UNIVERSITY SENATE  
Second Meeting, Monday, 19 October 2015, 2:30 p.m.  
Dean’s Auditorium, Pfendler Hall

AGENDA

1. Call to order  
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

2. Approval of Minutes of 14 September 2015

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson  
   Professor Kirk D. Alter

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

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

7. Question Time

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

9. Presentation on Income Share Agreement (ISA) Initiative  
   For Information  
   PRF CFO and Treasurer Brian Edelman

10. System-wide Faculty Governance  
    For Information  
    Senate Leadership

11. New Business

12. Memorial Resolutions

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

The minutes of the 14 September 2015 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

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

President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix B).

Professor David A. Sanders, Chair of the Steering Committee, presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix C). The Chairs or designees of the Senate standing committees briefly described the current activities of their respective committees.

At Question Time, President Daniels entertained questions from the Senate floor.

Professor David Sanders made the following statements and asked the following questions:

- As Chair of the Steering Committee, to which the responsibility of ensuring that resolutions of the Senate are carried out as delegated, I ask, “What action has been taken to restore the Common Reading Program as resolved by the University Senate on 24 April 2014?” President Daniels answered that the program is not coming back and that the modified Boiler Gold Rush Program is working well according to the feedback he has received.
• This past summer the University established a “Commitment to Freedom of Expression” without faculty input, and yet in two tests of “Freedom of Expression” that the University has faced, the administration has acted to suppress “Freedom of Expression” or has permitted it grudgingly. (The referenced two tests were an on-campus presentation in which some classified information was shown on a slide and an issue involving student-campaigning on campus.) Have members of the administration not read the document? The President mentioned that he wishes the slide containing classified information had been masked or blocked. However, the University employee who handled the situation did so correctly as per her job requirements. The video that had been taken down was later made available. The matter concerning the student campaigning on campus was also resolved after some discussion. The discussion occurred among the interested parties including the Director of Event Management, Paul Horngren. Professor Sanders read the following statement from Mr. Horngren into the record:

The protocols we previously described to you are based on longstanding precedent and the notion that, although Purdue is a public university, there is no First Amendment requirement that its facilities be opened without restriction for uses other than those dedicated to education, research, administration and University-sponsored activities.

The President noted that Purdue University has removed restrictions on speech that had been in place two or three years ago. Hence, FIRE has raised Purdue to its highest ranking for University free speech. University Counsel Schultz said that every institution has recognized a fundamental 1st Amendment tenet. In the case of the Purdue Memorial Union and the Steward Center, they are limited public fora for freedom of expression and are open for certain purposes. Purdue has volunteered these spaces to allow expression of freedom of speech and voting rights. In this particular case, face-to-face campaigning was allowed following completion of the discussions.

Professor Mary Comer asked if new Deans would be appointed as part of the growth process at Purdue University. President Daniels said that was not the intention, but new faculty members will be hired in areas of need and opportunity.

8. Professor J. Stuart Bolton, Co-Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), presented for Discussion Senate Document 15-2, Endorsement of the Revised Promotion and Tenure Criteria. He explained the rationale for the document and how it was related to Senate Document 15-1 which had been approved at the September University Senate meeting. He then entertained questions from the Senate floor.

Professor Harold Kirkwood asked if schools and college would be able to develop models specific to their unique promotion and tenure requirements. For example, the Libraries requirements will differ from those of other colleges. Provost Debasish Dutta stated that we are in the implementation phase at this time and many things must be clarified in this regard. Other schools and colleges will have similar concerns to those of the Libraries.

Professor Bolton noted that most colleges have their own policy and procedure documents already, although they are based on the University policy and procedure document. Professor William Campbell asked if the Board of Trustees (BoT) adoption of the revised promotion and tenure criteria make moot the current documents of each of the colleges. Provost Dutta said the current documents are not moot, but they will need to be revised
to meet the BoT-approved changes to the criteria, especially as they relate to mentoring of students. Professor Campbell said it would be helpful to have clear guidelines on timing and substance and any criteria that would be grandfathered as the transition occurs from old to new promotion and tenure criteria. Provost Dutta said the current process should continue as is and that even the revised criteria document will be changed as needed over time. Professor Alter emphasized the points that changes may be made as time passes, but the BoT-approved document will serve as a guide for any needed changes. These are nontrivial issues as the careers of our colleagues will be impacted by the promotion and tenure criteria. This is especially true for new, assistant professors who will be most impacted by the changes in criteria.

9. University Legal Counsel Steven R. Schultz and Purdue Research Foundation CFO and Treasurer Brian Edelman presented information on the Purdue University Income Share Agreement (ISA) Initiative (see Appendix D). They explained the program and then took questions from the Senate floor. The questions and answers will be included in updated minutes once received from Messrs. Edelman and Schultz.

10. Regional Campus Senators John Niser (IPFW), Janusz Duzinkiewicz (PNC) and Feng-Song Wang (Purdue Calumet) presented information about the ongoing merger of the Purdue North Central and Purdue Calumet campuses (see Appendices E and F).

11. There was no New Business brought to the Senate floor.

12. Memorial Resolutions had been received for Dennis Weidenaar Dean Emeritus and Professor Emeritus of Economics and Stephen Weingram Professor Emeritus of Mathematics. Out of respect for their departed colleagues, the Senators stood for a moment of silence.

13. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
Chairman’s Address to the University Senate – October 19, 2015

Good afternoon, and warm greetings to all.

It has been a busy several weeks since our last meeting, and I’d like to provide you with an update.

At our last meeting I articulated four major issues which this Senate needed to take hold of, and to act upon. Those issues are: the promotion and tenure document for West Lafayette; the class size policy; the concern about academic space; and the assessment of student cognitive growth through standardized testing.

I am happy to report that it appears that we have now whittled that list down to three, as the promotion and tenure criteria will soon be off our list. The other three issues remain, however, and we are counting on the standing committees to bring forward resolutions addressing them.

Let's talk briefly about the promotions and tenure criteria. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, on which the Senate Chair serves as an ex-officio member met on October 8th. One of the actions taken was the approval of the revised promotion and tenure criteria for the West Lafayette campus. You may go to the Board of Trustees website to see exactly what was approved, and you will be hearing later today from Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Chairman Bolton regarding this.

The revised document, as adopted officially by the Board of Trustees at their full meeting on October 9th, was the culmination of the hard work and diligence of the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Office of the Provost, the Senate leadership, and Trustees Brouillette, Hardin, and Castagna. The final document differs from the one endorsed by the Senate through its resolution 15-2. That will be discussed further by Chairman Bolton later in this meeting.

Also at our last meeting I reported on my attendance at a joint convocation of the Purdue Calumet and Purdue North Central Senates hosted by Board of Trustee Chairman Berghoff and Provost Dutta. My purpose in attending that meeting was to get a sense of the challenges faced by the two Senates as the official Purdue entity merges to become the new Purdue Northwest.

Subsequent to that meeting the Intercampus Faculty Council met, and one of the high priority topics of discussion was whether the IFC could add value to the process by listening to the concerns and points of view of the two Senates and their leaders. Professor John Niser of Purdue Fort Wayne and I were tasked with visiting the two sets of campus leaders to hear of the challenges and concerns. On October 7th those meetings were held – visiting first Purdue North central, followed by an afternoon meeting at Purdue Calumet, followed by attendance at the regular meeting of Calumet’s Senate.

The charter of the IFC, which is found under Section C of the University Code: Coordination of University Faculties states that “The IFC shall be responsible for coordination of legislative and policy making actions of the various faculty governing bodies” (C 4.00 Responsibilities of the Council). The members of the IFC are: the chairperson and immediate past chairperson of the West Lafayette campus’s University Senate; two representatives selected by the Calumet Faculty Senate; two representatives selected by the Fort Wayne Senate; two representatives of the North Central Senate; one member of the School of
Engineering and Technology at IUPUI; and one member of the School of Science at IUPUI; the President of the University or his designee who serves as the coordinator of the council; the registrar of the West Lafayette campus; and the Secretary of the Faculties.

During my attendance at those meetings I found two very different sentiments among the Senates. The sentiment at PNC was very much one of being on-board with the adoption of the new proposed Constitution. The PNC Senate voted in favor of the new Constitution, and the full body of the faculty also voted strongly in its support. The sentiment and actions at PUC were markedly the opposite. The PUC Senate rejected the new Constitution, and as a result it was not moved to a vote of the full faculty.

I would characterize the two meetings attended on October 7th as fruitful, while not without strong feelings and challenges. It appeared that the IFC would be able to successfully play a role in helping to find reconciliation, and both entities seemed willing to continue with discussions that had essentially broken off.

Subsequent to then, however, both parties have indicated less enthusiasm to utilize the IFC to assist in finding a way forward.

So, you ask, why are we spending time discussing this in a West Lafayette Senate meeting?

The answer is that we are, or should be, One Senate, One Faculty, system-wide. There is only one Purdue University President, and only one Purdue University Board of Trustees. The IFC was designed so that the faculty of all of the entities coordinate legislative and policy making actions.

The Purdue Northwest merger of two campuses into one has many significant implications in all things relevant to shared faculty governance. There are program, degree, curricula and accreditation issues. There are representation issues...will the smaller campus lose some of its voice, will the larger campus? How will representation in the West Lafayette Senate and the IFC change? How might any significant changes through this merger affect the other campuses...West Lafayette, Fort Wayne, IUPUI?

From correspondence I received last week it appears that at least some parties at PUC and PNC do not wish to utilize the IFC as a mechanism to allow a system-wide faculty-led solution to the problems of merging to occur. It appears instead that some would like to bypass a faculty-led solution and instead seek a Trustee-led or Office of the President-led solution or mandate.

This seems fraught with danger, and emblematic of faculty surrendering its role and its power in all things academic in order to “win the battle, and show its allegiance.” To that end, one campus seems inclined to find a way to bypass the senate of the other and force a vote of the entire faculty. While this still could come to pass, by fiat, it would be a complete breech of shared governance, bypassing the elected representatives of the senate.

It is important to the faculties of the entire Purdue system that faculty governance of the new Purdue Northwest be resolved by the elected senates.
By way of an update, as of 12:30pm today the senate leaderships of PNC and PUC have agreed to provide to the IFC a timetable by Nov. 7th showing the way forward to achieving shared governance for the new Purdue Northwest. That is good news indeed.

Later today in this meeting we will be hearing more from members of the PNC and PUC campuses.

Finally, President Daniels has previously introduced us to the idea of a new mechanism for some students to finance their education utilizing methods other than student loans. Today we have asked to have a presentation on that method – Income Sharing Agreements (ISA) so we can begin to understand what is entailed.

Last, I encourage all Standing Committees and Faculty Councils and Committees reporting to the Standing Committees to pay attention to the calendar so that we might bring action through resolutions to the Senate sooner rather than later.

Thank you.

Kirk Alter

University Senate Chairman
$2.019 billion by 2019
Timeline

- July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2019
- $910M raised to date from 83,000+ donors
Student Support

- Double student support annually: $400-500M

- Provide collaborative, state-of-the-art learning environments

- Enhance the quality of life on and around campus
Faculty Support

- **50% increase in endowed professorships, headships & deanships: $400-$500M**
  - Many to most will be existing faculty
  - Support for graduate students and research staff

- **Launch the next great era in research excellence: $400-$500M**
  - Advance interdisciplinary & cancer research
  - Increase Discovery Park’s impact & visibility

- **Improve physical infrastructure through renovations: $300-$400M**
  - Specialized facilities for multidisciplinary work
Pillars of Excellence in the Life Sciences

- **$60M+ investment**
- **Supports:**
  - The hiring of leading faculty
  - The addition of highly trained technical staff
  - The purchase of advanced instrumentation
  - Development of core facilities in the life sciences
University Senate
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 rcb@purdue.edu

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

1. Ad Hoc committee reviewing BOT’s statement on freedom of expression.
2. Ad Hoc committee reviewing Affirmative Action Report and trends on recruitment and retention across campus
3. Invited Amy Noah (Vice-President for Development) and David Lasiter (Associate Vice-President for Advancement) to discuss funding opportunities for underrepresented students.

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

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

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

1. Continuing study of wage proposal for increasing student hourly minimums to $9.00 per hour. Studying other issues related to the proposal.
2. Continuing work to measure levels of academic cheating on campus, and ways to combat any pervasive problems.
3. Studying the campus climate for international students, and ways to avoid their tendency to form cliques.
4. Looking into the need for a campus-wide policy for student sick leaves, relative to any possible legal action arising from ADA or other compliance issues.

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

1. Re-establishing contacts/coordination between Physical Facilities and URPC Subcommittees for Architecture and Visual Arts.
2. Learning about a Sponsored Programs project to replace COEUS, the electronic research administration system.
3. Sustainability sub-committee is discussing the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment

Chair of the Senate, Kirk Alter, alterk@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, David A. Sanders, retrovir@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
To: The University Senate  
From: J. Stuart Bolton; Acting Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee  
Subject: Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, West Lafayette Campus  
Disposition: University Senate for Endorsement  
References: Proposed changes to Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document  

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

Respectfully submitted,

J. Stuart Bolton

Approved:

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

Absent:

Fabrice Baudoin  
Linda S. Prokopy  
David A. Sanders  
Krishnamurthy Sriramesh  
Paul G. Wentholt  
Mark J.T. Smith
Progress To Date

- PRF leading pilot working team
- Reviewed 7 “Expression of Interests” proposals from potential ISA providers

Overall Assessment:

- Believe we can deliver a viable funding option for students and effectively market test ISAs
- Pilot will require an endowment investment: Risks are manageable

Next Steps:

1. Request that PRF make an investment from the endowment for 1st year of pilot
2. Encourage PRF to seek external funds for the pilot
3. Support working team’s decision to engage financial advisor and ISA provider
PNC - PUC

From escalation phase to a collaborative search to create a better university
IFC responsibilities (C.4.00)

- The Intercampus Faculty Council shall be responsible for coordination of legislative and policy making actions of the various faculty governing bodies.
With respect to a document which is of concern to more than one faculty, the council may take one or more of the following actions:

1. It may suggest that the governing body of each faculty consider the matters contained therein and take action at either of its next two meetings.

2. It may suggest that the president delay implementation for a period not to exceed sixty days in order that the governing bodies of all faculties concerned have had the opportunity to act.

3. If the governing body of one or more faculties fails to act on a document within a sixty day period and the matter is of urgent concern to one or more of the faculties which have acted upon it, the Council may suggest that the president implement or, if appropriate, place it on the agenda for the next meeting of the Board of Trustees.

4. If actions taken by two or more of the faculty governing bodies are in conflict, the Council may point out the conflicts and suggest that each governing body reconsider its action at its next meeting.
The escalation phase

- Power Strategies
  - Take unilateral action
  - Win at all costs
  - Attack/Defend
  - Threaten
  - Coerce
  - Withdraw (taking the ball home)
  - Verbal/written violence
The escalation phase

“rights strategies” being used that invoke:
- contractual agreement
- policies & procedures
- precedent
- past practices
- third party arbitration
The escalation phase

- The characteristics of all these strategies are adversarial, usually end up in a lose/lose result, expensive and lead to long term negative impacts on relationships up, down and across institutions.
Time to reset

- Both Senate leaderships and maybe the administrators need to consider a fundamentally different approach to this problem based on “interests”, that is hard on problems and soft on people
Starting point

- Our Board of Trustees, our President and all our Senates probably want to build a better university.
- Everyone’s heart is in the right place.
- We may differ on what a better university means on how to get there and what would be the measure of success.
- Let us focus on the opportunities for highly intelligent people to seek out openings, solve problems, identify honestly what everyone needs, based common interests and complementarity.
**Process**

- Define “interested parties” and request each party appoints a legitimate representative.
- Invite parties to meet with us to work on the list of “needs” and “desired outcomes”.
- Kirk and John will work on mapping the needs and desired outcomes of all parties.
- Identification of synergistic areas and more problematic areas.
- Present to all parties our findings and seek way forward based on collaborative approach.
Faculty Governance and Purdue North Central and Purdue Calumet Unification

19 October 2015, UNIVERSITY SENATE, West Lafayette

Janusz Duzinkiewicz

This is not an official statement from the Purdue North Central Senate nor from the PNC faculty as a whole. These are views of a participant and an observer.

At each meeting of the Intercampus Faculty Council since February 2014, the representatives of the North Central and Calumet campuses begin their reports by saying “It’s unification, unification all the time”. This, of course cannot be taken literally, but it did happen more than once and does indicate how unification dominates our concerns and our lives. Faculty Governance is part of this process of unification and unification will determine faculty governance in the new Purdue Northwest.

Attitudes towards unification among the North Central faculty cover the usual spectrum. A few are probably enthusiastic about it (though I personally have not met them), many more see the potential for good but are cognizant of the daunting challenges and serious dangers, others show a basic apathy – “whatever” as long as I can teach my courses” – and still others, a much smaller group, believe unification is a bad idea and are either vocal or silent about it. Engagement in unification efforts also follows a predictable spectrum from fully engaged to moderately so, to as little as possible. Combining these two spectra, a generalization appears: The largest group of faculty at PNC sees potential good in unification, worries about the work and challenges involved and are at least moderately engaged. The general attitude of PNC faculty can be stated in another way: we realize that a fundamental decision about our institution’s future was made in February 2014 without our knowledge or input, but unification is a reality and we must all do our best to make it work. There is real determination for the task, not real enthusiasm.

The target date for Unification is 1 July 2016. How realistic is this deadline and the rigid timetables that eventually emerged? That is an excellent question. As Faculty we already have full-time jobs and the moral obligation to do them well. Not least is our responsibility to our students.

The initial announcement referred to only an administrative unification of the two campuses. At some point that expanded to unification of everything including curriculum. No plan of action was offered with the initial announcement – if there had been, no doubt there would have complaints that all was being imposed from above. Still, it was confusing. The first step was to figure out what needed to be done. A person working on Banner integration described that process and subsequent unification efforts as untangling a gigantic wad of Christmas lights. In order to meet the deadlines very concrete foundational work had to be done at the same time as strategies were being developed. That is still largely the case today.

The most notable unification deadlines included August 2015 when the application for change of status was due at the Higher Learning Commission. Without the HLC’s approval, the new Purdue Northwest would not be accredited. Next, the new academic structure was due to the Board of Trustees in September and was approved earlier this month. Most of that work was done over the summer months when faculty were off contract and off campus. Next month the HLC will visit the campuses on
the 16th and 17th. The goal will be to compare reality on the ground with the information in the application. The work continues. Currently, the entire curriculum (hundreds of courses and just under a hundred degrees) from both campuses is being harmonized in anticipation of the new Banner system going live in March 2016. This involves extensive negotiations and a tremendous amount of electronic paperwork. A bright spot in unification efforts is the adoption by both Senates of a common general education core. The labor put into these and other efforts has been and continues to be enormous. The quality of rushed work can be questioned. The impact on our regular obligations has been adverse. The human cost is high.

Not all unification work has been done by faculty, of course. The Faculty appreciate the burdens borne by Administrators. Legally the Faculty has authority over curriculum, graduating students, the calendar and its own self-government. The Administration, to its credit, has also involved faculty in closely related issues such as academic structure, mission, vision, goals and utilization of one-time savings. Faculty serve on the flagship Committee, the Chancellors Unification Committee, which meets monthly. The most impactful decisions are made, however, by the Joint Senior Leadership Team comprised of the chancellors and vice chancellors with the two faculty senate chairs attending every third meeting. The Chancellor Search Committee appointed by the Central Administration was compromised almost entirely of faculty members from throughout the Purdue system. That committee operated particularly well under the excellent leadership of Trustee Gary Lehman. The PNC faculty is very appreciative of this response to its call for a nation-wide search.

In all, the chair of the Purdue North Central Senate estimates there are, or have been, 25-35 unification committees on which faculty serve. Each Senate has created an Ad Hoc Unification Committee to address and coordinate unification matters concerning faculty. Perhaps most important was the Joint Constitution Committee commissioned to create the foundational document for a common faculty governance structure at PNW. A draft was produced in Spring 2015 and approved by Purdue lawyers. The PNC Senate unanimously voted to hold a Faculty referendum on the draft constitution. The results were: 80% in favor with a turnout rate of roughly 60%. The PUC Senate, to our surprise, voted not to permit the Calumet faculty to vote on the draft constitution, so we are now at an impasse. If the impasse is not resolved there are likely to be two separate Senates in the new combined institution, an arrangement reminiscent of the old Dual Monarchy of Austria–Hungary whose informal motto was “the situation is hopeless but not serious.” A solution to the constitutional impasses could also be imposed from outside the Faculty. This would undermine the Faculty’s credibility. Fortunately, campus visits from University Senate Chair Alter and discussions at the Chancellors Unification Committee seem to be leading, directly or indirectly, to renewed negotiations.

Post Senate Note: The Senator from Calumet informed the University Senate on 19 October, or gave the strong impression, that the impasse on the constitution was due to the different methods of electing senators on the two campuses and the insistence of the North Central faculty on having their senators being volunteers. This is not, in fact, the situation. The draft constitution provides for only one method of election: Senators would be selected by Departments with at-large senators filling the gap to assure equal representation for each campus during a three year transitional period. There is no reference to a voluntary Senate. The draft constitution follows this text.

The many challenges of unification are magnified by special problems. From the beginning we were assured that both campuses would be treated equally and that the smaller campus, North Central,
would not become “Calumet East”. Some at Purdue Calumet do not accept this principle of a union of equals either because of the numbers or because of an unjustified perception of professional superiority. Others at Calumet do not accept the very idea of unification and out of a deep sense of principle are working doggedly to stop it. The methods used in both cases run the full gamut including behavior that has been characterized as strong-arming and obstructionism. The dual resistance to unification saps precious energy from people who are already over-extended and has led to impasses in faculty governance and degree programs that may require outside mediation.

Senators Alter, Niser and Wang just mentioned how the Intercampus Faculty Council is discussing the unification efforts and problems and their impact on faculty governance. The IFC is concerned about the coherence of the Purdue Faculty system-wide and the well-being of the new Purdue Northwest. It is willing to assist North Central and Calumet if they chose to accept help. Earlier today, the IFC “strongly suggested” that the PNC and PUC Senate leaderships develop a plan by 6 November to break the constitutional impasse. The University Code also grants the IFC the power to refer problems or conflicts between campuses to the President should they not be resolved within a set time limit. Using its prerogatives wisely the Intercampus Faculty Council could become a significant organ of system-wide faculty governance and might aid in unification. This is unexplored territory.

As I end, let me make three points.

First, unification has been and continues to be a heavy burden on a significant percentage of the North Central Faculty. In effect, Faculty members with full-time jobs have been asked to take on even more work and many have done so out of a sense of duty. Estimates of the amount of work involving faculty are rough. Between 33% - 45% of the full-time Faculty have served on between 25 and 35 committees. Each involved Faculty member has, on average, devoted between 85 and 120 hours to unification work. This does not include Faculty participating in the Chancellor Search or in summer-time retreats for which they were paid. The additional work is impacting the quality of life and more importantly the quality of the education Faculty offer in their 4/4 teaching loads. The problem of overwork due to tight deadlines, ambitious expectations and a blind spot for the human cost are now recognized by the Chancellors’ Unification Committee which is seeking remedies.

Second, clerical, administrative and professional staff find themselves in a much more vulnerable position than faculty. Many Faculty members recognize this. Tenured Faculty can say no to an increased, unpaid workload; the average staff member cannot. The situation is serious. For years before unification was announced, efficiency moves had already greatly increased staff workloads. I, personally, remember a very hardworking, talented secretary saying a few years ago “I simply cannot take on any additional work.” Since February 2014 unification additional work has been piled on, the old work still has to be done and no additional staff has been hired. Since unification is intended to cut costs by, among other means, cutting staff, these unfortunate people have to suffer in silence for fear that they will be among those eliminated should they voice their concerns or pain. In effect, they are asked to do overtime within their regular hours and are not fairly compensated. A substantial number have left as a result. Like many of the faculty, the staff are over-extended and tired. The human cost of unification for both faculty and staff is, indeed, high and must be included in any final accounting of unification costs and savings.

Third, one should not overstate the problems with unification or create alarmist headlines. Instead the recent West Lafayette Promotion and Tenure Criteria document controversy offers an
insight. Yes, the faculty rejected revisions made by the Trustees and rejected them “resoundingly” in the Senate by a vote of 57 to 11 to 4. But note what happened next. Vice Provost Panitch, Senate Chairperson Alter, and interim Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Bolton led an effort to find common language that would express common convictions. Within a month both the West Lafayette Faculty Affairs Committee and the Board of Trustees had approved new revisions to the document. The Senate is likely to pass the revisions next month. End of controversy. This should not be a surprise. Academia operates on a passion for the truth that usually lies far below the surface, honest dialogue among people sincerely committed to the common good and disciplined imagination to overcome obstacles. The same can be expected in the current difficulties and controversies over PNC and PUC unification.

[PROPOSED]
CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY
OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY NORTHWEST

The faculty (hereinafter referred to as the “Faculty”) of Purdue University Northwest ("PNW") is a community of scholars whose purpose is to find, discover, and create knowledge, to share that knowledge with students, colleagues, and the wider community, and to apply that knowledge, especially to the constituencies of PNW.

This Constitution delineates the powers, rights, privileges and responsibilities of the Faculty of Purdue University Northwest and the basic form of governance of that Faculty. Subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees of Purdue University, and in consultation with the President of Purdue University, the Faculty is responsible for governing itself as it deems most effective in fulfilling the educational mission of Purdue University Northwest.

I. Composition of the Purdue University Northwest Faculty

A. Faculty. The Faculty consists of the following:

- The President of Purdue University
- The Chancellor of PNW
- All those who teach or hold academic rank, including:
  - Tenured and tenure-track faculty
  - Clinical professional faculty
  - Research faculty
  - Administrators holding faculty rank
  - Limited term and continuing lecturers and other adjunct faculty
  - Visiting instructors of any rank
  - Emeritus faculty

B. Voting Faculty. Voting members of the Faculty (hereinafter referred to as the “Voting Faculty”) may elect members to the Senate (as defined below), and to its committees and subcommittees, as those elections are prescribed by the Bylaws of the Senate (the “Bylaws”). Voting Faculty shall consist of:

- The President of the University
- The Chancellor of PNW
• All tenured and tenure-track faculty
• Clinical professional faculty
• Administrators with academic rank

II. Establishment of the Governing Body

The Purdue University Northwest Senate (hereafter referred to as the “Senate”) shall be the governing body of the Faculty. The Senate shall exercise the legislative, policy-making, and advisory powers of the Faculty, subject to review and check by the Faculty through procedures established in this Constitution and in the Bylaws.

III. Powers and Responsibilities of the Faculty

A. General Powers

Subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees and in consultation with the President of the University and the Chancellor of PNW, the Faculty, acting through the Senate, shall have the general power and responsibility to propose and adopt policies, regulations, and procedures needed to achieve the educational objectives of Purdue University Northwest and to promote the general welfare of those involved in Purdue University Northwest’s educational processes.

B. Specific Powers

The Faculty shall have the power, except when the interests of other campuses within the Purdue University system are affected:

1. To review and approve the undergraduate academic degree titles conferred by Purdue University Northwest;
2. To review and approve the general requirements for the curricula of Purdue University Northwest leading toward undergraduate academic degrees;
3. To review, approve, and recommend to the Board of Trustees the establishment of new degrees and degree programs to be introduced at Purdue University Northwest, and the discontinuance of existing degrees and degree programs when they no longer contribute to the fulfillment of the mission of Purdue University Northwest;
4. To develop curricula and course content;
5. To develop instructional and examination procedures;
6. To nominate all candidates for academic degrees;
7. To establish the academic calendar;
8. To establish general policies for scheduling classes;
9. To establish policies for participation in inter-collegiate athletics;

10. To establish policies governing student-group extra-curricular activities, including student participation in athletics;

11. To nominate individuals, through the Senate, to serve on search committees for the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors of Purdue University Northwest;

12. To nominate individuals, through the Senate, to serve on any performance evaluation committees convened to review the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors of Purdue University Northwest;

13. To consider and act upon any action of the Purdue University Northwest student legislative assembly whenever a request to do so is received from that body.

C. Advisory Role

Through the Chancellor, the Faculty may advise the President of the University and the Board of Trustees concerning:

1. All new degrees to be introduced at Purdue University Northwest;

2. Policies and criteria for admission to programs;

3. Policies governing the conduct and dismissal of students at Purdue University Northwest;

4. Policies and administration of the library, audio-visual services, academic computing, and telecommunication resources and services of Purdue University Northwest;

5. All proposed changes and procedures concerning the academic organization of Purdue University Northwest;

6. The planning of the physical facilities and staff where these may affect the welfare of the Faculty and the students;

7. Resource allocation and budget priorities of Purdue University Northwest;

8. Policies affecting the general welfare, privileges, tenure and responsibilities of the Purdue University Northwest faculty, standards for appointment, and procedures for academic promotion of members of the faculty.

D. Appeal to Trustees

The Faculty shall in all instances have the right to present its views to the Board of Trustees through the President of the University on any faculty or administrative action pertaining to the conduct and welfare of Purdue University Northwest.
E. Purdue University System-wide Faculty Government

The Faculty shall be appropriately represented on all bodies dealing with matters of Purdue University system-wide concern.

IV. Composition of the Senate

A. The membership of the senate shall consist of the following:

1. Four at-large senators. Each campus will select two at-large senators. This requirement will expire on the third anniversary of the earlier to occur of (a) the approval of this Constitution by the Board of Trustees or (b) the date on which the formal creation of Purdue University Northwest officially occurs under a unification plan approved by the Board of Trustees (the “Transition Completion Date”). At that time, Article IV.A.1 shall be reconsidered, and a change to this requirement may be approved following the amendment procedures outlined in Article X.

2. Two senators from each department. In the case of departments that cannot provide senators, the open position(s) will revert to an at-large position. One senator will be selected from each campus. If a department does not have faculty from both campuses, both members may be selected from one campus.

The total number of senators shall not be less than 14 percent of the total number of Voting Faculty. If necessary, at-large senator positions will be created to increase the total number necessary to meet this minimum threshold of Voting Faculty.

The Senate’s membership will be comprised equally of representatives from the Calumet and North Central campuses. This requirement will expire on the Transition Completion Date. At that time, Article IV.A.2 shall be reconsidered, and a change to this requirement may be approved following the amendment procedures outlined in Article X.

For purposes of Senate composition, the library shall be counted as a department.

3. The President of the University, ex officio, without vote.

4. The Chancellor of Purdue University Northwest, ex officio, without vote.

5. The Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services, ex officio, without vote.
B. Officers of the Senate

1. Chair. The Chair of the Purdue University Northwest Senate shall serve as the presiding officer with vote. The Chair may stand for re-election for up to three one-year terms. After serving three consecutive terms, the Chair may not serve as either Chair or Vice-Chair for a period of three years. Duties shall be as specified in the Bylaws.

2. Vice-Chair. Vice-Chair of the Purdue University Northwest Senate shall preside in the absence of the chair. Duties shall be as specified in the Bylaws.

3. Secretary. The Secretary shall be appointed by the Chair of the Senate and approved by the Agenda Committee. The Secretary shall serve without vote unless he or she is an elected member of the Senate. Duties shall be as specified in the Bylaws.

4. Sergeant at Arms. The Chair of the Senate shall select annually a Sergeant at Arms from the Senate membership. The Sergeant at Arms shall separate visitors from members of the Senate at meetings and carry out instructions of the Senate or the Chair during each meeting. The Sergeant of Arms shall serve with vote.

5. Parliamentarian. The Chair of the Senate shall select annually the Parliamentarian of the Senate, who shall not be a member of the Senate. The Parliamentarian shall guide the Senate and the Chair on parliamentary procedure, and serve without vote.

6. The President of Purdue University is the president of the Purdue University Northwest Senate.

7. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate must represent different campuses. This requirement will expire on the Transition Completion Date. At that time, Article IV.B.7 shall be reconsidered, and a change to this requirement may be approved following the amendment procedures outlined in Article X.

C. Election of Senators

1. The normal term of an elected Senator shall be three years, beginning one week before the first Senate meeting of the fall term following his or her election. Senators may be re-elected to successive terms. The departments shall compile the election of their senators who are to assume office for the subsequent academic year and report the results to the Secretary of the Senate by its last meeting of the academic year. The faculties of departments shall determine their own methods for election of senators. The Senate shall establish procedures for electing its at-large members. Guidelines for elections of departmental and at-large senators will be described in the Bylaws. Senate leadership will conduct a regular review of the Senate's composition to ensure that the Senate is representative of all Faculty.
2. Senate terms will be staggered so that each department elects one senator for one year and one senator for three years. At-large slots will also be staggered with half expiring after one year and half after three years.

D. Removal of a Senator

The Senate shall have the power to remove a senator for just cause. Removal must be by secret ballot of two-thirds of voting senators. ("Voting senators" is defined as all members of the Senate who are eligible to vote.) The Senate has the power to establish procedures for replacing a senator.

V. Operation of the Senate

1. The Senate shall convene at least eight times during the regular academic year and may be convened for special sessions by the Senate Chair, by the petition of one third of the voting members of the Senate, or by the Chancellor.

2. Two-thirds of the voting members of the Senate shall constitute a quorum.

3. In the absence of the Senate Chair at a Senate meeting, the Vice-Chair shall call the meeting to order and shall preside over that meeting.

4. The minutes of each meeting shall be distributed to the Faculty as specified in the bylaws.

5. The Senate shall establish rules of procedure. However,
   a. No rules shall infringe upon the right of any member of the Faculty to present, in an appropriate manner, any proposal before a meeting of the Senate;
   b. Senators must be present to vote. No substitute shall be permitted to serve for the temporary absence of a Senator. In case of the inability of a Senator to complete a term the Senator shall be replaced;
   c. By a two-thirds vote of voting members present, the Senate may seek advice and counsel by a mail ballot from the Faculty on any issue.

6. The Senate shall create the standing committees needed to exercise its general powers, responsibilities, and duties.

7. In the event the Senate deems it to be beneficial in carrying out the Faculty's responsibilities, the Senate may also create ad hoc committees and other groups and delegate to them specific powers, subject to such powers as the full Senate may reserve unto itself when establishing any such committee (including but not limited to the power of review, approval or veto).

8. The Senate shall be informed of the activities, studies, and recommendations of any Purdue University Northwest Committee upon which the Faculty are asked
to serve, except under circumstances where Purdue University policy requires privacy and confidentiality.

VI. Powers and Responsibilities of the College Faculties

The faculties of the various colleges of Purdue University Northwest may exercise those authorities delegated to them by the Senate. The policies of the Senate take precedence over policies of colleges and administrative committees and councils.

VII. Legislative Powers of the Purdue University Northwest Faculty

As established in Article III, the powers and responsibilities of the Faculty shall be exercised by the Senate. However, the actions of the Senate shall be subject to review and check by the Faculty through the following procedures:

1. At any convocation of the Faculty called pursuant to Article VIII below, past actions of the Senate may be brought to the floor for discussion. If a majority of those present rejects a previous action of the Senate, the Senate must reconsider this action at its next regular meeting.

2. Any action taken by the Senate can be required to be resubmitted to the Senate for reconsideration by faculty petition. Such a petition must be received by the Chair of the Senate within four weeks after the circulation of the Senate minutes covering the action. The petition must be signed by at least fifteen percent of the Faculty and state the specific action of the Senate and the petitioners' reasons for objecting to this action.

In either of the above procedures, if the Senate affirms its original action, the issue must be submitted by mail ballot to the Faculty. The decision of a simple majority of those voting in such a ballot shall be final.

VIII. Convocations of the Purdue University Northwest

1. The Faculty shall be convened by the Senate Chair at least once a year to meet with the Chancellor. The Agenda Committee of the Senate shall establish the agenda of convocations. Any item may be brought up for discussion and the Senate petitioned for action by the convened faculty.

2. The Chair of the Senate shall preside over Faculty convocations.

3. A special convocation of the Faculty can be convened by a majority of voting Senators or petition through the Senate by fifteen percent of the Voting Faculty.
IX. Board of Trustees' Responsibilities

Nothing in the above shall be construed as restraining the Board of Trustees from taking such action as they determine to be necessary in the discharge of their legal responsibilities.

X. Amendments

Changes and amendments shall become effective when approved by the Senate, with a simple majority of those voting, and accepted by the Voting Faculty, with a 60 percent majority of those voting.

Approved March 3, 2015

Purdue University North Central
Jeff Shires
Jonathan Swarts
Dan Wilbur
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Tom Dobrowski
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Heather Fielding

Purdue University Calumet
Leslie Rittenmeyer
Bipin Pai
Rita Brusca-Vega
Judy Hack
Michael Dobberstein
Memorial Resolutions

Dennis J. Weidenaar
Dean Emeritus and Professor Emeritus of Economics
October 4, 1936 - May 16, 2015

Stephen Weingram
Professor Emeritus of Mathematics
March 2, 1934 – November 20, 2014
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