

The very best [student-athletes] will execute this mission sharing a common set of values – integrity, mutual respect, a belief in hard work and team work, a commitment to inclusiveness – and the courage to lead. They will be the Purdue Athletics’ brand and continue to enhance our reputation while being pleased with every aspect of their experience at the university.

It is expected that [the department] will be a financially self-supporting enterprise that provides the resources for coaches and staff to develop championship programs.
Goals in support of the Departmental Vision and Mission

Athletic

All sports will place in the top 25 nationally. Consistent performance at this level will see us competing for Big Ten and NCAA championships.

[The department] will deliver exceptional support services throughout the athletics department to all student-athletes to ensure they are mentally and physically prepared to absorb the skill development necessary to maximize their potential as students, leaders, and athletes.

Student Athlete Development and Welfare

Student-athletes will maintain a cumulative grade-point average of 3.0 or above each semester while competing to perform at or above the all-campus cumulative grade-point average; all Purdue teams will have a graduation success rate (GSR) equal to or better than sport specific Division I-A GSR while striving to achieve a department-wide GSR of 85 percent or higher.

The athletics academic support services unit operates with a rolling three-year plan. Each year, the athletics academic support services staff reviews and updates the plan to ensure it is meeting the academic needs of the student-athletes and that it helps create the atmosphere and expectation for academic success. The three-year plan provides the opportunity for the staff to modify and update current practices in an organized manner. The three-year plan objectives are reviewed twice a year with both faculty athletic representatives (FARs) and the athletics senior staff to ensure progress is being made. These meetings provide the opportunity for input by the FARs and sport administrators.

The department provides a number of personal and professional development activities. Examples are reported in Appendix 5.

Fiscal

All financial resources will be allocated in pursuit of the vision and managed to ensure that [the department recognizes] the expectation to remain self-supporting while providing scholarships, quality academic support services, competitive operating budgets, and comprehensive facilities. Marketing and development plans will be designed and executed to generate revenue.

Equity and Integrity

To promote an atmosphere that upholds and embraces inclusiveness among all constituencies, [the department] will provide champion-caliber participation opportunities that recognize and reinforce gender and ethnic equality for all coaches, staff and student-athletes.

Image

The student-athletes, coaches, and staff will live their shared values as the role models that they are, so that people “experience” Purdue Athletics with respect, admiration, and pride. All decisions will be communicated in a manner to create, project and enhance this strong intercollegiate athletic brand.
Appendix 1: Members of the Athletic Affairs Committee for 2015-16

Howard Mancing – CHAIR (University Senate Appointment, Professor of Foreign Languages and Literature)

Jeffrey T. Bolin (Faculty Athletic Representative, Professor of Biological Sciences and Associate Vice President for Research)

Anna Appert-Lund (Student Representative – Women's Golf Student-Athlete)

Morgan J. Burke (Vice President and Director of Intercollegiate Athletics)

Nancy L. Cross (Senior Woman Administrator, Senior Associate A.D. for Development – Sports)

Bob Falk (Alumni Representative)

Gerald Gentry (Alumni Representative)

Nathan Hartman (University Senate Appointment, Professor of Computer Graphics & Technology)

Peter Hirst (University Senate Appointment, Professor of Horticulture)

Edward G. Howat (Senior Associate Athletics Director for Student Services – Sports)

Barbara J. Kapp (Senior Associate Athletics Director for Business)

Chuck Krousgrill (Student Affairs Liaison, Professor of Mechanical Engineering)

Beth McCuskey (Presidential Liaison, Vice Provost for Student Life)

Tom Mitchell (ex-officio, Assistant Athletics Director – Compliance)

Alyssa Panitch (University Senate Appointment, Leslie A. Geddes Professor of Biomedical Engineering and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs)

Greg Phillips (Student Representative – Football Student-Athlete)

Emily Rasmussen (Student Representative)

Christie L. Sahley (Faculty Athletic Representative, Professor of Biological Sciences and Director, Purdue Center for Faculty Success Special Advisor to the Provost, Gender Equity)

Joe Seaman (Community Liaison)

Calvin Williams (Associate Athletics Director – Sports)

Karen Yehle, (University Senate Appointment, Associate Professor of Nursing)
Appendix 2: A typical agenda for a meeting and representative topics of discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 2: A typical agenda for a meeting and representative topics of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Fourth 2015-2016 Meeting, November 17, 2015**  
3:30-5:00 p.m. WEST CLUB - MACKEY |
| 1. Call to Order and Introduction of Members | H. Mancing |
| 2. Approval of September 2015 Minutes | Committee |
| 3. Guest – Head Coach - Cross Country/Track and Field | R. Greene |
| 4. Waiver Petitions, Schedule, Approvals | H. Mancing |
| 5. Remarks from the Director: 2014-15 in Review | M. Burke |
| 6. Remarks from the Sr. Associate AD-Sports  
Associate AD-Sports | C. Williams |
| Sr. Associate AD-Academics/Sports | E. Howat |
| 7. Compliance Issue of the Month | T. Mitchell |
| 8. Report from the Student Affairs Liaison | C. Krousgrill |
| 9. Report from the Student Members | A. Appert-Lund and E. Rasmussen |
| 10. Report from the Faculty Representatives | J. Bolin and C. Sahley |
| 11. Other Business | Committee |
| 12. Dates for Future Meetings | H. Mancing |
| 13. Adjournment | |

Examples of Topics Discussed at 2016 AAC Meetings

- Presentations and Q&A with coaches  
  team profiles, academic metrics, distribution of aid, practice & competition schedules

- NCAA academic metrics

- Personal & professional development programs for students

- Involvement of teams and students in community service (see Appendix 4 for examples)

- Capital Projects; R&R and other facilities issues

- Sport schedules & missed class time  
  Volleyball schedule, influence of televised events, Rutgers & Maryland

- Big Ten and NCAA legislation and reports on meetings  
  2015 NCAA proposal addressing academic misconduct

- Topics related to rules compliance

- Big Ten & NCAA discussions/actions related to student issues  
  Time demands of participation dominates 2015-16
## Appendix 3: Academic Metrics and Enrollment Data by College and Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance Measures:</th>
<th>Spring 14-'15</th>
<th>Fall 15-'16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of Semester GPA of 3.0 or higher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>58.8% (298)</td>
<td>59.5% (300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of Academic Honors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>33.2% (163)</td>
<td>32.7% (165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s List and Semester Honors</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Honors only</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s List only</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of perfect 4.0 Semester GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>8.3 (42)</td>
<td>8.7% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placement on probation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>3.4% (17)</td>
<td>9.7% (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropped from the University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>0.4% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the subject semesters, undergraduate enrollment at Purdue University totaled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 14-'15</th>
<th>Fall 15-'16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>15,658</td>
<td>16,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11,786</td>
<td>12,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,444</td>
<td>29,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For academic reporting purposes, student-athlete enrollment totaled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 14-'15</th>
<th>Fall 15-'16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Cumulative Grade Point Average by Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2015 - Team</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-Athlete Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Body Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.06</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2015 - Team</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-Athlete Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Body Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.08</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Longitudinal Cumulative Grade Point Average Data
NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Data

The Graduation Success Rate (GSR) serves a purpose similar to the Federal Graduation rate. Both measure graduation within six years for annual cohorts of students. The federal rate does not account for students who transfer from one institution to another and graduate. The GSR does account for these, which provides a more inclusive calculation of academic success.

**STUDENT-ATHLETE GRADUATION SUCCESS RATES (GSR)**

Graduation Rates for 2005-2008 Cohorts

( ) Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Purdue</th>
<th>NCAA Division I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>84 (82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>74 (76)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>85 (73)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (FBS)</td>
<td>76 (71)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>75 (56)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming</td>
<td>89 (94)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>91 (89)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Track/CC</td>
<td>80 (67)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Wrestling</td>
<td>70 (75)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>100 (100)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>57** (75)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>95 (94)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Softball</td>
<td>93 (94)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming</td>
<td>91 (88)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>89 (88)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Track/CC</td>
<td>96 (100)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>100 (100)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The GSR permits institutions to subtract student-athletes who leave their institutions prior to graduation as long as the student-athlete would have been academically eligible to compete at Purdue University had he or she remained.

** Women’s golf has a below normal GSR due to transfer activity during the 4-year time period. Due to the small cohort sizes, the transfer activity impacted the team’s overall GSR.
The Academic Progress Rate (APR)

The APR is an NCAA semester-by-semester assessment of academic progress. It is calculated by allocating one point per student for eligibility and one for retention—the two factors that research identifies as the best predictors of graduation. The data are presented on the basis of four-year rolling averages for each team. Teams must achieve an APR score of 930 to avoid NCAA penalties. Teams below 930 are ineligible for NCAA post-season competition and are required to develop and execute an academic improvement plan.

Each player on a roster earns a maximum of two points per term, one for being academically eligible and one returning to the institution. A team’s APR is the total points of a team’s roster at a given time divided by the total points possible. The number is then multiplied by 1,000. Thus, a raw APR score of 0.930 is reported as 930 and reflects an approximate 50 percent Graduation Success Rate (NCAA website).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Multiyear APR Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Cross Country</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Track</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Wrestling</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Cross Country</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Softball</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Track</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment Data

NUMBER OF STUDENT-ATHLETES BY COLLEGE OR SCHOOL
Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or School</th>
<th>Number of student-athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Engineering</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Enrollment Review: Top 20 Courses
Fall 2015, Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Students who participate in Intercollegiate Athletics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Fall 2015 Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO12500</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM11400</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR26200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON25100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP56060</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP54900</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL10600</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL42000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST15200</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA15300</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA15600</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA16010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT20100</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR310100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS27400</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY12600</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC10000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC22000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN10200</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN20100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who do not participate in Intercollegiate Athletics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Fall 2015 Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL11000</td>
<td>1,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM11000</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM11500</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM114000</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON25100</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP51000</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL10600</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR3700</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA15000</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA15100</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA15500</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA20100</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT20000</td>
<td>1,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS17200</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY12000</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC10000</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN10100</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN10200</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT20100</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Studies:

2,366 independent studies were taken by undergraduate students in the Fall 2015 term. Of those 2,366, only 29 (1.2%) were taken by student athletes. Student athletes made up approximately 1.9% of the undergraduate student body in the Fall 2015 term.
**High Enrollment Courses for Participants in Intercollegiate Athletics**  
(Courses with > 15% enrollment by participants in ICA)

Fall 2015, Office of Institutional Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Non-Athlete</th>
<th>Athlete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAS37300</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS37600</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS39200</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD43000</td>
<td>82.35%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRY11000</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM26100</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR10000</td>
<td>82.67%</td>
<td>17.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR28200</td>
<td>80.66%</td>
<td>19.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE27900</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI43200</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL25700</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR39600</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST32000</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK11101</td>
<td>79.41%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK22500</td>
<td>78.13%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK37600</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK44300</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK49600</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAL20500</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA19000</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS34600</td>
<td>80.28%</td>
<td>19.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS37500</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS45600</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS47700</td>
<td>82.26%</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTGS10100</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grade Distributions for High Enrollment Courses

(Courses with > 15% enrollment by participants in ICA)

Fall 2015, Office of Institutional Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Athlete</th>
<th>A, A+</th>
<th>B, B+</th>
<th>C, C+</th>
<th>D, D+</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAS37300</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS37600</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS39200</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD43000</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRY11000</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM26100</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR10000</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>88.71%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR28280</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>14.36%</td>
<td>62.86%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE27900</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC43280</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL25700</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>41.11%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR39600</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST32000</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK11101</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>51.66%</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK22500</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK37600</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK44300</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK46800</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAL20500</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA19000</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS34600</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>77.19%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>25.57%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS37500</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>89.47%</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS45600</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS47700</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTG510100</td>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Examples of Student Involvement in Community Service During 2015-16

Multiple Teams
- The Purdue Cancer Challenge - 5K Walk/Run
- IMPACT (Influencing/Mentoring by Purdue Athletes w/Cardinal Tradition)
- BoilerMaker Wish (Purdue Athletes making a wish come true for physically challenged children in the community)
- Shoes for Haiti
- John Purdue Thank-a-Thon
- Boilers Care – Day of Service at the YWCA

Basketball-Women’s
- Special Olympics - Pull the Plane at Indianapolis Airport
- Special Olympics - Polar Plunge
- Special Olympics - 3 on 3 Basketball Tournament
- Cancer Community Network events - to help local cancer patients
- Reading to elementary school children
- Hunger Hike
- Feast of the Hunter’s Moon
- 5K Run for the Cure
- Relay for Life Cancer Walk
- Adopt a Family for Christmas - Provided beds for a family with new home
- Provided free WBB clinics
- Think Pink Initiative
- Participate in Purdue Cancer Challenge
- Community Service Boys/Girls Club
- BoilerMaker Wish with special needs children
- IMPACT - 1 on 1 mentoring to underprivileged school aged children
- Volunteering at Hanna Community Center
- YWCA - moved furniture into new domestic violence shelter
- Boilers Care - Day of Service at YWCA
- Natalie’s Second Chance Animal Shelter
- Championing Equality Event

Football
- Mentored Kids at Happy Hallow
- “Reading Super Bowl” at Hershey Elementary
- Natalie's Dog Shelter - Walked the dogs
- Worked with kids at Bauer Community Center
• Read to kids at Klondike Elementary
• YMCA - worked with kids’ groups
• Participated in College Mentors for Kids
• Read books at Burnett Creek Elementary
• Volunteered at Almost Home Humane Society
• Habitat for Humanity - Built part of a house
• Lafayette Veterans Home - visited the elderly
• Volunteered at St. Elizabeth Hospital
• Boys and Girls Club - Played games with kids and talked about school
• Volunteered at Local Day Care Program
• IU Health Hospital - Visited patients
• “Spelling Bee” - Competed in Annual Adult Reading Academy
• Read to Kids at Murdock Elementary
• Kappa the Flag - Teamed up with sorority for service
• Hosted the Purdue Football Blood Drive
• Abundant Outreach Church - Volunteered
• TC Harris Academy - Visited with Students
• Delphi High School - Talked to students about importance of school
• PALS Camp - Worked the summer camp
• Volunteered at Church Event
• IU Health- Andrew Luck - Volunteered at camp and worked with kids
• Wainwright Middle School - Talked about importance of exercise and school
• Best Buddies - Teamed up with middle school kid’s
• GreenTree Assisted Living - Visited the elderly
• Volunteered at Pharmacy Department
• Spoke to kids about exercise at Sunnyside Middle School
• Mission Trip to South Africa
• National Walk to School Day
• College Go Week
• Boilers Care - Day of Service
Appendix 5: Examples of Personal and Professional Development Activities.

- Leadership development programs: the John R. Wooden Leadership Institute, BAC (student-athlete advisory committee), Emerging Leaders program
- Transition into Purdue: “Boiler Bigs,” BAC members mentor incoming freshmen and transfer students-athletes
- Transition into Purdue: EDPS 490: Life Skills seminar classes for freshman and transfers in collaboration with CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services)
- Transitioning-out: “BLAST” Boiler Life After Sport. The program covers financial literacy, mental health and wellness, nutrition/fitness and professional Development.
- In conjunction with "Boilers STANDUP" the department implemented team-by-team Bystander Intervention Training in order to educate about what consent means and create a culture that makes sexual assault unacceptable.
- Resume, cover letter, mock interviews, self-branding and financial workshops throughout the year. (partnering with CCO, PEFCU, AfterSport)
Purdue Athletic Affairs Committee

Report to the University Senate
April 18, 2016
The Athletic Affairs Committee (AAC)

• One facet of institutional control of athletics
• Ties to the beginnings (1895) of what is now known as the Big Ten Conference and the role of the faculty
  – The Presidents of the original member institutions delegated oversight of athletics to the faculty
• Intended to represent the interests of the entire University community
  – Faculty, students, alumni, community representatives, and senior administrators from Intercollegiate Athletics
The Athletic Affairs Committee

- University Senate
- University President

Athletic Affairs Committee

- 8 Faculty Members
  - Committee Chairperson
  - 2 Faculty Athletic Reps.
  - Senate Student Affairs Liaison
- 2 Student Members
- 3 Alumni & Community Representatives

President’s Liaison

4 Athletics Representatives
- Director of Athletics
- AAD*, Sr. Woman Administrator
- AAD*: Student Services
- AADs*, Sports Administration
- AAD*, Compliance & Business

Student-Athletes
- Boilermaker Athletic Council

Coaches

Big Ten Conference
NCAA
The Athletic Affairs Committee

• Faculty members serving on the AAC
  – Chair: Howard Mancing (Liberal Arts)
  – Student Affairs Liaison: Chuck Krousgrill (Engineering)
  – Senate Appointees:
    Peter Hirst (Agriculture)    Alyssa Panitch (Engineering)
    Karen Yehle (HHS)           Nathan Hartman (PTI)
  – Faculty Athletic Representatives
    Chris Sahley (Science)      Jeff Bolin (Science)

• Connections to the Senate
  – Committee members; minutes of all meeting; annual report
Typical Agenda for AAC Meetings

• Introduction of guests and approval of minutes
• Presentations by guests (often head coaches)
• Report: team schedule approvals & related Issues (Chair)
• Remarks from the Athletic Director
  – Status of the department, facilities issues, Purdue sports, national and Big Ten issues
• Reports & information from other athletics staff
  – Sports Administration, Student Services, Compliance
• Report from the Student Affairs liaison
• Report from the Student Members
• Report from the Faculty Athletic Representatives
  – Student & academic Issues, Big Ten and NCAA matters, etc.
Topics Discussed at 2016 AAC Meetings

• Reports from coaches
  – team profiles, academic metrics, distribution of aid, practice & competition schedules, community service, etc.
• University and NCAA academic metrics
• Personal & professional development programs for students
• Sport schedules & missed class time
  – Volleyball schedule, influence of televised events, Rutgers & Maryland
• Capital projects; R&R and other facilities issues
• Big Ten and NCAA legislation and reports on meetings
  – 2015 NCAA proposal addressing academic misconduct
• Topics related to rules compliance
• Big Ten & NCAA discussions/actions related to student issues
  – Time demands of participation dominates 2015-16
Content in the 2016 AAC Report

• Student athlete majors by college
• CGPA: student-athletes and all students
• CGPA: by team
• Other academic metrics: NCAA APR and GSR
• Top 20 courses: student-athletes & all students
• Courses with >15% or higher participation by student-athletes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or School</th>
<th>Number of student-athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Engineering</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CGPA: student athletes and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance Measures</th>
<th>Spring 14-'15</th>
<th>Fall 15-'16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athletes</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CGPA: by team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2015 - Team</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
<th>Fall 2015 - Team</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Men's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Women's Cross Country</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Totals</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Student-Athlete Totals</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body Totals</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Student Body Totals</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top 20 courses: student-athletes & all students
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“Please provide a sport-by-sport and freshman, sophomore, junior, senior breakdown of student majors, GPA, and five most popular (by enrollment numbers) courses.”

Comparable material is provided in the written report and in this presentation.

– But, student GPA data are aggregated by sport or across all sports
  • Data not readily available by academic classification and small squad sizes would raise FERPA issues for several sports (e.g., basketball, golf, tennis, volleyball)
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“Why does the Purdue athletic department not retain on-campus researchers, skilled in the assessment of the brain health of athletes, to monitor the exposure to head collisions and subsequent effects on brain function for the 100+ players who participate in football each year?

Such an action would permit Purdue to catch up to other Big Ten schools (e.g., Penn State University, University of Nebraska) that have made protection of the brain health of their student athletes a priority, and would readily appear to be a valuable investment of Athletic Department money.” [sic]
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“Why does the Purdue athletic department not retain on-campus researchers, ... to monitor the exposure to head collisions in football. Such an action would permit Purdue to catch up to other Big Ten schools (e.g., Penn State University, University of Nebraska) ...that have made protection of the brain health of their student athletes a priority....”

Brain health is a priority of all contact sports at Purdue and all concussions, regardless of sport or cause, are managed with a comprehensive program of rest, restriction of play and academics, and a gradual reintegration to classwork and sport as the individual symptoms permit.

Purdue’s Concussion Management Plan has been approved by the NCAA Concussion Protocol Committee and is similar to other plans within the Big Ten (including PSU and Nebraska) as well as the other Power 5 Conferences.

Purdue sports medicine is collaborating with researchers to develop a system that accurately measures head impact forces.

Dr. Greg Rowdon, M.D., Head Team Physician, was consulted on these questions.
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“Why does the Purdue athletic department not retain on-campus researchers, ... to monitor the exposure to head collisions in football.

Such an action would permit Purdue to catch up to other Big Ten schools (e.g., Penn State University, University of Nebraska) ....a valuable investment of Athletic Department money”

Faculty members & athletic staff from Penn State* and Nebraska** were consulted by telephone to learn the status of academic-athletic interactions.

Very good cooperation seems to exist at both, but the involvement of researchers appears to be voluntary or supported by sponsored programs or university resources.

* Faculty athletic rep. & “Sam” Slobounov, Ph.D., professor of Kinesiology, and director of the Center for Sport Concussion Research and Service.

** Faculty athletic rep. & Steve Waterfield, JD, Executive Assoc. Athletics Director.
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“What is left of “mens sana in corpore sano”; the original idea that justified athletics in the academy?” *

(1) Practical endorsement of this idea by the academy has declined.

“...the physical education requirement declined from an all-time high of 97% in the 1920s and 1930s to an all-time low of 39.55% in 2010. Given society's ongoing health challenges and the important role of physical activity in maintaining health, this seems counterintuitive. It is also inconsistent with the National Physical Activity Plan.”


* Some Thoughts Concerning Education, 1693, John Locke.
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“What is left of “mens sana in corpore sano”; the original idea that justified athletics in the academy?” *

(2) On the other hand, Purdue students actively endorse the concept*

– 650,000 card swipes into rec. center during fall semester (7,000/day)
– 9,864 unique participants in intramural sports 2014-15
– 2184 participants in Club Sports (32 club teams) 2014-15
– Purdue research on the academic consequences**

Survey of 500 Purdue students...400 used the rec center, 100 did not

Among the findings: the group who used the rec. center presented
  • 10% higher GPA (almost .3 of grade point higher)
  • 20% improvement at being able to manage stress

* Data provided by Howard Taylor, Director, Division of Recreational Sports
** http://www.education.purdue.edu/news/slattenreccenter.html
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“What is left of “mens sana in corpore sano”; the original idea that justified athletics in the academy?” *

(3) A disturbing possibility…. it’s been lost by us but not others.
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“There is significant body of evidence surrounding sports-related head trauma and CTE. Some of this is being explored in Purdue labs. Is there any plan within the NCAA, or within Purdue, to limit head trauma or monitor athletes? Is there any program that provides health care for athletes who may develop CTE symptoms after their collegiate career?”

• Purdue University has a program in place to provide proper coaching technique for tackling (Heads Up Program), to minimize the amount of contact during practices, and to deemphasize "gratuitous" hits. The NCAA has also instituted football practice guidelines and penalties on headfirst contact as well as blows to the head during competition.

• Unfortunately there is currently no way to monitor or test for CTE in the living. Further the symptoms are non-specific and similar to multiple other dementia-like illnesses.

Dr. Greg Rowdon, M.D., Head Team Physician, was consulted on these questions.
Requests and Questions from the Senate

“What percentage of students in each sport take prescription pain relievers? What percentage of those prescriptions are for opioids? What analysis of the use of prescription or illegal pain relievers by former Purdue student athletes is being conducted?”

• The percentage of student athletes in each sport taking prescription pain relievers is not maintained and would be deemed a violation of HIPAA regulations. In general, anti-inflammatories may be prescribed on an as-needed basis to treat their medical/orthopedic conditions.

• In general, a very small percentage of student athletes may receive opioid pain relievers on a case by case basis for the acute treatment of significant injury (fracture, acute back pain) or following surgery. No student athletes are allowed to participate in their sport while taking opioids.

• The use of prescription or illegal pain relievers by former Purdue student athletes would be impossible to track.

Dr. Greg Rowdon, M.D., Head Team Physician, was consulted on these questions.
Purdue University Senate
Educational Policy Committee
Annual report for the 2015-2016 academic year
Submitted by Ryan Cabot, EPC chair

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) met regularly during the 2015-2016 academic year (meeting approximately once every two weeks). This report provides a summary of the business conducted by the EPC during the 2015-2016 academic year.

2015-2016 EPC voting members


*Todd served as the PGSG representative to EPC from August 2015-December 2015. He was unable to attend the EPC meetings beginning in January 2016 due to a schedule conflict; Dina took over as the PGSG representative from January 2016-May 2016.

2015-2016 EPC advisors, ex-officio members, and guests

Lesa Beals, LeeAnn Williams, Julie Cox, Candiss Vibbert, Sheila Hurt, Kelly Pistilli, Sandy Monroe.

Documents sent to the full senate:

Senate Document 15-8 Transcript Notations-passed
This document states that disciplinary sanctions, which result in a student being involuntary separated from the University, will be noted on a student's transcript.

Faculty committees reporting to EPC:

Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC):
The UCC has invited representative from the Purdue regional campuses to join their meetings.

Committee for Scholastic Delinquencies and Readmissions (CSDR):
The CSDR continued to handle readmission applications.
**Special note to the Nominating Committee**: The CSDR was missing two faculty members this year; they request that these spots be filled for the upcoming academic year.

Academic Organization
A request from the Department of Computer and Information Technology to become the School of Computer and Information Technology. This was supported and passed on to the Provost’s office.

A request from the Fort Wayne campus to change the name of the Department of Consumer and Family Sciences to the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management. This was supported and passed on to the Provost’s office.

Academic Progress and Records
Nothing to report

Committee for Student Excellence
Nothing to report

**Policy regarding application for readmission after multiple academic drops**
The Office of Admissions announced in the spring of 2015 that they would only accept readmission applications from students after their first academic drop; students that were dropped two (or more) times for poor academic performance would no longer be allowed to apply for readmission consideration. Because this change in process conflicted with the policy language, EPC considered changing Purdue’s policy on multiple academic drops. After reviewing the academic performance data of students readmitted to Purdue after two or more academic drops, EPC found that a substantial number of these students ultimately earn a degree from Purdue. EPC asked Admissions to reconsider their change in practice. The Office of Admissions now, once again, allows students with multiple academic drops to apply for readmission consideration.

**Assessing critical thinking skills**
EPC received information regarding the use of a variety of assessment tools geared toward measuring the critical thinking skills of incoming Purdue students (e.g., the CLA+ and iSkills tests). EPC drafted a letter that outlined our concerns surrounding the current state of this testing initiative after reviewing the information provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness (OIRAE). This letter was sent to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the President, and members of the Oversight, Research & Implementation teams from the Student Growth Taskforce on March 23, 2016.

**Academic integrity**
EPC formed a working group that focused on issues pertaining to academic integrity at Purdue. This group had representation from faculty, students, and the
Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Initial discussion revealed a need for funds to support exam proctoring; this need was rapidly addressed by Vice Provost Dooley. We understand that this resource has been restored.

Another point that surfaced quickly was that academic dishonesty is not notated anywhere on a student's academic transcript. This point, along with discussions from the holistic review of academic policies and student regulations (outlined in the following section) led EPC to develop Senate document 15-8, which was approved by the full University Senate.

One idea discussed by the group the addition of a new grade to our current grading scale, a grade known as an “XF”. This grade would be issued by an instructor when a student receives a failing grade due to a breech in academic integrity. Many points and factors were considered and this will continue to be an active area of discussion in the next academic year.

**Holistic review of academic policies and student regulations**

The Office of the Registrar, along with input from the academic advising community and EPC, continues to work through the many polices that pertain to student academic regulations at Purdue. Part of this effort involves “cleaning up” outdated languages and identifying policies that are in conflict with one another. In addition, this group worked to identify policies that are vague or that seem to be interpreted and enforced differently across programs at Purdue. We expect that proposed changes to existing policies will begin to come to EPC in the 2016-2017 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan Cabot
The Purdue University Nominating Committee met 6 times this AY and worked on the following:

- December, 2015 – reviewed the Senate Bylaws, with respect to the Nominating Committee, and began work on a Senate document recommending changes
- January, 2016 –
  - Sent all faculty members an invitation to volunteer for the various Faculty Committees via a Qualtrix sign-up link
  - Met to begin populating the Faculty Committees
- February, 2016 –
  - Met twice: once to finish populating Faculty Committees and once to begin populating Standing Committees
  - Sent all Senate faculty members an invitation to volunteer for the various Standing Committees via a Qualtrix sign-up link
  - Further discussed changes to the Bylaws and developed a document to bring to the full Senate
- March, 2016 –
  - Met to finish populating Standing Committees
  - Brought the Bylaw changes to the Senate – it was defeated
- April, 2016 –
  - Sent a letter to the Provost requesting that the Senate committee sign-up site be handled by Se’Andra Johnson, rather than the College of Veterinary Medicine
  - Met with Se’Andra to discuss how the Senate committee sign-up might be handled, if the Provost will support her working on this over the summer.
MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

FACULTY: Pamela Aaltonen, Mary Comer, Ed Fox, Stanton Gelvin, Matthew Ginzel, Chad Jafvert, Russell Jones [chair], Chuck Krousgrill, Carlos Morales, Robert Nowak, Sandra Rossie, Kipling Williams

STUDENTS: Geralyn Denger, Jocelyn Dunn, Linfeng Jin, Daniel Romary, Renner Winston, Anastacia Young

ADVISORS: Heather Beasley, Linda Mason, Beth McCuskey

RESOLUTIONS FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

1. Senate Resolution 15-9 was presented by SAC in February and passed in March by Senate vote. This resolution proposes an increase in the minimum wage for part-time and temporary employees on campus to $8.25 per hour.

2. Senate Resolution 15-13 was scheduled for presentation by SAC in March, but was delayed because of lack of a quorum, which was called for in the midst of Prof. Jones’ presentation. Therefore, the resolution is scheduled for discussion and, hopefully, action [pending a suspension of the rules] at the April meeting of the Senate. This resolution proposes a continuation of funding for PLaCE, Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange, a new unit focused on improving oral and writing communication through culturally sensitive, educationally purposeful activities. This center focuses on helping international students who come from countries whose first language is not English. At present, funding is only guaranteed for PLaCE through academic year 2016-17.

3. Senate Resolution 15-20 is being presented for discussion at the March Senate meeting. SAC is hopeful that action can be taken as well at the meeting. This resolution is focused on increasing the staff size, by eight clinicians, of the Counseling and Psychological Services [CAPS] center on Purdue’s campus. Comparative studies document the shortcomings of our staffing relative to the number of psychologists available, the length of wait times for students to see a clinician, and the continued expected increase in loads as time goes on. This resolution was crafted through the excellent work of two student senators from Purdue
Student Government, Daniel Romary and Mackenzie McDonald. It has the support of the Equity and Diversity Committee as well.

ADDITIONAL WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

4. Selection of Faculty Representatives to PSG and PGSG meetings
   We elected Matthew Ginzel to attend the Purdue Student Government meetings as our faculty representative from SAC, and, similarly, Chad Jafvert as the representative to Purdue Graduate Student Government.

5. Academic honesty; cheating
   A request from President Daniels, forwarded via the Steering Committee to SAC at the beginning of the academic year, asked us to focus on issues of academic honesty amongst the student body. SAC chair Jones put together a panel of students, headed by Renner Winston, to study the issues, specifically ways in which students cheat, and how pervasive cheating on campus seemed to be. Winston submitted a report of the committee’s findings, which was forwarded on to the Steering Committee in March. [See Appendix A.]

6. Campus climate for international students
   The committee spent the better part of fall term in discussion of the campus climate for international students. We were dependent on one of our graduate student committee members, Linfeng Jin, to help spearhead the conversations, relating his experiences as an undergraduate at another institution, and comparing that to his time at Purdue. We discussed the "Let’s Talk About It" program begun by PSG, which has as it’s goal to focus on a variety of important issues concerned with campus climate. A recent event drew an audience of 300 participants to Fowler Hall. It was suggested to take some events to the dorms, spreading them to different locations each time rather than a singular location. It was suggested that the climate for international students could be a topic for a future session. All in all, we feel that the University goes out of its way to involve international students in day-to-day activities of the campus-wide activities. Opportunities to make friends with people from countries other than one’s own are plentiful, and begin with Boiler Gold Rush. While it is natural that students will form cliques, and this is unavoidable, the opportunities to meet others are frequently made available.

7. Policy on procedures for allowing time for student leaves of absence
   The Equity and Diversity Committee [EDC] sent a request to SAC for information related to whether a policy could be established to protect students who required a leave of absence
from the University for a long-term illness. We specifically looked at three issues: re-admittance to undergraduate school; loss of financial aid; and loss of graduate financial aid. We learned that undergraduate students may withdraw from the University for up to three semesters and be re-admitted without having to re-apply. Their financial aid is not secure in all cases, however, depending on the type of aid they have received. This is because most financial aid is controlled by governmental sources. In essence, while students may not incur issues with academic standing when taking a leave of absence, their financial aid will probably be impacted. Issues of graduate student funding are much more difficult to guarantee, because of the variety of sources of graduate stipends and assistantships. These funds, and their security for a student requesting a leave, must be arranged on a case-by-case basis. Thus, at present, there is no campus-wide policy that guarantees a secure re-admittance, with continuance of funding, for either undergraduate or graduate students.

8. **The Forecast App**

At our meeting following the Senate meeting in which The Forecast App was presented, the question arose as to whether students have the ability to opt out of participation, or even if they are aware that their actions/movements are being tracked. The committee decided to draft a statement of concern, which was forwarded to The Steering Committee. As a result, the start of The Forecast App pilot was delayed, and a new task force was formed to work on issues of student privacy, with three members of SAC taking positions on the task force: Stan Gelvin, Chad Jafvert, and Chuck Krousgrill. The Statement of Concern is as follows:

_The Student Affairs Committee expresses concern about the proposal to implement “The Forecast App“ at Purdue. We perceive there is a potential for the invasion of student privacy with this tool. One thing to consider is whether students are aware of how their activities are being monitored, and whether they can be given the option to opt out of such monitoring. We strongly suggest further study before the policy is implemented.”_
APPENDIX I

Purdue Student Report on Academic Honesty

Student Affairs Sub-Committee on Academic Honesty
Purdue Student Government
Purdue University
April 1st, 2016
Summary

The Academic Affairs Committee is comprised of several faculty members and several undergraduate and graduate students; its Sub-Committee on Academic Honesty is comprised of several undergraduate students within Purdue Student Government who represent various demographics and students. The focus of the sub-committee was to research various methods of academic dishonesty that the students have either witnessed or have heard about during their time at Purdue. The committee chair, Renner Winston, was able to attend a seminar at Purdue University with a focus on academic integrity to provide information to the sub-committee before its first session. The students were also provided some common statistics from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The students researched different methods of cheating while coming up with a proposed solution for each method mentioned below.
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Statistics on Academic Dishonesty

The students were provided the following information from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities from 2013: 676 total discipline cases have been adjudicated by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities; 202 (9.8%) of those cases have involved violations of the policy on “Academic Dishonesty; All Other Dishonesty;” 98 (48.5%) students in those cases accepted responsibly for the charges that were assigned; 83 (41.0%) students in those cases were found responsible for the charges that were assigned; 21 (10.3%) students in those cases either had their university level charges dismissed or were found not responsible; 91 (45%) students in those cases self-identify as International students.

Several common examples of a violation were: unauthorized sharing of homework (most common in Engineering and Computer Science courses, specifically ENG 132, CS 159, CS 240); plagiarism and improper citations/references; cheating such as copying from others exams, using unauthorized material during an exam, or attempting to resubmit graded homework/exams for extra points. More egregious examples were: purchasing papers from internet websites and submitting those as original works; entering faculty member offices to remove exams/homework assignments without authorization; entering university computing systems to alter/change recorded grades; Attempting to have teacher/instructor manuals shipped to students enrolled in a class.

As mentioned in the previous statistics, 45% of the cases in violation of the policy on “Academic Dishonesty; All Other Dishonesty” were international students. Some common reasons to explain this trend would include: different perceptions/understanding of what “collaboration” and “group work” means; lack of understanding of faculty member expectations for particular assignments/coursework; pressure centered on academic success coming from their home; concern over the creation of a “record” of the incident. It should be noted that many of these concerns are the same for domestic students as well.
Student Thoughts on Information Provided by the Academic Integrity Seminar

An Academic Integrity seminar took place on March 4th, 2016 at Purdue University with guests from other colleges around the area. Renner Winston, chair of the sub-committee on Academic Honesty, was able to take notes and provide them for discussion during the sub-committee meetings. The following paragraphs include the topic of discussion as well as the student’s thoughts and perspectives.

International Students view academic dishonesty differently than students in the United States do. Part of this issue is due to a different testing system to get into college compared to our testing system. In some cultures, using someone else’s work can be perceived as a sense of honor for the other person; the issue with this is when there is not a proper citation of the referenced material.

Fraternity systems have a large amount of previous class files and binders that are used to help new members while helping to improve the chapters GPA. This was not perceived as negative by the committee, because if a professor were to hand back exams to the students after taking it, then it should be expected by the professor that it will be studied for future exams.

Some students are ashamed to reach out to their professors if they are struggling with their courses. If this is the case, then students will sometimes resort to cheating on their assignments in order to get the work done. This could be a result of students being unprepared academically when they get to Purdue, so we must trust that the Office of Admissions is recruiting the right students that are getting in to Purdue. If students are ashamed to reach out to professors, a method could be set in place to incentivize students to reach out if they are in need of help in lieu. It could also be recommended to professors by the university that this is a root cause of cheating, so that professors can promote their students to come to them if they need any help. It was also noted that a potential solution would be to reach out to the parents of the students who are in violation of the academic honesty policy.

In some rare cases, a student will give an emotional excuse as to why they cheated and convince the professor to not turn them in. This can end up doing
more harm than good because the student could have given the same response to a different professor in a different class at a different time. The program is in place that if a student is caught cheating, then the Dean of Students will be notified. If there is a common trend with that student, then they are removed from the university. The issue is that some professors are not reporting every single case because it might be a minor infraction and they trust that the student will not do it again. The sub-committee did not know the correct solution, but it was recommended that there is a software that allows professors to record these “minor infractions” so that there is not a severe punishment the first time around for that student.

The final topic was on the website “Chegg,” an online homework help site. If the professor gives out problems from the end of a chapter from a well-known text book, the student is capable of going online to find every solution to their problems for a small fee. This is most commonly used by students with large course loads who have not properly managed their time to complete the homework on their own. It is much easier to “Chegg” their homework assignment for 30 minutes, than it is to actually work out the problem on their own for 3 hours. This is only helpful in the short-term, because when it is time for the exam, the student will not know how to properly think through a problem to solve it. Once a student uses this website for the first time, it becomes much easier to use it again because they do not want to face the time commitment of solving a lengthy homework assignment. It was recommend that professors give out homework assignments that were not previously recorded online or in a text book, because there will more than likely be a solution to it online.

Conclusions

The information provided by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities to the sub-committee was very helpful in looking at common trends with academic dishonesty. The sub-committee was able to look at the data, analyze it, and relate it to the information provided by the Academic Integrity seminar. The information provided allowed the sub-committee to think about their own experience at Purdue and communicate a realistic student-perspective on the data that was provided.
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University Resources Policy Committee
Annual Report for 2015-2016 Academic Year

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

URPC met once a month for the 2015-2016 academic year, 7 meetings in all. The meetings had a 50% attendance rate, roughly 8 out of 16 URPC members participated at each meeting. The URPC meetings also had a significant number of guests, including representatives from the 7 subcommittees that report to URPC and representatives from Purdue Physical Facilities. There were no resolutions that passed from the URPC and introduced to the full University Senate, but a number of topics were discussed that include:

   Michael Cline Advisor - Vice President for Physical Facilities
   Beth McCuskey Advisor - Vice President for Housing and Student Services
   Jo Ann Banks Botany and Plant Pathology
   Stephen Byrn Industrial and Physical Pharmacy
   Elena Coda Languages and Cultures
   Clifford Fisher Management
   Alan Friedman Biological Sciences
   William Hutzel (Chair) Mechanical Engineering Technology
   Monika Ivantysynova Agricultural and Biological Engineering
   Richard Johnson-Sheehan English
   Sophie Lelièvre Basic Medical Sciences
   Douglas Nelson Hospital and Tourism Management
   Voicu Popescu Computer Science
   Joseph Sinfield Civil Engineering
   William Sullivan Executive VP for Business and Finance
   Eric Scott PSG Appointment
   Mackenzie McDonald PSG Appointment
   Christopher Kulesza PGSG Appointment

2. Subcommittee Work
   a. Architectural and Landscape Design & Planning: Daphene Koch
      The lines of communication between faculty and staff were disrupted by a reorganization within Physical Facilities that eliminated the Purdue Office of the Architect. The opportunity for faculty input was re-instituted with the new Office of Asset Management.
   b. Library Committee: Jan Olek – no activity reported
c. Parking & Traffic: Andrew Hirsch

Pay parking in some Purdue parking garages was instituted for home football games. This was not a popular decision among faculty and staff who already pay for parking privileges. The staff responsible for parking management insisted that 1) parking permits do not necessarily include weekend parking and 2) alternative free parking is still available on campus during home football games.

d. Staff Appeal Board for Traffic Regulations: Hazar Dib

This subcommittee is fully staffed and handling appeals on an as-needed basis.

e. Sustainability: Jane Yatcilla

A resolution to have Purdue President Mitch Daniels sign the Climate Change Commitment was submitted and discussed. The resolution was endorsed by the Sustainability Sub-Committee but was not passed by URPC. The concern at URPC was the open-ended nature of the Climate Change Commitment in terms of cost and specific actions required. A compromise measure is moving forward in that Physical Facilities has agreed to update its own university-wide Sustainability Plan in a comprehensive way, with significant input from faculty, staff, and students.

f. Budget Interpretation, Evaluation, and Review: Larry DeBoer

This group develops its own comprehensive analysis of the Purdue budget in a way that provides insight into the implications of budgetary decisions. The work of this committee was hindered this year by a change to Purdue’s accounting procedures that make data collection more difficult.

g. Visual Arts

This committee is actively involved in the selection, purchase, and installation of art work on campus. Their poster collection was recently transferred to oversight by the Purdue Graduate Student Council. A detailed report is attached

3. Summary of Presentations to the URPC Committee

a. Utility Scale Solar at Purdue – student presentation

April presentation discussed opportunities for cost effective investment in solar electricity

b. State Street Project Update – Don Petersen, Director for Energy & Construction

March presentation gave an overview of the upgrades planned for State Street

c. COEUS Replacement – Ken Sandel, Director of Sponsored Programs

February presentation highlighted plans to replace the web-based tool for managing research projects

d. Space Management – Carol Horan, Registrar and Brad Bowen, Asset Management

February presentation discussed Physical Facilities management of campus space

e. Sustainability Plan – Michael Gulich

February presentation presented a strategy for updating Purdue’s sustainability plan

4. Professor Alan Friedman, Biology, was elected Committee Chair for 2016-2017
Highlights of the EDC’s accomplishments during its second year as a University’s Senate Standing Committee:

1. In August 2015, several members of the Equity and Diversity Committee (E&DC) met with Provost Dutta to discuss the administrative decision to eliminate the position for VP-Diversity and Inclusion.

2. Members of the E&DC wrote an editorial for the Journal & Courier and the Exponent to share highlights from the discussion with Provost Dutta regarding his plans to take over the position of Chief Diversity Officer. See copy of Journal and Courier editorial below:  

3. On the request of a Department Chair, the E&DC asked the Senate Students’ Affairs Committee to look into whether there was policy to handle graduate students’ extended sick leave of absence. It was found that undergraduate students have some protection, but graduate students with a TAship or RAship are more vulnerable. Mark Smith, as Dean of the Graduate School and Ex-Officio Member of the E&DC, will look into creating a fund to allow graduate students needing an extended sick leave to have assurance of continued fellowship funding on their return to campus.

4. The E&DC sought to learn more about opportunities for financial support available for underrepresented students and to explore ways that these opportunities could be improved. To this end, the E&DC:

   a. Invited David Lasater, Associate VP for Advancement from Purdue Research Foundation (PRF), DJ Layton, PRF and Karen McCullough, PRF, to make a presentation to committee members.
   b. Mark Smith and Alberto Rodriguez met with VP, Pamela Horne, Admissions, Financial Aid and Enrollment Management and others to learn more about how decision for scholarships are determined and how URM students are considered.
   c. The Committee learned that Purdue continues to provide a great deal less financial support to URM students than other big ten universities,
and the bottom line is to press the central administration for more funds to be allocated for recruitment and retention of URM students.

5. **Statement of unity of solidarity:** Given the nationwide and local student demonstrations against institutionalized racism. The E&DC successfully introduce a resolution that included a strong statement of solidarity with the student protesters. After a heated discussion, the resolution was passed with overwhelming majority [See Senate Document 15-5, Nov 16, 2015].

6. **Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Expression:** This committee was created to prepare a resolution in response to the Board of Trustees’ Freedom of Expression statement. After much deliberation, the E&DC introduced a resolution in the Senate that was passed. See Senate Document 15-11, March, 2016.

7. **Ad Hoc Committee on Recruitment and Retention:** This committee reviewed the university’s *Affirmative Action Report: Gender, Race and Ethnicity* (2014-2015). The goal was to investigate recruitment and retention trends across the university and to provide recommendations for improvement with a focus on long-term structural changes. The E&DC submitted a resolution for its first reading at the April 2016 meeting (See Senate Document 15-20). The E&DC will follow up this resolution at the September 2016 meeting when it will come for a vote of the senate.

8. The E&DC is reviewing the results of the COACHE survey and is exploring ways to address findings related to climate and mistreatment of faculty. Mimi Boudin, an E&DC Member, is also a member of the task force created by the Provost Office to review the COACHE data. The E&DC will continue working on this topic next academic year.

9. Related to item #8 above, the E&DC is also seeking support for a campus wide climate survey to contrast with the 2008 climate survey results. Next year’s E&DC members will continue this work.