AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

2. Approval of Minutes of 15 February 2016

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 15-7 Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility
   For Action
   Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

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

   For Action
   Professor Russell Jones

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

11. Senate Document 15-11 Freedom of Speech Resolution
    For Action
    Professor Alberto Rodriguez

12. Senate Document 15-12 Faculty Committee Nominees
    For Action
    Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

13. Senate Document 15-18 Steering Committee and Nominating Committee Nominees
    For Action
    Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill

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

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

16. Senate Document 15-15 Resolution on Student Evaluations
    For Discussion
    Professors Prokopy, Krishnamurthy, Leilèvre, Duzinkiewicz & Sanders

17. Senate Document 15-16 Bylaws Changes Conforming to Current Practice
    For Discussion
    Professors Sriramesh Krishnamurthy and David Sanders
For Information
Associate Vice Provost Peter Hollenbeck

1. **COACHE Survey Presentation**
2. New Business
3. Memorial Resolutions
4. Adjournment
1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson Kirk Alter.

2. The minutes of the 15 February 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.

7. At Question Time, Provost Dutta answered questions from the Senate floor.
   - Professor David Sanders: What action is the University taking to confront the rise in sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) among Purdue students? Provost Dutta was not aware of a rapidly increasing number of cases. Professor Sanders mentioned that Tippecanoe Health Department data suggest they are increasing. Provost Dutta
said if that is the case, we will follow-up. Professor Sanders noted that we provide HPV vaccines for students and that HPV is increasing in males in the U.S. He does not see a lot of effort to educate our students about HPV. Dean Katie Sermershein said that the clinicians at PUSH have seen a decline in STDs among Purdue students. She reiterated that there are numerous educational programs about STDs as well as condom distribution at Purdue. We also have testing available for students. She has not seen the county data, but the suggested increases are not what are being seen on campus.

- Professor Evelyn Blackwood asked for more details on the new Summer Start such as courses available, cost, and faculty involvement. Provost Dutta deferred to Blake Nemelka who is directing the program. Mr. Nemelka recommended that Professor Blackwood go online to www.purdue.edu/summerstart/courses to see the description of the program. He mentioned that the Department heads and actual instructors were involved in developing courses. Tenured faculty members were sought as the instructors, but there will be involvement of some graduate students with experience when faculty members are not available to teach a particular course.

8. Professor Michael Hill, Co-Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 15-10, Vice-Chair Nominees, for Action. A motion to approve the document was made and seconded. Each candidate was provided several minutes to speak to the Senators. Professors Mary Comer, Clifford Fisher and Alberto Rodriguez presented their comments to the Senate. In the initial vote, none of the three candidates had a majority of the votes and a runoff was held between the two nominees receiving the most votes, Professors Fisher and Rodriguez. The runoff election occurred and Professor Rodriguez garnered a majority of the votes and was declared Vice-Chair-Elect of the University Senate. His term will begin on 1 June 2016.

9. Professor Michael Hill, Co-Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 15-7, Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility, for Action. Professor Hill explained the rationale for the proposed changes. Professor Hill also noted changes in wording that were made based on Senators’ recommendations. Once again, Professor Cosier opposed the ineligibility of Department Heads and Assistant Department heads as defined in the document. Professor Kristina Bross suggested that administrative responsibilities of less than 50% would be an appropriate cutoff to allow administrators at the above-mentioned level to serve on the Senate. She believes there should be a clear separation of administrative duties from the deliberations of the Senate. Provost Dutta stated that he had thought about this matter and fully supports the position of Professor Cosier. Department heads and Assistant Department head perform all of the duties of the typical faculty member and can provide perspectives that are important in the deliberations of the Senate. Provost Dutta does not understand why these individuals would be excluded from Senate eligibility and it is important to include them on the Senate. Professor Alter respectfully disagreed with Provost Dutta’s position. Professor John Niser was concerned about creating an “us vs. them” situation as often exists in academia. As a Department Head, he feels caught in the middle between faculty and upper-level administrators. Professor Jeorg Appenzeller suggested that if a faculty body elected a Department Head to serve as a Senator, they must have had a reason to do so. Professor Hill suggested that the presence of a Department Head in the Senate might stifle free discussion by Senate members of her/his department. A motion was made and seconded to amend the document as follows:

- Only faculty with a rank less than Dean or Associate Dean are eligible to serve as Senators.
The amendment failed to reach the two-thirds majority vote required for changes to the Bylaws with 30 votes in favor, 24 in opposition and 1 abstention. The vote on the main motion was taken and it, too, failed with 33 votes in favor and 27 in opposition.

10. Professor Ryan Cabot, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), presented, for Action, Senate Document 15-8, Proposal Regarding Transcript Notations. Currently, some regulations contained in the University Student Regulations are in conflict with each other. This document will help clarify the regulations. In addition, there is currently no notation on a student’s transcript pertaining to the reason(s) a student is expelled or suspended from the University. A motion was made and seconded to approve the document. No discussion occurred and the document passed with 59 votes in favor, 1 vote in opposition and 1 abstention.

11. Professor Russell Jones, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), introduced, for Action, Senate Document 15-9, Minimum Wage Resolution. A study was commissioned to determine the effect of raising the student minimum wage from $7.25/hour to $8.25/hour. A motion was made and seconded to approve the document. The motion was approved by a vote of 45 in favor, 7 in opposition and 1 abstention.

12. Professor Alberto Rodriguez, Chair of the Equity and Diversity Committee (E&DC), introduced Senate Document 15-11, Resolution on Freedom of Expression, for Action. Professor Bross commended the Equity and Diversity Committee for bringing this resolution forward for consideration by the Senate. Professor Patrick Kain made a motion to amend the document and his motion was seconded. The proposed amendment was to replace the final “Whereas” clause with two “Whereas” clauses as follows:

- **Whereas**, Purdue University, as a public university dedicated to free inquiry, includes and supports a diverse array of individual experts, advocates, and critics who engage important social concerns, yet the University as an institution seeks to avoid unnecessary entanglement in partisan activity and advocacy on social concerns that may be incidental to its mission or functioning; and
- **Whereas**, it is often critically important that individuals in positions of power exercise their freedom of expression to criticize and contest hateful expression that may occur at the University;

Following a brief discussion the vote on the amendment was taken. The amendment failed with 24 votes in favor, 30 in opposition and 2 abstentions. A motion was made and seconded to amend the document by adding “staff” to the second “Whereas” clause. In addition, Professor Kain offered a friendly amendment to edit several clauses with changes to punctuation (commas) and word order. The word order change involved moving “engage” from after “effectively and responsibly” to before those words in the third “Whereas” clause. Professor Rodriguez accepted the friendly amendment. Following the acceptance of the friendly amendment, the motion to approve the formal amendment was passed by a vote of 40 in favor, 14 opposed and 2 abstentions. The main motion to approve the now-amended document was called and was approved by a vote of 49 in favor and 6 in opposition.

13. Professor Michael Hill presented Senate Document 15-12, Faculty Committees Nominees, for Action. A motion was made and seconded to approve this document. The motion to approve passed by a unanimous voice vote. All terms will begin on 1 June 2016.
14. A request was made from the floor of the Senate to assess the presence of a quorum. Using the electronic clickers, fewer than the required 51 Senators were accounted for and official Senate business ended at 4:15 p.m. The remaining Senators accepted the offer of Presiding Officer Kirk Alter to allow Provost Dutta an opportunity to make a presentation on the rationale for the proposed minimum class size policy (see Appendix C) and a second presentation on the “Summer Start Pilot Program” (see Appendix D). As the Senate was not officially in session, no minutes were recorded.

15. Following Provost Dutta’s presentations, another quorum call was issued and a head count determined that 52 Senators were present. Given the existence of a quorum, official Senate business resumed.

16. Professor Michael Hill presented Senate Document 15-18, Steering Committee and Nominating Committee Nominees for Action. A motion was made and seconded to consider the document. As there were only two nominees for the Nominating Committee slot, the vote was held by electronic clicker. Professor Peter Dunn was chosen for the single open position on the Nominating Committee. Eight nominees were slated for the four open positions on the Steering Committee. The vote was done by secret paper ballot and Professors Cosier and Hill served as tellers. Professors Jo Ann Banks, Alan Beck, Catherine Riehle and Laurel Weldon were chosen as new members of the Steering Committee. All terms will begin on 1 June 2016.

17. Another quorum call was requested and the head count indicated that only 50 Senators were present. Once again, official business of the Senate ceased. However, the remaining Senators agreed to allow Associate Vice Provost Peter Hollenbeck give a presentation on the recently completed COACHE survey (see Appendix E). As the Senate was no longer in session, no minutes were recorded.

18. Documents not discussed during the March Senate Meeting will be discussed during the April Senate Meeting.
TO: The University Senate
FROM: Natalie Carroll & Michael Hill, Co-Chairs of the Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Bylaws of the University Senate
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption
RATIONALE: Recent questions to the Nominating Committee suggest that changes to the Bylaws would clarify policy:
- Two-term limit for a senator is serving as a replacement (while a senator is on sabbatical, for example)
- Eligibility for service as Senate Vice-Chair and Chair

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

Current Bylaws text with recommended changes in red/strikethrough:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Suspension

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

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

2. Expulsion

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

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

3. Degree revocation

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

“The individual’s degree has been revoked and this individual has been expelled due to violation of University regulations.“

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,  
Russell Jones, Chair  
Student Affairs Committee

Approve:  
Pam Aaltonen  
Mary Comer  
Edward Fox  
Stan Gelvin  
Matthew Ginzel  
Chad Jafvert  
Russell Jones  
Robert Nowack  
Sandra Rossie
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate
REFERENCES: Bylaws, Section 3.20a, b and c
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

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

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

Candidate résumés are attached.

Mary Comer

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

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

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

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

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

Alberto Rodriguez

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

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

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

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

**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: Recommendations for Interpreting the Board of Trustees’ Statement on Freedom of Expression  
DISPOSITION: University Senate Vote  
REFERENCE: Board of Trustees Resolution on the “Chicago Principles”

Whereas, free inquiry is central to the mission of Purdue University, and of great benefit to all of its members and to society;

Whereas, free inquiry requires broad freedom of expression for its participants, particularly for the University’s students and faculty;

Whereas, fostering the ability of individuals to “effectively and responsibly” engage in free inquiry and expression is "an essential part of the University’s educational mission";

Whereas, civil and mutually respectful expression supports and sustains free inquiry;

Whereas, some protected speech is false, offensive, insulting, demeaning, disrespectful, or hostile, and has negative effects, effects that often fall heavily on already vulnerable members of our community, and "Shock, hurt, and anger are not consequences to be weighed lightly" (Yale University "Woodward Report");

Whereas, speech that criticizes or contests—without suppressing—false, offensive, demeaning, disrespectful or hostile speech is an important part of free inquiry; and this speech is a necessary remedy for some of the negative effects of some speech, and a form of assistance to those who are negatively affected by it;

Whereas, the University and its officials have a responsibility to uphold its mission of free inquiry and the values integral to this mission, including freedom of expression, civility and mutual respect, and equality of opportunity in its activities;

Whereas, it is critically important that freedom of speech be exercised by individuals in power to criticize and contest hateful expressions;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the University Senate as follows:

1. The University Senate hereby affirms Purdue’s “Statement of Commitment to Freedom of Expression," (Attachment 1).

2. The University Senate receives the Equity and Diversity Committee’s "Review of the Purdue Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy Statement” (Attachment 2).

3. The review and refinement of University policies and procedures to reflect these principles must involve collaboration between the Purdue administration and its Faculty. For example, the policy changes adopted along with the Freedom of Expression Statement deserve further consultation and review.

4. The Purdue Faculty and administration shall develop educational opportunities for new and continuing students, faculty, administrators, and staff, that explain Purdue’s policies on freedom of expression, and that empower all of its members to effectively and responsibly exercise their freedom of expression at Purdue.

5. Members of the University community shall be encouraged to support free expression and to criticize and contest speech that they consider to be false, offensive, demeaning, disrespectful, or hostile.

6. University leaders have a particular responsibility to foster and defend freedom of expression and to criticize and contest expressions that they judge to be harmful to the University’s mission of free inquiry, its declared values, or the equal opportunity of its members.
Attachment 1

Purdue University
Commitment to Freedom of Expression

Because Purdue University (the “University”) is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community “to discuss,” in the words of former University of Chicago President Robert M. Hutchins, “any problem that presents itself.”

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University may restrict expression, for example, that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University’s commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

In a word, the University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University’s educational mission.

As a corollary to the University’s commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the
views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.
Review of the Purdue Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy Statement
University Senate—Equity and Diversity Committee

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

- Process of approval
- Issues of clarity of content
- Possible conflicts with existing policies (e.g., Anti-Harassment)
- Recommendations moving forward

As a committee, we clearly confirm the importance of the Freedom of Expression to the mission and functioning of institutions of higher education in general and to Purdue University specifically. We are however troubled that free speech can have more negative implications on already marginalized populations than on majority populations. Given this reality, it is imperative that freedom of speech be exercised by individuals in power to condemn hateful speech and acts.

Process of Approval

During the Spring of 2015, the PSG and the PGSG approved parallel resolutions to modify five existing Purdue policies (see attached copy of the full Board of Trustees resolution including Exhibits B1-B5) in order to enhance freedom of expression on campus. A resolution indicated these requested changes was sent in January 2015 by PGSG president to the University Senate Steering Committee. When no action was taken by the University Senate, the PGG and PGSB presidents brought the requested policy changes to the BOT in May of 2015. The BOT not only approved the requested changes but also chose to approve a broader Commitment to Freedom of Expression Policy Statement (i.e., the Chicago Principles).

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

Clarity

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

- The Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement pertains only to members of the University Community and to invited speakers
• The Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement does not apply to uninvited speakers who choose to offer perspectives to members of the university community.

• When the Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement was adopted there were five other campus policies that were modified (see attached copy of the full resolution including Exhibits B1-B5). The substance of each changes appears to be:
  o Exhibit B1—pertains to modified language in university regulations governing student conduct, disciplinary proceedings, and appeals.
    ▪ “Conduct Subject to Disciplinary Sanctions. The following actions constitute conduct for which students may be subject to informal action or disciplinary sanctions”: Disorderly conduct or expression, lewd, indecent, or obscene conduct or expression on University property or in connection with a University Activity.
    ▪ Change eliminated “expression” in the prior statement.
  o Exhibit B2—pertains to modified language in university regulations in the bill of student rights
    ▪ Change involved:
      • a) addition of language related to the freedom of inquiry, thought, and expression,
      • b) deletion of “hostile”, demeaning, or intimidating”, and
      • c) addition of language that narrows the verbal or physical actions (i.e., “targeted conduct that is so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive”) that may be considered as detracting from the educational experience of others.
  o Exhibit B3—pertains to modified language of guidelines for speech and expression on campus.
    ▪ Change involved a complete revision of this policy from one that described the areas wherein freedom of expression could be exercised to an emphasis on how spaces have been specifically designated to facilitate “robust debate and the free exchange of ideas.” In addition, the last paragraph highlights that the policy is not intended to limit the right of student expression in other areas of campus and lists actions related to student expression (e.g., obstructing building entrances, walkways, and rights-of-way, obstructing vehicular or pedestrian traffic, interfering with classes, meeting, events or ceremonies) that will be considered disruptive to the functioning of the University.
    ▪ This policy appears to protect Freedom of Expression for all individuals who elect to speak on campus—invited or uninvited.
  o Exhibit B4—pertains to modified language of the university residence guidelines for bulletin boards.
    ▪ Change involved significant revision of this policy including:
• a) deletion of requirement for approval of all notices and posters and addition that the Office of University Residences has the right to reject any posting that is inconsistent with University policies and state, local, and federal laws.
• b) deletion of the statement “signs or displays containing profane, lewd, or indecent expression will be removed.”
• c) addition of statement “promoting the use of alcohol and/or illegal substances is prohibited.”

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

Connection with Existing Policies

We reviewed the following policies:

With regard to the Anti-Harassment Policy:
- Harassment is defined as (taken directly from Purdue policy):
  - Conduct towards another person or identifiable group of persons that has the purpose or effect of:
    • Creating an intimidating or hostile educational environment, work environment or environment for participation in a University activity;
    • Unreasonably interfering with a person’s educational environment, work environment or environment for participation in a University activity;
    • Unreasonably affecting a person’s educational or work opportunities or participation in a University activity.
  - Use of the term Harassment includes all forms of harassment, including Stalking, Racial Harassment, and Sexual Harassment.
• It appears then that in order to be harassment, verbal conduct would need to be intended to create or result in the creation of an intimidating or hostile environment that affects individuals’ opportunities or participation. According to Purdue policy, harassment has a clear focus on the effects of verbal conduct.

  o Who is it that assesses these effects?
  o When do verbal statements go beyond free expression and become harassment?

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

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

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

With regard to Nondiscrimination Policy Statement:

• When does free speech become discrimination?

Recommendations

• Establish a culture to which Purdue aspires, according to its mission, in which it is expected that administrators, faculty, and staff will speak out against hateful, racist, sexist, and discriminatory expressions on campus. Such a culture would assist faculty, staff, and students in determining what is acceptable and unacceptable social behavior.

  o Freedom of Expression protects University officials’ speaking out against hateful expressions.

  o Administrators, especially those highest up including the president, the provost, and the chancellors need to issue clear, strong, and direct statements
emphasizing the critical nature of mutual respect and civility and speaking out against hateful, racist, sexist, and discriminatory expressions.

- The University needs to respond when hateful expression arises via social media outlets and offer clear, strong, and direct statements against hateful, racist, sexist, and discriminatory expressions.

- Develop required educational modules/courses for first-semester, first-year students to educate them on the importance of the Freedom of Expression in higher education and the Purdue Commitment to Freedom of Expression policy statement. This module needs to be integrated into Boiler Gold Rush and/or into a common first year course.
  - Training needs to emphasize skill building regarding perspective-taking and the critical importance of civility and mutual respect. Most particularly, students need to gain an understanding that they and each of their peers come to campus with distinct backgrounds, cultures, and experiences.
  - Training needs to empower all students to use their ability to express their perspectives and beliefs, as many students come to campus with no experience expressing their ideas. In fact, many come from backgrounds where the expression of their perspectives and beliefs have been directly and indirectly hindered and suppressed.

- Train faculty, staff, and paraprofessionals (e.g., residence assistants) regarding when verbal conduct goes beyond Freedom of Expression and becomes harassment or discrimination. Training needs to be integrated into faculty training through online modules.
  - Training needs to educate faculty regarding how to effectively teach students about these distinctions and also regarding best practices in negotiating situations of harassment when they arise in the classroom setting.
  - Training also needs to include educating faculty on how to foster an inclusive classroom where all perspectives and beliefs can be expressed and heard.

- Include direct links to Anti-Harassment Policy and Nondiscrimination Policy Statement to the left of the Statement of Freedom of Expression webpage.
TO: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee  
SUBJECT: Nominees for Faculty 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 faculty committees listed below. The faculty members elected are to serve for terms as specified:

A. University Grade Appeals Committee

Scot Feld  Sociology
Song No  Languages and Cultures
Rajeswari Sundararajan  Engineering Technology

for terms of service ending at the end of Summer Session 2019.

B. University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee

Regular Members
Otto Doering  Agricultural Economics
Ehtibar Dzhafarov  Psychological Sciences
Peter Dunn  Entomology
Jessica Huber  Speech, Language & Hearing Sciences
Brian Leung  English
Robert Nowack  Earth, Atmospheric & Planetary Sciences
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh  Communication
Jessica Sturm  Languages and Cultures
Howard Zelaznik  Health and Kinesiology

Alternate Members

None required at this time

for terms of service ending 31 May 2019.

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 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
Edward Fox
Stan Gelvin
Matthew Ginzel
Chad Jafvert
Russell Jones
Linda Mason
Carlos Morales
Robert Nowack
Sandra Rossie
Kipling Williams
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)  
Evelyn Blackwood  
Christian Butzke  
Janusz Duzinkiewicz (via telephone)  
Steven Landry  
David Sanders  
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh  
Elizabeth A. Strickland  
Paul Wenthold  
Alysa C. Rollock (Advisor)  
M.J.T. Smith (Advisor)
Voted Against:

Did Not Vote/Abstained:
Levon Esters (Chair)
Fabrice Baudoin
Stuart Bolton
Alberto J. Rodriguez
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
DISPOSITION: Approval by the University Senate
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 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.

5.40 *The Faculty Affairs Committee*

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall consist of thirteen senators and two advisors.

Replaced by

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall consist of eleven Senators.

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

The Nominating Committee proposes the following nominees for service on the University Senate Nominating and Steering committees. The persons elected are to serve the period of years shown following each name. Brief biographies of the nominees are included below (when submitted).

A. For the 1 vacancy on the Nominating Committee, the following 2 faculty members are proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dunn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Kelley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technology, Leadership &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. For the 4 vacancies on the Steering Committee, the following 8 faculty members are proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Banks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Botany and Plant Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Beck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comparative Pathobiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Mariga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Computer &amp; Information Technology</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>Catherine Riehle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng-Song Wang</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Laurel Weldon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approving in person or via email:
Wayne Campbell
Natalie Carroll
Ji-xin Cheng
Michael Hill
Russell Jones
Julie Mariga
Sulma Mohammed

Nominating Committee – Nominates elective members for all Senate committees. Solicit information from the faculty concerning faculty preferences and qualifications for committee assignments annually.
Peter Dunn  
Entomology

Peter E. Dunn is a professor in the Department of Entomology. He earned the B.S. in chemistry from Fordham University and the Ph.D. in biochemistry from Purdue University (December, 1973). Following postdoctoral research in insect biochemistry at the University of Chicago (1974-1977), Dunn joined the faculty of Purdue's Department of Entomology in 1977 as assistant professor. Dr. Dunn served a three-term on the University Senate beginning in the late 1970’s. During his tenure on the Senate, he served on Senate Steering Committee and as chair of the Steering Committee during his final year. As a result of this position, he was appointed to the Committee to Select the President following the resignation of President Hansen. He was promoted to professor in 1988 and received Purdue’s Agricultural Research Award in the same year. Dr. Dunn’s research interests include insect biochemistry, developmental biology, and comparative immunology, with a focus on the cellular and humoral immune responses of the tobacco hornworm, *Manduca sexta*, to infection by bacteria and parasitization by an endoparasitic wasp, *Cotesia congregata*. He has published forty-four refereed papers, co-edited one book, and received one issued U.S. patent. Dr. Dunn teaches Insect Physiology and Biochemistry (ENTM 55100) and a graduate course in Responsible Conduct of Research (GRAD 61200).

Dr. Dunn joined the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) in 1995 and served as Purdue’s Assistant Vice President for Research from 1995-2001 and as Associate Vice President for Research from 2003-2013. In addition, from late 1997-March 2000, he served as Director of the Purdue Research Foundation’s Office of Technology Transfer. In OVPR, Dunn’s areas of responsibility included research integrity, protection of human and vertebrate animal subjects of research, biosafety, conflict of interest management, export controls and research security. He was responsible for administering Purdue’s policy on research misconduct beginning in 1995 and held the title of Research Integrity Officer since the position was created in April 2003 until the end of December 2015. Dr. Dunn returned to primary responsibility as professor of Entomology in July 2013 and returned to full time as professor of Entomology in January 1, 2016.

Todd Kelley  
Technology, Leadership and Innovation

Todd R. Kelley is an Associate Professor in Technology Leadership and Innovation. Dr. Kelley joined Purdue in 2008 upon completion of his PhD at the University of Georgia. He was hired as a P-12 STEM educational researcher and technology teacher educator. His dissertation research was on teaching and learning engineering design in secondary education. Prior to graduate school, Kelley was a high school and middle school technology education teacher for nine years teaching in three school districts in New York state and Indiana.

Dr. Kelley’s research focus is in design and cognition seeking to better understand how young students learn design and how design improves STEM education. He joined a team of researchers to create a program to improve learning STEM in elementary grades, and the team was awarded an NSF Math and Science partnership called Science Learning Through Engineering Design (SLED). Kelley is currently the PI on an NSF I-Test project called Teachers and Researchers Advancing Integrated Lessons in STEM (TRAILS). TRAILS prepares science
and technology education teachers to integrate STEM content through biomimicry inspired engineering design within the context of entomology.

Dr. Kelley the program coordinator for the engineering/technology teacher education program at Purdue. Dr. Kelley is also leading the second year Design Thinking course for the Purdue Polytechnic Institute. The course is a collaboration between the Polytechnic and Anthropology to integrate ethnographic approaches by developing technological and engineering design human centered design solutions.

Dr. Kelley is happily married to Diane for over 18 years. They have four children: Mark age 13, Kate age 11, and twin daughters Alyssa and Ashley age 6. Dr. Kelley and his wife Diane are active members of Riverside Covenant Church, West Lafayette.

**Steering Committee** – Shall propose the agenda for every session of the Senate; ensure the distribution of the agenda to each member of the Senate at least five days before each regularly scheduled meeting. The Steering Committee may schedule an annual report of each of the Senate committees to the senate. The various councils will be requested by the Steering Committee to inform the senate of their activities, studies, and recommendations at fixed intervals to be established by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee shall receive communications from any faculty member or group of members who wish to present any proposal before any meeting of the Senate.

**Jo Ann Banks**
**Botany and Plant Pathology**

Jody Banks is a professor in the Botany and Plant Pathology Department in the College of Agriculture. After receiving a PhD from the Ohio State University in genetics, Banks spent five years as an NIH postdoctoral fellow at the Carnegie Institution, Johns Hopkins University, where she worked on the epigenetic regulation of McClintock’s transposable elements. After a two-year stint as Assistant Professor in the Biology Department at McGill University, Banks moved to Purdue University in 1991.

While at Purdue, Banks has investigated the interesting and unique biology of ferns and lycophytes, which are vascular plants that dominated the earth 200-300 million years ago. One fern is interesting because it is the only known eukaryote able to tolerate and hyperaccumulate the deadly toxin arsenic. Genes that are both necessary and sufficient for arsenic tolerance and accumulation have been cloned and characterized in the Banks lab. Knowledge gained from these studies is being used to prevent the accumulation of arsenic in crops and groundwater, which are ever increasing problems throughout the world.

Banks also studies sex determination in another fern whose sex is epigenetically regulated by a pheromone that is secreted by females and causes its neighbors to become male. Genetics and genomics approaches have been used in the Banks lab to identify the sex-determining genes and their regulation by the pheromone. All of these projects are funded by The National Science Foundation.
Undergraduate students (as well as graduate students and postdocs), including underrepresented minority students, have been heavily involved in all aspects of this research. To Banks, providing students with research experiences is a time-consuming but rewarding and important endeavor.

Banks teaches two formal courses each year at Purdue, including the undergraduate level course *Plant Systematics* and the graduate level course *Plant Growth and Development*, which is team-taught. Both courses are very “hands-on”. In the former course, students take field trips and learn to identify plants based on morphology and DNA sequences (they generate their own sequences and construct phylogenetic trees, among other things). In the latter course, students discuss and evaluate current and relevant literature. Writing and critical thinking are emphasized in both courses.

During her one-year tenure as a senator, Banks served on the University Resources Policy Committee.

Banks is widowed with one daughter, who just graduated from Purdue having majored in German and Linguistics. She is currently on track to become a licensed beautician and volunteers as an aid to physically disabled adults in our community.

---

Alan Beck

**Comparative Pathobiology**

ALAN BECK received his Baccalaureate from Brooklyn College, in New York and Master's degree from the California State University at Los Angeles. He received his Doctor of Science in Animal Ecology from The Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health. He has studied the ecological and public health implications of dogs in Baltimore, St. Louis, New York, and along the United States-Mexican border. His book, *The Ecology of Stray Dogs: A Study of Free-Ranging Urban Dogs* is considered a classic in the field of urban ecology and was republished by Purdue University Press in 2002. He has published more than 80 professional articles, over 57 book chapters, over 45 popular articles, and 5 books on the nature of our relationship with animals.

Dr. Beck directed the animal programs for the New York City Department of Health for five years, and then was the Director of the Center for the Interaction of Animals and Society at the University of Pennsylvania, School of Veterinary Medicine for 10 years.

In 1990, Dr. Beck became the “Dorothy N. McAllister Professor of Animal Ecology” and Director of the Center for the Human-Animal Bond at the Purdue School of Veterinary Medicine. The Center was established to develop a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between people and their companion animals. Since joining Purdue has served in the Human Subjects Committee and many special committees. He has also served on the Senate for six years and joining again after the required one year forced retirement. During most of his Senate tenure he was on the Faculty Affairs Committee.

---

Julie Mariga

**Computer Information Technology**

Julie R. Mariga is an Associate Professor of Computer and Information Technology (CIT). Her areas of interest include enterprise collaboration, social media/social computing on both the individual level as well as within companies, globalization of technology and diversity within
computing disciplines. She is very interested in attracting more women and URM into Information Technology (IT) and other computing disciplines. She is currently developing a graduate level course titled *Diversity in Information Technology*.

Professor Mariga has been teaching in the CIT department for 19 years. She has published numerous journal articles, co-authored an academic textbook, was editor of a book, written numerous chapters, and several conference papers. Her interest in diversity within IT began back in 2003 when she presented a conference paper on diversity. She has been attending the Grace Hooper Women in Computing Conference since 2004. The Grace Hooper Women in Computing Conference is the largest gathering of women technologists. She is the founding moderator of the LGBTQ listserv, started in 2006, that is a Systers community through the Anita Borg Institute. She was a panelist at the 2008 Hopper Conference on LGBT issues with 3 other lesbians. She led a panel at the 2014 conference entitled *Showcasing ABI systers everywhere: Building strong globally connected communities to empower every woman in computing EVERYWHERE* with four other women from underrepresented areas within technology. She has written numerous proposals to both government agencies and industry partners and foundations on diversity within information technology.

She served a previous term on the University Senate from 2005-2008 and was a member of the steering committee in 2005. She has served on numerous college and department committees over her 19 career.

As a current University Senator she is a member of the Nominating Committee and the Equity and Diversity Committee.

Norbert Neumeister  
Physics and Astronomy

Raghu Pasupathy  
Educational Studies

Catherine Riehle  
Libraries

Catherine Fraser Riehle is Associate Professor of Library Science and Instructional Outreach Librarian in Purdue University Libraries. She serves as Libraries liaison for faculty, staff, and students affiliated with the Brian Lamb School of Communication, the department of Human Development & Family Studies, and Women’s Gender, and Sexuality Studies. She is also heavily involved in Purdue’s Instruction Matters: Purdue Academic Course Transformation (IMPACT) initiative, for which she has served as a consultant on course redesign teams since 2011. Prof. Riehle has taught or co-taught several undergraduate courses on topics ranging from publishing to identity theory, and she serves on the advisory board for the *Journal of Purdue Undergraduate Research*. Her research interests focus on the intersection of undergraduate education, information literacy, and scholarly communication.
Since joining Purdue’s faculty in 2006, Prof. Riehle has served on a wide variety of Libraries and University-wide committees. She chaired the Libraries Curriculum Committee from 2009-2010 and from 2014-2016, and the Libraries Nominations Committee from 2012-2013, leading the implementation of a departmental peer review of teaching service and a digital balloting system for faculty elections, respectively. Prof. Riehle has also served on the University Committee for Student Excellence, the Common Reading Committee (for which she co-facilitated the Curriculum & Co-curricular Applications Subcommittee 2009-2011), and the University Foundations of Excellence Committee’s Roles and Purposes subcommittee.

Feng-Song Wang
Biological Sciences

Feng-Song Wang, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor in the Department of Biological Sciences, Calumet campus. He was elected the Purdue Calumet campus University Senate representative in 2015 for a three-year term.

Feng-Song has served on many departmental, college, Calumet campus, university-system, and state-wide committees. Selected service is listed below:

- **Departmental**
  - Curriculum committee
  - Graduate study committee
  - Freshman experience committee

- **College**
  - Policy committee
  - Dean’s advisory committee

- **Calumet campus**
  - Senate chair (2013 and 2015)
  - Senate vice-chair (2012 and 2014)
  - Senate faculty affairs committee (2011)
  - Senate student affairs committee (2016)
  - Vice chancellor for academic affairs search committee (2014)

- **University-system**
  - Intercampus faculty council (2011 - 2016)
  - Senator (2012, 2015 - present)
  - Senate Steering committee (2102 - 2013)
  - Senate Educational policy committee (2015 - present)
  - Senate Equity and Diversity committee (2015 - present)
  - Purdue University Northwest chancellor search committee

- **State-wide**
  - Statewide Transfer General Education Core Leadership team (2012 - 2013)

S. Laurel Weldon
Political Science
## CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15-7            | Changes to the Senate Bylaws for Term Limits and Eligibility       | Nominating Committee Professors Natalie Carroll and Michael Hill | *Failed 21 March 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-8</td>
<td>Proposal Regarding Transcript Notations</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Ryan Cabot</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-9</td>
<td>Minimum Wage Resolution</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Professor Russell Jones</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-10</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Professor Alberto Rodriguez</td>
<td>*Approved 21 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-12</td>
<td>Faculty Committee Nominees</td>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Professor Russell Jones</td>
<td>*Postponed for Discussion at the April Senate meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-14</td>
<td>Minimum Class Size Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Professor Levon Esters</td>
<td>*Postponed for Discussion at the April Senate meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-15</td>
<td>Resolution on Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Professors Prokopy, Krishnamurthy, Lelièvre, Duzinkiewicz &amp; Sanders</td>
<td>*Postponed for Discussion at the April Senate meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>Bylaws Changes Conforming to Current Practice</td>
<td>Professors Sriramesh Krishnamurthy and David Sanders</td>
<td>*Postponed for Discussion at the April Senate meeting</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greetings and welcome to what will be a very busy and very important session of the Senate.

As it is officially spring our agenda is full today with many resolutions – 5 to be voted upon, and 6 to receive their 1st reading.

Additionally today we have two presentations – one from our Provost on Minimum Class Sizes, and one from Associate Vice Provost Peter Hollenbeck on the COACHE survey.

Perhaps our most important business today is the election of our next Vice Chairperson. This position is critically important, as the next several years of the functioning of our Senate and ensuring its productive and meaningful role in shared governance will depend on the quality, character, and effectiveness of our future Chair.

Today we have three excellent candidates for the position of Vice Chair in Mary, Cliff, and Alberto.

I have learned a lot as chair. I learned that while healthy skepticism and a degree of caution is always important when executing the duties as head of one of the “branches of government” in our shared governance system, that our Board of Trustees is populated with bright successful people, who while perhaps holding different perspectives and positions about higher education than the typical faculty member, still should be respected and valued as contributing to the conversation. I have learned that while I may not agree with all of the visions for higher education that are articulated by our President, that he too is a bright individual who should be respected as having a voice worth considering. That said, of course, I expect that respect between the board, the trustees and senate leadership should be a two-way street.

There is no doubt in my mind that at this moment that that respect is a two-way street. I am confident that the board has listened this year as I have addressed them, as has President Daniels in our regular meetings. It is vitally important that we continue in that vein, making today’s election quite important.

We must have senate leadership that has enough steel in its backbone to have the tough conversations, while at the same time recognizing that the board and the president also have the best interests of Purdue in their minds at all times as well. They may not agree with our decisions and inputs, but they need to be willing to listen.

Shared governance is about negotiation, compromise where appropriate, and rigid opposition sometimes...on those few VERY IMPORTANT matters which shall not be compromised. Sometimes oppositional leaders pick fights that truly are not worth having...minor issues, non-strategic issues...the arts of communication, compromise, and the effective persuading and conversion of “non-believers” is what is called for, and not heading to the barricades at every imagined offense.

I encourage you to today elect a Vice Chairperson who will be the most effective negotiator in promoting the academic mission of Purdue, and in preserving the voice of the faculty in future governance.
As President Daniels is unable to attend today’s session, nor will he be able to attend our next and last session for the year in April, I have asked Provost Dutta to attend, and to make a presentation on the “proposed minimum class size policy.”

The reason for this is that this issue is emblematic of a less than exemplary way to address matters of shared governance with the Senate, the only university-wide elected body representing the faculty voice. Today we will hear a first reading of SR 15-14 opposing a University-wide minimum class-size policy as written in UEAC 01-02. This policy did not come to the senate for advice and counsel. It was drafted in the Provost’s Office, then apparently rolled out to the Deans, perhaps first for advice, then for tacit adoption, and is now apparently assumed as a fait accompli. Only recently has the proposed policy been presented at any of the standing committees of the Senate, and now today, unfortunately any presentation to the Senate may seem as a “defense,” rather than a collaborative effort.

The way this should have worked is for the Office of the Provost to first approach Senate leadership and to identify the proposed problem, and then seek the advice, wisdom and counsel of the Senate. Had this occurred, Senate leadership, working through the Steering Committee, would have tasked one of the Standing Committees with addressing both the problem, and the proposed solution as recommended by the Provost’s Office. The assigned committee could have been challenged to make haste, and to return with alternative proposals, or revisions to the extant proposal. That’s not what happened. What happened apparently is that the deans were consulted, with at least some some of them immediately embracing it, and now we have some Colleges where faculty have been told that “this is the way that it is,” and others who know very little about it. We can do better than this in our shared governance, and we must do better than this.

We have two first readings of resolutions coming forward today which also, while technically within the bylaws, are bypassing the normal senate deliberation process. Neither of these two proposals was deliberated upon by any senate committee, which exist so that multiple faculty viewpoints are equally considered. While our bylaws do allow this, we must ask ourselves whether or not it represents best practice for this body. I am in general opposed to resolutions that do not go through committee except in emergency situations, and I am generally also opposed to suspending the rules. As a group, faculty tend to be offended when it appears that the administration circumvents the deliberative shared governance process. If we are guilty as well it gives us less credibility. And yes, I know that the retort will be that “the senate will still have the ability to vote on them,” but everyone understands the point I am raising.

SR 15-15 is a resolution calling for the elimination of two metrics from Purdue’s online course evaluation system – the two metrics proposed to be eliminated are: the overall instructor rating, and the overall course rating. We heard last month of the research of the discriminatory implications of those sorts of ratings. I am sure that many assembled here today feel as I do that not only those two ratings, but our entire system of course evaluation is broken and should be replaced. That said, we must come forward as a faculty with a replacement. Were I a trustee, president or provost I would be skeptical about a decision of faculty to eliminate evaluation metrics without proposing a suitable and executable
replacement at the same time. My suggestion would be to eliminate the entire current system, but only once an implementable replacement is crafted, tested, and voted on by the senate.

SR 15-16 is a resolution to revise the current senate bylaws. While I am not particularly opposed to the changes suggested in this resolution, this too did not come through the senate committees, and as such has had only very limited review by the Steering Committee. Some of the changes proposed are just simple housekeeping measures, such as addressing the reapportionment of the senate in November and not December, as we do not meet in December. That’s the easy stuff. What I am more concerned about is a piece-meal approach to revising the bylaws. What we need is a wholesale line-by-line review and revision of the bylaws. That should be taken up by the senate leadership, and would be a great task for the newly elected Vice Chair to lead beginning June 1st.

With that, my comments are concluded, so let’s proceed with our business.

Sincerely

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. Provost’s new procedures regarding section and course enrollment minimums.
2. Assessment of critical thinking skills of Purdue students.
3. Academic integrity at Purdue.
4. Clarification of student regulations and academic policies.

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

1. Completed revisions to the resolution regarding BOT’s statement on freedom of expression.
2. Ad Hoc committee completed review of Affirmative Action Report and trends on recruitment and retention across campus. Introducing resolution at April meeting.
3. Reviewing findings from COACHE survey.

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

1. Electronic Teaching Evaluation
2. Minimum Class Size Policy
3. Clinical Faculty Leaves Policy
4. Policy on Academic Freedom
5. Procedures for Reducing Teaching Duties in Cases of Child Birth, Adoption and Foster Placement

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

1. We are presenting a resolution for continued funding for PLaCE, the ESL Learning Center.
2. We are working with PSG on a study related to increased staffing at Counseling and Psychological Services [CAPS].
3. We have created a student panel to study issues of academic honesty.
4. We are investigating the need for a policy related to Student Leaves of Absence.

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

1. Discussing the State Street project with the Physical Facilities Office of Asset Management
2. Providing input to 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., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
Rationale for Course Enrollment Minimum

• Establishes expectations and consistency across campus
• Seek an efficient use of resources (including faculty and staff time, as well as classroom spaces)
• Helps maintain accuracy in the course catalog (electronic in fall)
## Current policies on Minimum Enrollments, by College, March 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>MS level</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, HHS, and Science</td>
<td>No college policy - Individual departments have informal policies as to the minimum enrollment necessary for a course to be taught, which vary by course level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7 online</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>No college policy – left to departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 online</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krannert</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15 online</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 online</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>no college policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>No policy, but low enrollment courses are evaluated on a case by case basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Establishing Consistency—Provost Guidelines for Course Enrollment Minimum

1. Guideline for the section size of undergraduate lecture and distance courses offered in a particular term
   • Review for possible cancellation if less than 15 enrolled in a course section

2. Guideline that provides for an annual review of course for relevance and ongoing need, along with meeting expected enrollment thresholds
   • Review for possible expiration if average course enrollment is less than 10 for undergraduate or less than 5 for graduate/professional
   • Review for possible expiration if the course has not been offered in the past 4 years
Undergrad Sections to be Reviewed for Possible Cancellation, S16 (G1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Number of Sections</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or less</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses to be Reviewed for Possible Expiration (G2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Threshold Level</th>
<th>% below threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Undergrad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/Prof</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio State

• Just gone through a state-law mandated review of under-enrolled courses statewide in the publics, with a requirement that our Board of Trustees certify to the Ohio Dept. of Higher Ed what our current status is, that we are addressing issues, and how we might consider sharing under-enrolled courses among our universities.

• OSU formal university-wide guideline is 15, with no distinction between undergraduate and graduate courses. We do have a list of exceptions (labs, clinics, undergrad research, service learning, and the like).
The Provost establishes minimum course enrollment threshold expectations that represent a strategic balancing of best practices in teaching and learning, faculty availability and workload, and available fiscal and physical resources. Enrollment policies may be amended from time to time to reflect current university conditions. The Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, in consultation with campus registrars, conducts regular reviews of course enrollments and reports findings to the Provost and to the colleges and course delivering units, including World Campus and Continuing Education.
ADMISSIONS UPDATE  YEAR TO DATE

West Lafayette, Comparable to Feb 2015
SUMMER START PILOT

What:
• Targets applicants denied admission because of SAT or GPA but who show strong potential
• Grants admission conditional on completing special summer program
• 2 on-campus courses & a study skills seminar (7 credits), plus support programs
**SUMMER START PILOT**

**Support:**
- Cohort-based, living learning community
- Live-in peer mentoring
- Full-time access to a success coach & all resources available to traditional students
- $1,000 scholarship for students who maintain 3.0 GPA & complete weekly “success assignments”
SUMMER START PROFILE

Who:

- 7 colleges
  - Agriculture, Education, Exploratory Studies, HHS, Liberal Arts, Management, Polytechnic
- 486 offers with goal to yield 150

61% Residents
40% 1st Generation
56% Female
37% URM
SUMMER STAY SCHOLARS NEW

- Summer scholarship for current students
- Combines on-campus coursework with research or internship in West Lafayette
  - 400 applicants
  - 100 finalists selected
  - April 11 – Banquet for selected students
DIVERSITY  CAMPUS PROGRESS

- Initiated Diversity Transformation Award – Faculty
- Initiated D&I Transformation Award – Staff
- Created Campus Public Safety Relations Committee
- Hosted the Midwest Bisexual Lesbian Gay Transgender Ally College Conference
- Won the bid to be the new headquarters for the National Alliance for Doctoral Studies in Mathematical Sciences
- Hosting Provost Luncheons with Concerned Students
Advisory Committee on Diversity

- Established fall 2015 with 30 members
- Retention, recruiting and climate subcommittees developed goals, metrics and actions
- Consolidated ACD report was created in February and circulated among various faculty, staff, and student groups
- Feedback has been received; revisions are in progress
- Living document that will evolve
- Implementation of action items to begin this semester
Summary of the 2015 COACHE survey of faculty satisfaction

This document was prepared by the Faculty Affairs group in the Provost’s office as a guide to reading the “Provost’s Report,” which is the detailed analysis of the survey results provided to us by COACHE. That Report, along with the survey instrument itself, is available to all PU faculty on the web site, accessible via PU username and password. We encourage all interested colleagues to participate in further analysis of the results, and in planning action based upon them.

This document has four parts:

- A “Super-summary,” which glosses the results in one page
- A one-page summary of our comparison group institutions and our survey response rates
- A one-page summary of the Results at a Glance portion of the COACHE Provost’s Report
- A more detailed summary of the results, section by section, that follows the order of the Provost’s Report (PR).

Note that some questions in some areas were specific to particular faculty ranks, so the skip logic of the survey did not present every participant with the same number of questions.

Submitted by:

Peter J Hollenbeck
Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Professor of Biological Sciences
(phollenb@purdue.edu)
COACHE SURVEY ANALYSIS SUPER-SUMMARY:

Areas of strength relative to our peers:

(1) Research and Interdisciplinary work – both show high comparative satisfaction, improvement since 2012, and some very high absolute scores

(2) Mentoring – shows high comparative satisfaction, improvement since 2012, and some very high absolute scores

(3) P&T Policies and Clarity – both show broad improvement in satisfaction since 2012 (we worked on these post-COACHE)

(4) Engagement with Department – shows high comparative satisfaction and broad improvement since 2012

Areas of concern relative to our peers:

(1) Personal policies and health benefits – both show comparative dissatisfaction, declines since 2012, and some very low absolute scores

(2) Leadership: Senior & Departmental – both showed comparative dissatisfaction, with both improvement and declines since 2012, and some very low absolute scores

(3) Departmental Collegiality – showed comparative dissatisfaction, despite improvement since 2012

(4) Appreciation & Recognition – showed broad dissatisfaction, as in 2012

Hot spots in the data:

(1) Demographic: There is broad, low-effect-size dissatisfaction across many areas for three demographic cadres: Associates, Women, and Faculty of Color

(2) The strongest demographic differences in the entire survey are the relative dissatisfaction of Associates about Promotion and Appreciation/Recognition

(3) The strongest cluster of overall dissatisfaction is in Leadership: Consistency and President

Best and worst absolute scores:

Highest satisfaction = Influence over focus of research
Discretion over course content
Mentoring is fulfilling
Mentoring is important

Lowest satisfaction = President: stated priorities
Priorities are stated/acted on consistently;
Changed priorities negatively affected my work
Dept effectiveness in addressing sub-standard performance
COACHE SURVEY COMPARISON GROUPS AND RESPONSE RATES (pp. 13, 59-60 of PR)

The COACHE Provost’s Report (PR) clusters related questions into 20 “benchmark” areas. For each benchmark, it uses the response data (1) to quantify satisfaction at PU relative to our comparison institutions; (2) to compare demographic subgroups at PU to subgroups at other institutions; (3) to identify differences among demographic subgroups within PU.

Selected peer institutions in 2015 survey (chosen from the larger cohort that took the survey):

Iowa State University
University of California, Davis
University of Kansas
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
University of Virginia

Larger cohort: >100 institutions (listed in Appendix of digital PR)

Components of the PR from COACHE:

(A) Response rates by basic demographic groups (we already have them by College)

(B) “Results at a Glance,” a comparison of aggregated university-wide responses for the 20 benchmarks for PU vs both our 5-institution comparison group and the entire COACHE cohort. It includes the basic demographic breakdown and changes vs 2012.

(C) “Results in Context,” a comparison with all questions in each benchmark area broken out individually. It includes the basic demographic breakdown and changes vs 2012.

(A) RESPONSE RATES (p. 13 of PR)

Overall participation rate was 54%. Overall completion rate (modified by some filters) was 50%

Differences among demographic groups:

   Women = 64%;  Men = 44%
   White = 53%;  foc = 42% (URM 47%; Asian 38%)
   Asst = 56%;  Assoc = 50%; Full = 48%

Our participation rates were higher than all of our peers in every category, at top of the total cohort in all but one
(B) RESULTS AT A GLANCE (pp 14-17 of *PR*):

The aggregate data shows how PU satisfaction ranked against our 5 peers plus the larger cohort. Notable areas are those where we are top two among our peers and in the top 30% of cohort (“strength”); or bottom two among our peers and in bottom 30% of cohort (“concern”).

Dashboard data show this:

**OVERALL STRENGTHS:**

- Nature of Work: Research *(improved since 2012; small demographic differences)*
- Interdisciplinary Research *(small demographic differences)*
- Mentoring *(improved since 2012; medium demographic differences)*
- Departmental Engagement *(improved since 2012; small demographic differences)*

*Other benchmark areas that are improved overall since 2012:*
- Nature of Work: Teaching
- Tenure Policies
- Tenure Clarity
- Departmental Quality

**OVERALL CONCERNS:**

- Nature of Work: Service *(small demographic differences)*
- Health & Retirement Benefits *(worse since 2012; small demographic differences)*
- Leadership: Senior *(improved since 2012; small demographic differences)*
- Leadership: Departmental *(small to medium demographic differences)*
- Departmental Collegiality *(small demographic differences)*
- Appreciation & Recognition *(small to medium demographic differences)*

*Other benchmark areas where overall satisfaction declined since 2012:*
- None

Overall demographic concerns for the aggregated Dashboard data:

- There is only ONE large demo difference = Associate Professors and *Promotion*
- Diffuse small diffs across 15/20 areas (!) for Associate Professors
- Diffuse small diffs across 7/20 areas for Women
- Diffuse small diffs across 13/20 areas for foc

Two special questions here about working at PU:

(i) *If I had to do it all over, I would again choose to work at this inst;*
(ii) *If candidate for a position asked about your dept as a place to work, would you recommend?*

Both had similar responses to peers/cohort, >=50% positive
(C) RESULTS IN CONTEXT (pp. 18-42 of PR)

Note about comparison data: “strength” refers to an area or question for which PU satisfaction is in the top 2 of our peer group of 5 institutions, and in the top 30% of our larger cohort. “Concern” refers to an area or question for which PU satisfaction is in the bottom 2 of our peer group of 5 institutions, and in the bottom 30% of our larger cohort. Small, medium and large effect sizes of any differences are indicated and color-coded.

(1) Nature of work: Research, Teaching & Service

(1A) Research (an overall strength): 11 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = 5/11
   Sub-area of concern = none

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012:
   Support for obtaining grants
   Support for maintaining grants

Intramural demographic concerns:
*Diffuse diffs across sub-areas for tenured (4/11); women (3/11), assoc (7/11), foc (7/11);
*Med diff for Time spent on research for women, foc
*Med diff for Availability of course release for research for assoc

(1B) Service (an overall concern): 7 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = Number of student advisees
   Sub-areas of concern: Attractiveness of committees
                          Discretion of choose committees
                          Equitability of committee assignments

Areas with changed satisfaction since 2012: none

Intramural demographic concerns:
*Diffuse small differences for tenured (4/7), assoc (7/7!), women (3/7), white (3/7)

(1C) Teaching: 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = none
   Sub-areas of concern = Equitability of distribution of teaching load

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012:
Quality of students taught
Quality of grad students to support teaching

Intramural demographic concerns:
Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (5/8), assoc (8/8)
Small differences in 2 sub-areas for white
*Med differences in 4/8 sub-areas for foc
*Med differences for Time spent on administrative tasks for white
*Time spent on teaching = large diff pre-ten; med diff assoc; small diff women

Absolute score standouts: Influence over focus of research (4.35) and Discretion over course content (4.36) were two of the highest absolute satisfaction values of the entire survey.
(2) Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary

(2A) Facilities and work resources: 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = none
   Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas changed since 2012: none

Intramural demographic concerns:
   *Diffuse small differences across sub-areas for tenure (5/8); assoc (3/8), foc (6/8)

(2B) Personal and family policies: 10 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = none
   Sub-areas of concern = Family medical/parental leave

Areas with reduced satisfaction since 2012:
   Housing benefits
   Spousal/partner hiring program
   Family medical/parental leave

Intramural demographic concerns:
   *Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (4/10), assoc and women (6/10), foc (3/10)
   *Med differences for:
      Spousal/partner hiring program (foc)
      Childcare (pre-ten)
      Eldercare (tenured)
      Stop-the-clock policies (men)
      Work/life compatibility & Balance between personal/professional (women)

Absolute score standouts: 4 sub-areas here were very low [<3.0; Housing benefits (2.48);
Spousal/partner hiring program (2.88); Childcare (2.60); Eldercare (2.80)]

(2C) Health and retirement benefits (an overall concern): 4 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = none
   Sub-areas of concern = Health benefits for self; Health benefits for family

Areas with reduced satisfaction since 2012:
   Health benefits for self (med diff)
   Health benefits for family (med diff)
Intramural demographic concerns:
  * Diffuse differences for assoc (4/4); foc (4/4)
  * Med differences for foc on Retirement benefits, & Phased retirement options

**Salary**: 1 question
  Satisfaction reduced since 2012

Intramural demographic concerns:
  * Small differences for ten, assoc; med difference for foc
(3) Interdisciplinary work, Collaboration and Mentoring

(3A) Interdisciplinary work (an overall strength): 6 questions

Comparison with peers:
  Sub-areas of strength = five out of six sub-areas!
  Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012:
  * Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in tenure (med diff)
  * Dept knows how to evaluate interdisciplinary work

Intramural demographic concerns:
  * Diffuse differences for assoc (4/6), foc (3/6)
  * Med differences for assoc on Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in promotion

(3B) Collaboration: 3 questions

Comparison with peers:
  Sub-areas of strength = Opportunities to collab outside of dept
  Opportunities to collab outside of inst
  Sub-areas of concern = Opportunities for collab within dept

Areas changed since 2012: none

Intramural demographic concerns:
  * Diffuse differences for pre-ten (3/3); assoc (3/3); women (2/3); foc (2/3)
  * Med differences for assoc on Opportunities to collab within dept & outside inst

(3C) Mentoring (an overall strength – but significant demo diffs): 10 questions

Comparison with peers:
  Sub-areas of strength = most sub-areas
  Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012: 7 out of 10 sub-areas

Intramural demographic concerns: many, differences for
  * Mentoring of pre-ten faculty – assoc (med), women & pre-ten (small)
  * Mentoring of assoc faculty – assoc (large), women (med), foc (small)
  * Support for faculty to be good mentors – assoc (med), women (small)
  * Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept – men (med); foc (small)
  * Effectiveness of mentoring outside inst – men (med), foc (small)
  * Importance of mentoring (Q120) within dept – tenured (med), full & men (small)
  * Importance of mentoring outside dept – tenured (med), full/men/white (small)
Importance of mentoring outside inst – tenured & men (med), full (small)

[see graphic analysis on p. 27 of Report doc; no major diffs with peers/cohort, but interesting absolute numbers]

**Absolute score standouts:** “Being a mentor is fulfilling” (4.18) and “Importance of mentoring within dept” (4.24) had two of the highest absolute agreement ratings of the entire survey. But white and men demographics consider mentoring to be less important than average.
(4) Tenure and Promotion

(4A) Tenure policies (an area of improvement): 7 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas improved since 2012 = 7 out of 7!
incl Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure (med)

Intramural demographic concerns:
Diffuse small differences (4/7) for white

(4B) Tenure clarity (an area of improvement): 6 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = Clarity of expectations: Teacher
Clarity of expectations: Colleague
Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen

Areas improved since 2012:
Clarity of expectations: Advisor
Clarity of expectations: Colleague

Intramural demographic concerns: diffuse small differences for white (3/6)

(4C) Promotion: 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas improved since 2012:
Clarity of promotion process
Clarity of promotion standards

Intramural demographic concerns:
*diffuse small differences for foc (7/8), women (3/8)
*large differences for assoc (7/7)

Demographic standout: the dissatisfaction of Assocs with promotion is one of the hottest spots in the entire survey.
Three special Qs on P&T:

Have you received formal feedback on your progress toward tenure?
Almost 90% said yes, higher than peers/cohort

Have you received formal feedback on your progress toward promotion to full professor?
Over 50% said yes, higher than peers/cohort

When do you plan to submit your dossier for promotion to full professor?
PU timeline breakdown similar to peers/cohort; foc had more optimistic timeline
(5) Leadership (an overall area of concern)

(5A) Leadership consistency (an area of concern): 3 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = Changed priorities negatively affect my work

Areas declined since 2012: 3 out of 3

Intramural demographic concerns:
- med differences for tenured (3/3)
- small-med differences for white (3/3)
- diffuse differences for women (2/3)

Absolute score standout: these 3 Qs had among the lowest absolute satisfaction values (2.56, 2.48, 2.40) of the entire survey (priorities stated / acted on consistently; changed priorities neg affected my work)

(5B) Leadership: Senior (an area of both improvement and concern!): 6 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = All three Presidential areas (also very low absolute values, <3.0)
  - President: Pace of decision making (2.82)
  - President: Stated priorities (2.44)
  - President: Communication (2.79)

Areas improved since 2012: (5 out of 6; med upswing: CAO communication of priorities)
Area declined since 2012: President: stated priorities

Intramural demographic concerns:
- diffuse differences for tenured (3/6), assoc (4/6), women (3/6)
- med Pres differences for tenured (communic), women (pace of decision)

(5C) Leadership: Divisional: 4 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength or concern = none

Areas changed since 2012 = none

Intramural demographic concerns: med differences for tenured (4/4)
(5D) Leadership: Departmental (an area of concern): 5 questions

Comparison with peers:
   Sub-areas of strength = none
   Sub-areas of concern = all 5 out of 5!

Areas improved since 2012: Ensuring faculty input

Intramural demographic concerns:
   *small-med diffs for tenured on all 5/5; diffuse diffs: men (2/5), foc (2/5)

[Nb: 2 graphic Qs at bottom of p.33 about impact on faculty work of changes in priorities]
(6) The Department (an overall area of concern)

(6A) Departmental collegiality (an area of concern): 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = 6 out of 8
Areas improved since 2012: *Dept is collegial*

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse small differences for assoc (7/8), women (4/8), foc (7/8)

(6B) Departmental engagement (an area of both strength and improvement): 7 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = *Discussions of grad student learning*
  *Discussions of current research methods*
- Sub-areas of concern = *Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure*
  *Amount of professional interaction w/Tenure*
Areas improved since 2012: 6 out of 7

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (6/7), assoc (6/7), foc (4/7)

(6C) Departmental quality (an area of both improvement and concern): 9 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = 5/9:
  *Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty*
  *Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenured faculty*
  *Dept is successful at faculty recruitment*
  *Dept is successful at faculty retention*
  *Dept addresses sub-standard performance*
Areas improved since 2012:
  *Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty*
  *Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty*

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (3/9), men (7/9), foc (6/9)
  Med differences for foc on 3/9:
  *Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty*
  *Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty*
  *Dept is successful at faculty retention*
Absolute score standout: *Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty* had a very high (4.01) absolute rating; note that none of the absolute numbers in this section is very low (<3.0)

**Absolute score standout:** “*Dept addresses sub-standard performance*” had the 2nd lowest absolute satisfaction rating (2.47) of entire survey.
(7) Appreciation and Recognition (an overall area of concern)

**Appreciation & recognition:** 12 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = 5/12:
  - Recognition for teaching
  - Recognition from colleagues
  - Recognition from Head/chair
  - School/college is valued by Pres/Provost
  - Dept is valued by Pres/Provost

Areas changed since 2012 = none

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse diffs for tenured (4/12), assoc (10/12), foc (5/12)
- **Med** diffs for assoc on overall category and 4/12 sub-areas:
  - Recognition for advising; service; outreach
  - School/college is valued by Pres/Provost

**Demographic hotspot:** the dissatisfaction of Assoc on this cluster of questions was one of the strongest in the entire survey

Special Q: *The CAO seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank*, broken down for PU by rank.
- Pre-tenure are >60% unsure; certainty grows with rank, and both “agree” and “disagree” categories rise.
Special Qs on Retention and negotiations:

(1) the % of PU faculty who have: actively sought an outside job offer; received a formal job offer; renegotiated the terms of their PU employment; are all very similar to peers and cohort.

(2) PU responses to whether “outside offers are necessary for negotiations” are very similar to peers and cohort.

(3) “If you could negotiate adjustments to your employment, which of the following items would you most like to adjust”

Overall, the top 3 are the same as our peers and cohort:
- base salary; lab/research support; teaching load

However, we place employment opps for spouse/partner higher (4th) than peers/cohort

Intramural demographic differences:
- Base salary is #1 for all demographics
- All demographics have the overall top 3 in their top 4
- Tenured and White place administrative responsibilities in top 4; displacing employment opps for spouse/partner

(4) “If you were to leave your institution, what would be your primary reason?”

PU overall shares 3 of our top 4 reasons with peers/cohort:
- Retire; Improve salary/benefits; work at inst with diff priorities

However, we differ in placing move to a preferred geographic location in our top 4 (3rd)

Intramural demographic differences:
- Retire is #1 for Tenured, Men, White and almost #1 for Women; not in top 4 for Pre-tenured and foc
- Improve your salary/benefits and move to a preferred geographic location are in top 4 for every demographic
- Women place improve your quality of life in top 4 (4th)
- Foc place pursue an admin position in higher ed in top 4 (4th)

(5) Three Qs about how long faculty plan to remain at Purdue, all break down similarly to peers/cohort; only small demographic diffs
Two Best and Worst aspects of working here

(1) Choose the two (and only two) best aspects of working here.

**PU order:**
- Cost of living & quality of colleagues (near tie)
- Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues
- Support of colleagues; quality of grad students; academic freedom (tie)

We share our #1 (quality of colleagues) and our high ranking for support of colleagues and academic freedom with the entire peer/cohort group

**Intramural demographic differences:** very small

(2) Choose the two (and only two) worst aspects of working here.

**PU order:**
- Compensation and Location (near tie)
- Quality of leadership:
- Other (we'll get a digest of written responses)

We share our #1 (compensation) and importance of quality of leadership with entire peer/cohort group

**Intramural demographic differences:**
- First two aspects chosen are the same (Compensation and Location) for all demographics
- Pre-tenure cite unrelenting pressure to perform and lack of spousal/partner hiring program
- Foc cite lack of spousal/partner hiring program, lack of diversity and lack of support for research/creative work
Final special Q:
“What is the number 1 thing that your institution can do to improve the workplace for faculty?”

PU responses in order, from greatest to least (these are bins created by COACHE to categorize free responses, so they do not add to 100%):

- Leadership (>50%)
- Compensation/benefits/facilities (<50%)
- Research/teaching/service (<25%)
- The department (<25%)
- Appreciation & recognition (<15%)
- Promotion & tenure; Work-life balance; Collaboration & interdisciplinary work; Mentoring (all <5%)

Comparison of PU to comparable institutions:

- Swap #1 for #2; otherwise the order was similar
- PU % choosing #1, 2 and 4 was higher than peers