UNIVERSITY SENATE
Third Meeting, Monday, 16 November 2015, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order
   
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

2. Approval of Minutes of 19 October 2015

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson
   
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

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

6. Question Time

7. Senate Document 15-2 Endorsement of the Revised Promotion
   and Tenure Criteria
   
   For Action
   Professor J. Stuart Bolton

8. Senate Document 15-3 Reapportionment of the Senate
   
   For Action
   Professor David A. Sanders

9. Legal Implications for Faculty of Confidentiality Policies
   and Agreements
   
   For Information
   University Counsel Steven Schultz

10. CIC Meeting for Senate Leadership and Intercampus Cooperation
    
    For Information
    Professor David A. Sanders

11. New Business

12. Memorial Resolutions

13. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Third Meeting, Monday, 16 November 2015, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center


Guests: Valerie O'Brien (Marketing & Media), Spencer Deery (Marketing & Media), Brent Drake (OIRAE), Sumaya Bahrami (PHARM), Chantale Daifi (PHARM), Jarred Meeks (Exponent), Ryan Fogg (PSG), Alexis Moberger (WLFI), Joseph Paul (J&C).

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Chairperson Kirk Alter.
2. The minutes of the 19 October 2015 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. 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. PGSG Senator Andrew Zeller thanked the Student Affairs Committee for appointing student liaisons.
6. As President Daniels and Provost Dutta were not at the meeting, there was no formal Question Time.
7. Professor J. Stuart Bolton, Co-Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), presented for Action Senate Document 15-2, Endorsement of the Revised Promotion and Tenure Criteria. He explained the rationale for the document and how it was related to Senate Document 15-1 which had been approved at the September University Senate meeting. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. No discussion occurred and the vote was taken. The document was approved with 55 votes in support, 4 votes in opposition and 6 abstentions.
8. Professor Sanders introduced Senate Document 15-3, Reapportionment of the Senate. In order to vote on the document at this meeting, a motion was made to suspend the voting
rules. The motion was seconded and passed by consent of the Senate. Following the suspension of the rules, Professor Sanders made a motion to approve the document and this motion was seconded. During the discussion period, Professor John Niser noted that there is a lack of proportion representation of the regional campuses on the University Senate. Professor Alter responded that this concern will be discussed in the near future especially in light of the merging of the North Central and Calumet campuses. Following the discussion, the document passed by unanimous voice vote.

9. University Legal Counsel Steven R. Schultz and Professor Beverly Davis presented information on the Legal Implications for Faculty of Confidentiality Policies and Agreements (see Appendices C & D). Professor Davis serves as the Chair of the Purdue Polytechnic Institute Faculty Affairs Committee. Following their remarks, they took questions from the Senate floor.

a. Professor Natalie Carroll asked why a document concerning confidentiality was needed given the existing requirements for confidentiality in matters of promotion and tenure considerations. Professor Davis noted that she was not involved in the promulgation of the document, but thought that its purpose was to serve as an additional reminder of the need for confidentiality. Professor Carroll asked if the Purdue Polytechnic Institute (PPI) Dean already reminded faculty of the need for confidentiality and Professor Davis answered in the affirmative. The Dean was also not aware of the existence of a document requiring a signature from faculty members prior to the promotion and tenure discussions. Again, someone in the PPI thought that an additional reminder was needed and a signed document could strengthen the reminder. Professor Davis said that the need to have a signature is what caught the attention of the PPI faculty. Professor Alter commented that he has concerns about informal documents becoming the basis for formal policies without faculty input with the potential for shifting practices and procedures at the whim of administrators. Professor Rebecca Doerge asked if the signed document was meant as a means of enforcing confidentiality. Professor Davis said this was not the intent. This entire matter first came to light when a department head passed out the documents at a meeting and the faculty pushed back on the proposal to require signatures. Professor Stephen Beaudoin asked how bullet #4 (see Appendix D) was related to confidentiality. Professor Christian Butzke suggested that it is there so the University can protect itself. Professor Davis believes that the documents will be reviewed in the PPI and the signature requirement would probably be eliminated. Professors Davis and Alter encouraged comments from the Senators and faculty from all Colleges as the discussion of this matter continues in the PPI. Professors Cheryl Cooky and Natalie Carroll suggested that a “Band-Aid®” approach to fix the perceived problem was inappropriate and the issue should be reconsidered in its entirety. Professor Alter thanked Counsel Schultz and Professor Davis for their time.

10. Professor David Sanders presented information on intercampus cooperation among faculty governance groups within the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) membership. Professor Sanders also spoke against the use of the Gallup-Purdue Index (GPI) as a resource used by the Administration in the creation and promulgation of academic policies. He showed a one-slide PowerPoint presentation in support of his opposition to the GPI (see Appendix E).

11. Under New Business, Professor Alberto Rodriguez, Chair of the Equity and Diversity Committee (E & DC), presented Senate Document 15-5, Resolution in Support of
Embracing and Supporting Diversity in all its Forms: Senator Mike Young noted that Purdue Student Government (PSG) has a similar bill coming forward and if the Senate Document passes, the PSG document is likely to pass. A motion was made and seconded to suspend the voting rules in order to vote on this document during the November Senate meeting. The motion to suspend the rules passed. A motion was made and seconded to approve Senate Document 15-5. A vigorous discussion ensued. Clarifications of the wording and friendly amendments to modify the wording were accepted and/or discussed. Senators spoke in fervent support or opposition to specific words and phrases in the document. In addition to friendly amendments, two formal amendments to the wording were proposed and defeated. One of the formal amendments was to remove the word “institutionalized” from the document. This motion was defeated with 14 votes in favor, 36 in opposition with 2 abstentions. A second motion proposed additional rewording of the first sentence of the document. It was defeated with 14 votes in favor, 39 in opposition with 2 abstentions. Following the discussion, the vote occurred and Senate Document 15-5 was approved with 47 votes in favor, 7 in opposition with 1 abstention.

A second item of New Business was proposed by Professor Sanders. He introduced Senate Document 15-4, Resolution of Support for the Faculty Senate of the University of Iowa. Professor Sanders explained the rationale for and the creation of the document which had its origins at the Annual Meeting of the CIC Faculty Governance group. A motion was made and seconded to suspend the voting rules in order to vote on this document during the November Senate meeting. The motion to suspend the rules was approved by unanimous voice vote. A motion was made and seconded to approve Senate Document 15-4. Following a brief discussion, the vote was taken and the motion to approve passed with 36 votes in favor, 8 votes in opposition with 4 abstentions.

12. No Memorial Resolutions had been received.

13. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
To: The University Senate  
From: J. Stuart Bolton; Acting Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee  
Subject: Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, West Lafayette Campus  
Disposition: University Senate for Endorsement  
References: Proposed changes to Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document

WHEREAS: Purdue University demonstrates an ongoing commitment to excellence in its missions of research, teaching & learning, and engagement & outreach and

WHEREAS: The creation of new knowledge in all forms should be supported, valued and respected and

WHEREAS: Tenure helps to ensure academic freedom and should promote creative and innovative pursuits and

WHEREAS: Faculty promotion is an important indicator of professional accomplishment within the University and profession and

WHEREAS: Clearly established criteria are critical to ensuring that the evaluation of faculty is subject to a standard of fairness, consistency and objectivity and

WHEREAS: Clearly established criteria are critical to ensuring the recruitment and retention of world-class faculty, and

WHEREAS: The Faculty Affairs Committee voted affirmatively to endorse the revised Promotion and Tenure Criteria document (here denoted: FAC P&T Criteria Document 09102015 v1: pages 1-6) and that it be presented to the University Senate for a vote of endorsement.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Purdue University Senate endorses the revised Criteria document.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Stuart Bolton
Approving:

Fabrice Baudoin
J. Stuart Bolton
Christian E. Butzke
Janusz Duzinkiewicz
Steven J. Landry
Linda S. Prokopy
Alberto J. Rodriguez
David A. Sanders
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh
Elizabeth A. Strickland
Paul G. Wenthold

Not Approving:

Abstaining:

Alysa C. Rollock
M.J.T. Smith

Not voting (sabbatical leave):

Evelyn Blackwood
Levon T. Esters
To: The University Senate  
From: J. Stuart Bolton; Acting Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee  
Subject: Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, West Lafayette Campus  
Disposition: University Senate for Endorsement  
References: Proposed changes to Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document

It is moved to adopt the resolution previously approved by this committee (Senate Document 15-1) as revised to reflect the content of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria document (FAC P&T Criteria Document 09272015 v1: pages 1 – 6) presented to the Faculty Affairs Committee 10/05/15.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Stuart Bolton

Approved:

J. Stuart Bolton  
Christian E. Butzke  
Janusz Duzinkiewicz  
Steven J. Landry  
Alberto J. Rodriguez  
Alysa C. Rollock  
Elizabeth A. Strickland

Absent:

Fabrice Baudoin  
Linda S. Prokopy  
David A. Sanders  
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh  
Paul G. Wenthold  
Mark J.T. Smith
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Reapportionment of the University Senate
REFERENCE: University Senate Document 90-5; University Code D 3.00; Bylaws of the University Senate, Items 2.00 and 2.01
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Approval and Faculty Units

Section D 3.00 of the University Code, and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred two members. Eleven of these are specified in the items 1 through 11 below. The other slots will be apportioned among the West Lafayette faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two Senators. There are 2128 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette campus. When this number is divided by ninety-one the result is 23.39. Therefore, to qualify for two senators, a faculty unit should have at least 47 voting faculty members. Since no faculty unit can have fewer than two Senators, the Libraries unit qualifies for two Senators. The remaining units have a total of 2088 voting faculty members with eighty-nine senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The apportionment of Senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 23.39. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 12.99; Education, 3.08; Engineering, 17.44; Health & Human Sciences, 9.06; Liberal Arts, 12.61; Management, 4.14; Pharmacy, 3.12; Science, 14.15; Purdue Polytechnic Institute, 7.82; Veterinary Medicine, 4.83. In order to achieve the desired 89 Senators the faculty units were rounded to the nearest integer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas Represented</th>
<th>No. Voting Fac. Members</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>No. Voting Fac. Members</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 October 2014</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>1 October 2015</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chief Fiscal Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chairperson of the Senate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vice-Chairperson of the Senate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Calumet Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fort Wayne Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. North Central Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. IUPUI Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Graduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Faculty Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Sciences</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Polytechnic</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2128</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approving
Kirk D. Alter
Jo Ann Banks
Stephen Beaudoin
Kristina Bross
Paul D. Ebner
Michael A. Hill
Sophie Lelièvre
Sandra S. Liu
David A. Sanders
Gerald Shively
University Senate

To: The University Senate
From: David A. Sanders
Subject: Support for the Faculty Senate of the University of Iowa
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

It is hereby resolved that the Purdue University Senate adopts the following Statement of Support for the Faculty Senate of the University of Iowa. Our adoption of this statement will be communicated to campus, local, state, national, and education publications and to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

Statement of Support for the Faculty Senate of the University of Iowa

The Faculty Senate of the University of Iowa voted by a large majority at a September 8, 2015 meeting to issue a statement of no confidence in their Board of Regents. (*)

We, the undersigned representatives of faculty governance systems from across the Midwest express our support for the Faculty Senate of the University of Iowa.

Principles of shared governance dictate that the voice of the faculty, which carries out the core mission of the university, is accorded considerable weight in all important decisions of university governance. In appointing Bruce Harreld as the President of the University of Iowa against overwhelming opposition from the faculty, the Board of Regents, State of Iowa appear to have violated these principles. We have a common interest in ethical conduct, honesty, open and effective communication, public accountability, stewardship and service, and transparency in the process of the appointment of University Presidents and Chancellors.

We call on the Board of Regents, State of Iowa to adhere to the principles of shared university governance and to ethical behavior and transparency.
*This is the text of the resolution voted by the University of Iowa Faculty Senate:

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has failed in its duty of care to the University of Iowa and the citizens of Iowa and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of university governance, and

WHEREAS the Regents have failed to act according to their own strategic plan’s core values, namely ethical behavior, honesty, open and effective communication, public accountability, stewardship and service, and transparency, we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents wisely to govern our institution.

Following are the current signatories from other universities of the statement.

John R. Bender, President, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Faculty Senate

Willie L. Brown, Chair, University of Maryland Senate Executive Committee.

Colin Campbell, Chair, University of Minnesota Faculty Consultative Committee

Edward F. X. Hughes, President, Northwestern University Faculty Senate

Beth Meyerand, Chair of the University Committee, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Gay Miller, Chair, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Senate Executive Committee

Cassidy R. Sugimoto, on behalf of the Indiana University- Bloomington Faculty Council Executive Committee

Silke-Maria Weineck, Chair, Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs, University of Michigan

Laurie Zoloth, Vice-President, Northwestern University Faculty Senate
Endorsed by
Members of the Senate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Faculty Senate Northwestern University
Faculty Senate University of Wisconsin-Madison Faculty Senate

Respectfully submitted by
David A. Sanders
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: Senate Equity & Diversity Committee  
SUBJECT: Public Statement in Support of Diversity and Equity  
DISPOSITION: University Senate Vote  

Whereas, current events occurring across universities in the country—including the student rally held at Purdue University on November 13th of this year—

And whereas, one of the primary functions of the University Senate is to provide leadership on behalf of the university community,

Be it resolved that the University Senate release the following public statement in support of diversity and equity practices at Purdue University:

Given the recent events at Purdue University, the University of Missouri, and Yale University, this is a time to affirm that we must all work together against any act of discrimination or institutionalized oppressive practices, which could obstruct our growth as a university community. The Purdue University Senate wishes to reaffirm our commitment to embracing and celebrating diversity in all of its forms, and we will continue to work actively with the University Administration and campus organizations to ensure that all individuals feel welcome, valued, safe and respected in our university community.
Alter – Senate Address

November 16, 2015

Last Friday, November 13th, events occurred important both for the world and for Purdue. In Paris terrorists attacked multiple targets killing more than one hundred people, and at Purdue more than one hundred students, faculty and staff gathered and rallied against racism.

Subsequent to the attack in Paris it would be wrong for anyone to paint with a broad brush and attack as terrorists in word, thought or deed, those who are faithful to the worship of Islam. The killers in Paris were criminals. To criticize or condemn an entire race or class of people because of the actions of criminals and miscreants who may happen to be followers of a particular faith is, of course, muddled-headed and wrong…surely no one would do that, right?

Bobby Seale once said, “That you don’t fight racism with racism, the best way to fight racism is with solidarity,” and on Friday at Purdue a clear message of solidarity was sent that racism continues to live and breathe in our society and on our campus today. The challenge before us is to determine how to fight racism with solidarity – solidarity with students, solidarity with faculty and staff, solidarity with administration, solidarity with the greater community, and solidarity with those on our campus who hold opinions different than ours – whatever they may be.

We must talk, but not only talk, we must act, and we must also be careful to not be guilty of condemning or acting against those who hold and voice different opinions.

What must always resonate in these discussions is personal respect. I can only walk in my shoes and you can only walk in yours, and we must all do the right things to ensure that our walk is faithful to providing a rich, successful, and respectful Purdue experience for all. We must, though, always hold dear freedom of speech.

One of the best things about being on a college campus is being able to engage in the broad ranging discussions and debates that arise when you gather a large number of people from all walks of life, all cultures, all religions and all beliefs together in one place. There are bound to be disagreements and differences, and sometimes loud ones…and that’s a good thing.

I have read the 13 demands posted at #HowManyMoreFires, and being a card-carrying Lutheran am quite familiar and comfortable with the historically powerful idea of “nailing 95 theses to the church door.” As a child of the 1960s I also am well versed in the power of protest, having participated in many over the decades.

While I agree and endorse fully many of the 13 demands…while finding myself wishing for a more dialog-engaging moniker than demands, there are some that I do not, and that is, of course any individual’s right.

One of the demands…#9 (Beatles flashback anyone?) – that there be a 20% increase of underrepresented minority faculty is precisely what I asked Provost Duta for this summer, and on which I reported during the 1st Senate meeting of this semester. I called for the hiring of 100 new URM faculty hires over the next three years. This year Purdue will hire approximately 100 new faculty hires…that means according to the call, 33 of them should be URM hires. I suggested that each college or unit use their Senate apportionment as their target to achieve this goal. For example, in today’s report of Senate
reapportionment the Purdue Polytechnic Institute will have 8 Senators in the 2016-2017 year. As the goal is to increase our URM faculty hires by 100 over the next three years, then in order to meet the goal the Institute needs to succeed in hiring three URM faculty hires in its current searches. As another example, Engineering will have 17 Senators, so they need to ensure that six of their hires this year are URM faculty hires.

I had agreement with Provost Duta on this stretch goal of 100 over three years prior to the semester starting. Since then the Office of the Provost has walked this commitment back. What I have been told is that the Deans are rejecting the notion of a specific targeted goal. I suspect also that some faculty search committees are also soft on this goal. I know that that is not true in the Polytechnic Institute, as Dean Bertoline has embraced the idea, and is actively committed to meeting the goal. As a Senate we need to insist that all of our deans commit to this goal.

As faculty we have the ability to achieve this goal. All of the search committees are populated with faculty. My challenge to the faculty is to not try. My challenge to the faculty is to succeed. My School, in the Institute, is currently conducting three faculty searches. My school is only one unit of many, and all we have to do is to insist that at least one of our three searches be filled with a URM hire. It is in our power to do that.

Our commitment must be to bring forward at least one top-ranked URM recommendation and then insist that that person be the person hired by the dean. Any excuses such as “we couldn’t find any qualified URM candidates” is just that, an excuse. Our search committees must have the backbone and work ethic to get the job done. We all have our networks, and we must do the hard work of finding and recruiting top URM candidates. A tactic that faculty search committees could use is to send forward only one candidate, the URM candidate, and then insist that that be the hire. If we were a for-profit business entity and committed to finding a URM manager or executive for a certain vacancy we would scour the marketplace and we would succeed. That is what we must do, period. That is what all Purdue faculty engaged in search committees must do.

We cannot create a diverse and welcoming community at Purdue unless we populate our community with diverse faculty mentors and leaders.

Something else we must do is to populate the empty seats in the Senate, and on our Faculty Councils and Committees today, and from now on, with URM faculty who are willing to help to lead to cultural change. It is very challenging as Chair to look out at each Senate meeting and see twenty empty seats. Let’s fill those seats with actively engaged faculty.

Today in the Senate we will be hearing several calls to action to address examples of threats to our campus community and threats to shared governance – both at Purdue and in the Big 10.

First, on Monday Chairman Rodriquez of the Senate Standing Committee on Equity and Diversity and I agreed that the committee would produce a resolution affirming the Senate’s commitment to embracing and celebrating diversity in all of its forms. That resolution will be brought forward in this session today. Further, Chairman Rodriguez has presented to Provost Duta and I a plan for creating an ongoing dialog on campus regarding the issues brought forward at last Friday’s demonstration. The details of that plan will be announced soon.
Second, a month ago Senate Vice Chairman Sanders, Secretary of the Faculty Camp and I attended a CIC meeting of senate leaders from across the Big 10 held at the University of Illinois. At that meeting a collaboration of the senate leaders led to the creation of a resolution of support of the faculty senate at the University of Iowa as their voices were ignored in the selection process for their new president – a violation of the spirit of shared governance.

Third, we have a hopefully unique example of shared governance perhaps gone astray, with a Purdue institute’s (nee college) senate drafting and adopting a document regarding a signed confidentiality agreement by faculty...with perhaps unintentional, but chilling effects, and will recommend that that unit’s senate rescind the document. We will hear from Purdue Legal Counsel Schultz and Purdue Polytechnic Institute’s Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson Beverly Davis on this matter.

Today’s topics are of great importance and it is unfortunate that neither President Daniels nor Provost Duta is able to attend.

Thank you.
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

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

1. Ad Hoc committee reviewing BOT’s statement on freedom of expression.
2. Ad Hoc committee reviewing Affirmative Action Report and trends on recruitment and retention across campus.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
J. Stuart Bolton, Chairperson Bolton@purdue.edu

1. Promotion and Tenure
2. Teaching Evaluation
3. Minimum Class Size Policy

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Russell Jones, Chairperson russjones@purdue.edu

1. We have completed a draft resolution on the Student Wage Proposal to forward to the Steering Committee for the next Senate meeting.
2. Our discussion of the campus climate for international students is now underway.
3. We have been working jointly with EPC on the issues of academic honesty and cheating.
4. We now have two appointed faculty liaisons from SAC attending PSG and PGSG meetings.
5. We have formed a subcommittee that will work on policies related to student mental health concerns.

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

1. Organization and role of Asset Management within Physical Facilities
2. Sustainability sub-committee is discussing the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment

Chair of the Senate, Kirk Alter, alterk@purdue.edu  
Vice Chair of the Senate, David A. Sanders, retrovir@purdue.edu  
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu  
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
Confidentiality in all aspects of the promotion and tenure (P&T) process is critical to achieving the proper outcome. This includes the Primary Committees, Area Promotions Committee and the University Promotions Committee.

The Purdue University promotions policy states:

“It is in the best interest of the University and faculty that full and frank discussions occur during the deliberations of promotion committees. The confidentiality of remarks made at such meetings should, therefore, be carefully preserved. Recommendations against promotion may be discussed with the faculty member affected, in a discreet manner and without undue delay, by the appropriate department head or dean. Faculty will be advised of their promotion progress by their department head after the Primary Committee and by their dean after the Area Committee and University Promotions Committee meetings.”

All information associated with the P&T review process (including materials generated by the candidate or by the review process) shall be regarded as confidential by all members of Review Committees at any stage and in any capacity. Confidentiality of the P&T process is to be respected forever, not just in the year of review. Feedback to the candidate will only be provided by the Chair (unit head) or Dean following respective Committee decisions. Committee members who are actively mentoring a junior candidate may provide additional guidance based on the feedback given by the Chair or Dean, as well as their own personal opinions concerning the candidate’s progress toward promotion and tenure. Candidates are expected to refrain from approaching committee members concerning the deposition of their review and will understand that inquiries of this type are considered inappropriate.

Breaches of confidentiality can have negative effects on the faculty morale and CoT overall climate. This may lead to faculty grievance, retention difficulties and potentially legal action. Strict adherence to this policy is expected of all committee members participating in the P&T process.
College of Technology
Tenure and Promotion Confidentiality Agreement
As a committee member participating in the promotion and tenure (P&T) process, my signature below indicates that I agree to adhere to the following criteria during all aspects (prior to, during and following) any related committee activities.

1. I accept responsibility to protect the integrity of the P&T process of the College of Technology (CoT) at Purdue University.

2. I agree to disclose to the Department/School Chair, the Dean, or the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs any appearance of real or potential conflict of interest between myself and the candidate.

3. I acknowledge that information management is a crucial component of the P&T process. This includes any information received from or developed on the candidate, their department or college. Specifically I will adhere to the following:
   a. I will respect the absolute confidentiality of all candidates. I will not disclose or discuss the identity or any information about the candidate throughout the P&T process and following the completion of the P&T review.
   b. I will be accurate and honest in my management of information.
   c. I will guard against inaccuracies, carelessness, and bias made by emphasis or omission of information.
   d. I will strive to treat issues impartially and handle controversial subjects dispassionately.

4. I will place the best interest of the CoT and Purdue University ahead of all personal or special interest. I will use common sense and good judgment in applying ethical principles to all reviewed work.

5. I consider this statement to be a matter of personal and professional responsibility.

________________________________________________ ___________________
Signature Date

_________________________________________________
Printed Name
My education from [University Name] was worth the cost.
% Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Nonprofit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private For-Profit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended In-State Public University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Out-of-State Public University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DOCUMENT</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-5</td>
<td>Senate Document 15-5 Public Statement in Support of Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>University Senate Senate Equity and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>*Approved 16 November 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>