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

REVISED AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Patricia Hart

2. Approval of Minutes of 26 January 2015

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson
   Professor Patricia Hart

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 14-2 For Action
   Evening Examination Conflicts
   Professor Hal Kirkwood

9. Senate Document 14-3 For Action
   Proposed CSDR Regulation Changes
   Professor Hal Kirkwood

10. Senate Document 14-4 Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits
    For Discussion
    PGSG President Christopher Kulesza

11. Senate Document 14-6 For Discussion
    Classroom Improvement Resolution
    Professor Michael Fosmire

12. Senate Document 14-7 For Discussion
    Nominees for Senate Vice-Chair
    Professor Michael Hill

13. Senate Document 14-8 For Discussion
    Electronic Student Evaluations
    Professor David Sanders

14. Senate Document 14-9 Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy
    For Discussion
    Professor Levon Esters and Provost Debasish Dutta

15. New Business

16. Memorial Resolutions

17. Adjournment
**UNIVERSITY SENATE**

Fifth Meeting, Monday, 16 February 2015, 2:30 p.m.

Room 302, Stewart Center


Guests: Joe Paul, Audeen Fentiman, Michael Dara, Greg Buzzard, Suresh Garimela, Bave Banarerı, Robert Mate, George Bodner.

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson Patricia Hart.
2. The minutes of the 26 January 2015 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.
3. Senator Christopher Kulesza made a motion to remove Item 10 from the agenda. His motion was seconded and approved. The item will be brought for Discussion to the March Senate meeting. The agenda was accepted as amended.
4. Professor Hart presented the remarks of the Chairperson (see Appendix A). In her remarks, Professor Hart posed questions for the President concerning faculty salaries.
5. President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix B). In his remarks and presentation, President Daniels spoke to the questions posed by Professor Hart. President Daniels agreed with Professor Hart’s remarks and noted that
he and the Provost agreed that more data are needed on this issue. Once the data are gathered, they can be assessed to determine if Purdue is hurting its ability to recruit and keep the best faculty. President Daniels said that the University is considering the possibility of pay increases.

6. Professor David Sanders presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix C). The chairs of the Senate standing committees briefly described the current activities of their respective committees. Professor Michael Hill, Chair of the Nominating Committee, emphasized that candidates for the Vice-Chair position are welcome to volunteer prior to the March Senate meeting. The Senate Bylaws require that two candidates stand for nomination as Vice-Chair of the Senate and we currently have only a single candidate.

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

Professor Monika Ivantysynova asked if we have a full understanding of the distribution of grant overhead funds within the University. She asked if the University could be more efficient with these funds. President Daniels said that these questions are asked throughout academia. Some of the administrative support provided by these funds goes directly to supporting the research enterprise and the regulatory requirements imposed by governmental agencies. For example, the pre- and post-award offices are paid for, in part, by overhead funds. He said that feedback suggests Purdue is more efficient in its use of overhead funds. Professor Hart called on a guest, former Senate Chair George Bodner, to speak to the matter of salary comparisons with peer institutions. Professor Bodner noted that Purdue is remarkably transparent, but one needs to know which “window” to look through to find answers. The Data Digest serves the purpose well. When compared with peer institutions, Purdue ranks 12th of 15 for overall average faculty salary. Professor Linda Prokopy asked if salary data based on gender and race could be made publically available. This request came from one of her colleagues. Professor Peter Hirst stated that more of the costs of health care have been transferred to faculty over the last few years. He has heard that the health care reserve fund is now replenished and asked if there were any plans to use some of those funds to enhance faculty salaries. The President said that Purdue has seen health care cost savings due to employees’ careful and judicious use of their health care options. Although it has been considered, it is too early to state if any of the funds will be put towards salaries. Professor Joerg Appenzeller noted that our salary percentage increases have lagged compared with other employer/industries. Professor Joseph Sinfield remarked that the College of Engineering is bringing in more faculty with the specific purpose that their expertise will impact society in a positive manner and that is a different pool than has been sought in the past. Provost Debasish Dutta thanked all of the Senators who spoke and said his office will look at the current data. The best information available at this time dates to 2011. He noted that conversations about salaries need to be data- and context-driven and that all of the factors that influence salary and compensation must be considered. In a timely manner, he hopes to have more current information to share with the faculty. Senator Christopher Kulesza said that graduate students’ salaries lag behind those of our Big 10 peers. The PGSG has spoken with the President and Provost about this matter and he thanks them for considering the issue.

Professor Sanders asked about the status of the restoration of the Common Reading Program that was approved by the Senate last year. President Daniels said that his answer was the same as his previous answer; there has been no decision and no
assurance the program will be restored. The Boiler Gold Rush (BGR) program is still taking shape and there will be common reading components as part of the program. He envisions the BGR program focusing on providing guidance that will ensure our students are successful at Purdue University and in life.

Professor Evelyn Blackwood mentioned that Purdue University used to have an attractive health care program. She suggested that with the current high-deductible programs, people often wait to get appropriate health care. This lowers the costs to the University, but is, in essence, a pay cut. She asked: Why have the faculty not been consulted when there are major shifts in health care plans and what can be done to not force people to have to make choices? President Daniels said that the Blue Ribbon Health Care Report was faculty driven. It can be improved and refined, but we will not make a fundamental reversion to first-dollar coverage. Professor Ivantysynova stated that it was her understanding that graduate students have a different health care coverage and it is more expensive than the faculty health care plan, especially if they have children. Would it be possible to have same health care as faculty? She suggested that it was an unfair situation as their incomes are very low by comparison with faculty salaries. Professor Hart called on Interim Vice President Trent Klingerman to address the issue. He said that graduate students have different insurance than faculty and it is more economical by the measures he is familiar with. His office has worked with the PGSG to preserve current model for graduate student health insurance. Professor Hart suggested it might be helpful to distribute the information received from meeting between the PGSG and Interim Vice President Klingerman. Senator Kulesza noted that our current plan is good compared with peers. If Professor Ivantysynova has more information, he will be happy to receive it. Her concern is for families and the fairness of the rates for married with children. Senator Kulesza stated that the PGSG still considers that our rates are better than our peers. In addition, child-care grants from the PGSG have been helpful for graduate students with children. There are still significant concerns and the PGSG is well aware of the issue.

8. Professor Hal Kirkwood, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), introduced Senate Document 14-2, Evening Examination Conflicts, for Action. His motion to approve the document was seconded. Professor Kirkwood proposed a friendly amendment to make a minor change in the wording in Section C of the document. There were no objections to the friendly amendment and it was accepted. Professor Kirkwood explained the rationale for the changes was to provide students with ability to advocate on their own behalf when faced with conflicts due to scheduling of evening examinations. Following a brief discussion the vote was taken by electronic secret ballot. The motion to approve the document passed with 54 votes in favor, 3 votes in opposition and 3 abstentions.

9. Professor Kirkwood introduced Senate Document 14-3, Proposed Changes to the Committee on Scholastic Delinquencies and Readmissions (CSDR), for Action. His motion to approve was seconded. Professor Kirkwood stated that the proposed changes were designed to streamline the reapplication procedures for students initially approved for admission and to reduce the burden on the CSDR members. There was no discussion so the vote was taken by electronic secret ballot. The motion to approve the document passed with 59 votes in favor, 1 vote in opposition and 3 abstentions.

10. Professor Michael Fosmire, Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), introduced Senate Document 14-6, Classroom Improvement Resolution, for
Discussion. Professor Fosmire explained that the resolution recommends the University devote additional funds to the updating and improvement of the classrooms on the West Lafayette campus. The intent is to create more functional learning spaces than now exist in many classrooms. Several Senators spoke in favor of the resolution and provided suggestions for its implementation. Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer William Sullivan said the University is gathering information and date on the current state of space utilization on campus. He promised to work with the Senate and faculty members to determine where funds can be best used and what will be the next steps in the process.

11. Professor Michael Hill, Chair of the Nominating Committee, introduced Senate Document 14-7, Nominees for Vice-Chair of the Senate, for Discussion. Professor Hill noted that at least nominees are required according to the Senate Bylaws and encouraged anyone interested in running to notify him. Professor Hart also encouraged her colleagues to run for office.

12. Professor David Sanders introduced Senate Document 14-8, Electronic Student Evaluations, for Discussion. The proposal would add mid-semester student evaluations done electronically. An instructor would still have the option to have end-of-semester evaluations done. The mid-semester evaluations would focus on specific items of learning and teaching rather than an overall assessment of the course or instructor. The proposal stimulated vigorous discussion. Professor Rick Cosier noted that it is important that faculty members are held accountable for their teaching. He suggested that it is still important to have end-of-the-semester evaluations for salary considerations. Professor Prokopy said that research has shown that the current student evaluations are biased against women and minorities. She supports changing the language in the evaluations to lessen the chances for biased results from the student evaluations. Senator Kulesza asked if there would be punishment for students if they do not participate in the survey. Professor Sanders said that the decision would be up to each individual professor. He also said that he is willing to include wording about the mandate to do these evaluations for use in syllabi. Professor Alan Friedman said that he offers points for students who fill out the student evaluations as part of bonus points for class participation. Professor Sanders stated that bonus points for filling out the evaluations has to be clearly stated in the syllabus. Professor John Niser said that a mid-semester evaluation will provide the professor with feedback during the course. Changes that are implemented during the course can provide incentive for the students to do the evaluations as well as provide guidance to the instructor for improvements to the class. Professor Clifford Fisher said that administrators still need to see the results of the evaluations to help professors improve their teaching. He supports changing the wording of the document to that effect. Professor Stephen Martin stated that if we “…keep doing what we are doing…” we will not get different results. He, too, supports the resolution. Senator Bobby Haddix, Purdue Student Government (PSG) President, said that when the proposal was passed by the PSG it was meant to supplement, not replace, the end-of-semester evaluations. He suggested that both evaluations should be done. He also favored having mandatory evaluations to increase the response rate and have more representative results from a wider audience. He noted that our Big 10 peer institutions make the results available to others. Professors Douglas Nelson and Alan Friedman noted that having questions about a course up front will allow students to address other issues later in the course. Professor Sanders said that team teaching evaluations provide different results and there are concerns about how to handle team-taught courses. Vice Provost Frank Dooley said that the University is currently
evaluating each component of a course such as science courses that have lectures, laboratory periods and recitation periods. Senator Kulesza asked about incorporating evaluations of teaching assistants and it was noted that teaching assistants can be evaluated in the current system. Professor Sanders will be happy to add language about evaluations for teaching assistants. Professor Heather Servaty-Seib said that it will be helpful to see the text the students will see prior to the evaluations. Professor Patrick Kain asked if the evaluation questions would be standard across disciplines or specific to individual units. Professor Sanders said that there are some standard questions, but other questions can be added tailored to a specific class. Professor Sanders envisions working with the Center for Instructional Excellence to craft the questions. Professor Wayne Campbell asked if the evaluations will have hand-written or numeric questions. Professor Sanders said they would not be numerical. Professor Campbell expressed concern about maintaining anonymity of the students and Professor Sanders admitted that could be a problem in a class with few students. Professor Campbell suggested that substantive change will not be easily introduced in the middle of the semester. Professor Jorge Rodriguez expressed reservations about the proposal especially as the evaluations will often be completed by 18-year-old students. This seems irresponsible to him. Professor Sandra Rossie asked if the resolution should be considered by the EPC because of its teaching implications and the FAC because of its promotion and tenure implications. Professor Sanders stated that the resolution had been approved by the FAC and was forwarded to the Steering Committee by the Chair of the FAC, Professor Levon Esters.

13. Standing in for Chair of the FAC Levon Esters, Provost Debasish Dutta presented Senate Document 14-9, Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy, for Discussion. Provost Dutta noted that several changes had been made to the documents based on input from faculty members from all of the Purdue University campuses. There were additional suggestions for minor wording changes and Provost Dutta ensured that these would be taken into consideration. Provost Dutta’s office is quite willing to receive additional feedback. Once the feedback has been incorporated into the documents, they will be processed through the appropriate administrative committees and eventually be sent to the Board of Trustees for approval.

14. No New Business was brought to the Senate floor.

15. Memorial Resolution had been received for Valerie C. Rudolph, Professor Emerita English. Out of respect for their departed colleague, the Senators stood for a moment of silence.

16. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
Remarks to Senate on 16 February

Welcome to the February meeting of the University Senate. Today we have a lot of business, so let’s get started.

First, you may notice a change in the arrangement of seats. We have moved the voting senators with floor privileges into the front to make it easier for us to hear each other in the new configuration required by the Fire Marshall.

Next, regarding time management, the senate has purchased a new device to help us stay within our time limits. (SHOW) We have this timer that is like the one they use in the supreme court, with green, yellow, and red lights.

Today we have seven important items for discussion or action. Although I will set the timer for about 10 minutes of discussion per item, at least one—the promotion and tenure policy—will probably require more time.

First we will talk about issue that you have told me is uppermost in your minds right now: salaries and raises. I know that we could spend the entire meeting on this, but after my remarks and the president’s reply, I’d like to limit our discussion to 20 minutes today, with the understanding that this is nothing more than a start to our conversation. We will leave some additional time for questions on other subjects.

Although the meeting may be long, I would encourage you to stay to the end in service to your colleagues.

Now let’s get right to salary. The 2012 COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey listed salary as the top faculty concern, and the upcoming COACHE survey will be able to show us whether this concern has gone up or down. For all these reasons, the leaders of the senate would like to take this opportunity to encourage a vigorous, data-driven conversation on all aspects of this important subject.

The January Presidential Briefing stated QUOTE “overall, our faculties’ median salary is higher than our comparison group.” END QUOTE Many of you have written me to say that this statement does not jibe with your figures, and that you believe that this matter deserves a more nuanced discussion. Here is a VERY brief snapshot of things you have told me.

The data provided by central administration over the past several years as a basis for guiding equity adjustments have tended to show that our average faculty salaries lag behind those of our peers. The OIR report of a year ago showed us at 11th place in comparison to our 14 peers, and we have seen data that seem to show us very low in the Big Ten.

We have seen what we believe to be reliable metrics that indicate that salary increases have not kept pace with inflation, and we would like a chance to compare figures. Reliable studies of programs all around campus demonstrate lagging salaries.

The out-of-pocket expenses for healthcare have been increasing here at Purdue. This certainly has the effect of reducing spending power and in essence is a reduction in salary.

We are told over and over that, because the cost of living is low in our area, our salaries are competitive. This overlooks several facts. One is the reality that the percentage amount contributed to retirement is in actual dollars. People who work at
lower salaries have less real money saved for retirement (and they might not want to live in Lafayette when they retire).

Another is that the “low cost of living” is already being used as an argument to offset the fact that Purdue is not located in an urban area where partner hires are more readily available, particularly in faculty positions. What’s more, with no ocean, no mountains, and no big-city excitement, we have to try harder to convince prospective hires.

Since the contribution at Purdue toward retirement was decreased by 27% in 2008, we have also lost the argument that our salaries were much larger than they looked. We think this is a good time to ask if salaries have really kept pace with the promise to stay up with the market after that one-time bump.

The senate would like to ask the Provost’s office to assemble reliable data to paint a more nuanced picture of Purdue’s salaries in all parts of campus relative to our peers. It would also be relevant to look at is what longitudinal data tell us about whether the salary gap between Purdue and peers is growing or shrinking, by discipline. All of these data should be easy to find in one place, and should be updated regularly.

But the real question is the following:
• Are the salaries adequate to recruit and retain the faculty we need in order to remain a first-rate institution and achieve our goals? What does the market say? We would all like to have a data-based, factual discussion, but context is essential, and we’d like to point out that there are all kinds of facts, and some are harder to measure than others. For starters, it’s pretty hard to count the candidates who look at the salary range and simply decide not to apply. The first thing any candidate does in 2015 is google the university to study climate and salary.

We think the President and the Provost should gather the deans and unit heads for a candid discussion of what it takes to recruit and retain top faculty. Deans are front and center in negotiating hires. The Heads have up-close and personal knowledge of the difficulties of building and maintaining their faculties and the frustrations and costs in money and faculty time caused by attrition and failed searches. Are we generating the best pools? Are we getting our first choice hires? How many senior positions remain open year after year? How much are we spending to make counter offers? Do these offers succeed? Have other institutions figured out how to raid our faculty in different programs and at different ranks? Would we have spent our time and money more efficiently in creating an ongoing level of job satisfaction?

Time does not permit me to go into more detail, but I’d like to close with a question to the president:
• What will the salary pool look like for this year? Because we are being told that the revenue stream is strong and the reserves are very solid, can you articulate a reason not to give raises between 3 and 4%?

I’d like to remind you that after my remarks and the president’s reply, we will hear the Résumé of items under consideration by the Standing Committees, and following that we will entertain questions.

Questions:
Might I ask that the first questions be about the subject of salaries and raises, and that after that, we will discuss your other important matters.

When you address the senate, please stand, introduce yourself, and speak up, and remember that we need to share the floor.
APPLICATION TRENDS

Undergraduate Applications 17% or 6,400+ applicants
- Over 44,000 applications already received breaking Purdue’s previous record

Undergraduate Deposits 23% or 307 more deposits
- Continues to show strong demand for Purdue

U.S. Graduate Non-resident Applications 17%
Informal email survey of ≈50 peers

- Purdue: No. 1 for application growth
- Few other institutions reported applications over 40,000
Applications from:

- Women
- African Americans
- Hispanic Americans
21st Century students are much more likely to be female, under-represented minority, and first-generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21st Century Scholars</th>
<th>O’Bannon Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Purdue West Lafayette</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ball State</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indiana State University</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Purdue keeps low-income students on track to graduate”
1. **Top Students:**
   - % of freshmen meeting top 5% on SAT/ACT

2. **Faculty Awards:**
   - Honors & membership in prestigious organizations

3. **Research Productivity:**
   - Total sponsored awards
   - Awards/FTE
   - Sponsored awards/general funds in academic departments

1. **Scholarly production:**
   - Publications, presentations, creative works

1. **Entrepreneurial activity:**
   - Patents & licenses awarded among faculty
• Since 2009, Purdue faculty have published roughly 17,600 papers and been cited 138,500 times

• Provost is exploring partnership with Academic Analytics to generate better comparisons with peers
RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

July to Jan. sponsored awards: Award $ per faculty for entire fiscal year

All figures are without ARRA. Faculty include tenure track instructors, clinical & research faculty.
AWARDS BY COLLEGE YTD vs FY14 YTD

- **Eng**: 103
- **Ag**: 87
- **Science**: 35
- **HHS**: 38
- **Non-Teaching**: 29
- **Tech**: 21
- **Pharmacy**: 16
- **Vet Med**: 18
- **Ed**: $21
- **Lib Arts**: $17
- **Mgmt**: $9

- **July-Jan FY14**
- **July-Jan FY15**
ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY

Licenses & Options

FY13 FY14 FY15

37 52 53

Record!

Entire Year
July-Dec
ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY

Patents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>July-Dec</th>
<th>Entire Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record!
ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY

Startups based in University IP

FY14

Record!

FY15

Year Total

July-Dec IP not Official

July-Dec IP Official

13

16

24

16
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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  
Patricia Hart, Chairperson of the Senate phart@purdue.edu

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

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
Hal P. Kirkwood, Chairperson kirkwood@purdue.edu

1. UCC Embedded Outcomes Revision
2. Transfer Credits
3. 'In Residence' & Academic Regulations
4. Educational Policy Holistic Review

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

1. Meeting with key personnel to discuss Purdue’s equity and diversity main web page presence
2. Preparing a list of recommendations to improve equity and diversity web presence across campus
3. Reviewing university-wide data on recruitment and retention of faculty and students
4. Seeking additional senate members

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

1. On-line Course Evaluation
2. Limited Term and Continuous Lectures Policy

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Sandra Rossie, Chairperson rossie@purdue.edu

1. Communication gaps between international and domestic students.
2. Organize discussion with Athletic Affairs Committee.

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE  
Michael Fosmire, Chairperson fosmire@purdue.edu

1. Long-term energy plan for University
2. Space management and utilization
3. Concur
4. Graduate Student Health Coverage
5. Faculty retention

Chair of the Senate, Patty Hart, phart@purdue.edu  
Vice Chair of the Senate, Kirk Alter, alterk@purdue.edu  
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu  
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-1 Reapportionment of the Senate</td>
<td>Steering Committee Professor David A. Sanders</td>
<td>*Approved 17 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-2 Evening Examinations Conflicts</td>
<td>EPC Committee Professor Hal Kirkwood</td>
<td>*Approved 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-3</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-3 Proposed CSDR Regulation Changes</td>
<td>EPC Committee Professor Hal Kirkwood</td>
<td>*Approved 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-4</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-4 Amendment to the Senate Bylaws Concerning Term Limits</td>
<td>PGSG President Christopher Kulesza</td>
<td>Removed 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-5</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-5 Beaudoin Senate Resolution</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor Levon Esters</td>
<td>*Approved 26 January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-6</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-6 Classroom Improvement Resolution</td>
<td>URPC Committee Professor Michael Fosmire</td>
<td>For Discussion 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-7</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-7 Nominees for Senate Vice Chair</td>
<td>Nominating Committee Professor Michael Hill</td>
<td>For Discussion 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-8</td>
<td>Senate Document 14-8 Electronic Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Steering Committee Professor David Sanders</td>
<td>For Discussion 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Document 14-9 Endorsement of Promotion and Tenure Policy</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee Professor Levon Esters</td>
<td>For Discussion 16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>