

**From:** [Landry, Steven J](#)  
**To:** [Nichols, Deborah L](#); [Prokopy, Linda S](#); [Camp, Joseph W.](#)  
**Cc:** [University Senate Chair](#); [Sanders, David A](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 18-02  
**Date:** Monday, October 21, 2019 10:47:49 AM

---

You are describing the process. I don't disagree with the process. I disagree with the action - the Senate endorsing the document.

My opinion is just one opinion, and I am OK being outvoted by a knowledgeable and engaged Senate, who have gotten appropriate feedback from their constituents. That has not happened, and I will continue to oppose this until (a) I am outvoted under the conditions indicated, or (b) changes are made such that I no longer oppose its endorsement.

Here are my concerns:

1. Not all of my original concerns were addressed.
2. I still think it is disingenuous of faculty and the Graduate School to endorse a document that will have no effect other than to salve the conscience of those who are the source of the graduate student concerns. For example, one "right" expressed is the right to fair pay, yet the Graduate School, who "endorsed" this, has no intention of raising minimum graduate student pay even though they can do that on their own. We should be advising these students to pass this as some sort of statement of grievances, then working with faculty committees to address them at the School, College, and University level through appropriate, enforceable means. Endorsing this document is counterproductive – it will hurt graduate students.
3. This document originally should have been sent around through Senators to the units so that Senators could solicit feedback from individual faculty. Senators are supposed to speak for us, but not in cases where no one knows anything about what is being discussed. That error should be remedied before attempting to endorse this again. The response that "it was on the agenda and Senators should have done something on their own" does not mean that faculty then have no standing to object to it.

If this passes today, I **\*will again obtain 75 signatures to get it recalled.\*** I am sure I can do it, because there are few faculty who know anything about this, and I am certain they will object to its endorsement. Even the chair of the FAC didn't know this was coming! People really need to stop trying to sneak things through the Senate; regardless of whether sneaking was the intent or not, that is the effect.

Steve

---

**From:** Nichols, Deborah L <[deborahnichols@purdue.edu](mailto:deborahnichols@purdue.edu)>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 21, 2019 10:30 AM  
**To:** Landry, Steven J <[slandry@purdue.edu](mailto:slandry@purdue.edu)>; Prokopy, Linda S <[lprokopy@purdue.edu](mailto:lprokopy@purdue.edu)>; Camp, Joseph W. <[jcamp@purdue.edu](mailto:jcamp@purdue.edu)>

**Cc:** University Senate Chair <[senate-chair@purdue.edu](mailto:senate-chair@purdue.edu)>; Sanders, David A

<[retrovir@purdue.edu](mailto:retrovir@purdue.edu)>

**Subject:** Re: 18-02

Hello Steve.

18-02 appears for action on the agenda because it is a reconsideration of the original resolution based on comments shared by you with Chris Clifton and SAC last spring. After receiving your objections and signatures and in accordance with the bylaws, Jerry Shively returned the resolution to the SAC and Chris for reconsideration. No further action was taken by the SAC prior to the end of the academic year and no indication was made whether SAC had reconsidered 18-02 based on the petition. As current Steering Chair, I reached out to David Sanders and the SAC because your original petition and the reconsideration requires that they review it and make a decision about the action to be taken. There were several possible actions:

1. SAC could reconsider 18-02 and decide that, as the committee with the authority on this matter who first put it forward for consideration and action, no further action is warranted.
2. SAC could resubmit the original resolution that was approved during the November 2018 meeting and the senate would vote on that. If the Senate reaffirms its original action on this resolution in an unamended form, then the issue would be submitted, along with the appropriate documents summarizing opposing views, to a mail ballot by all University faculty (clinical-track and tenure-track).
3. SAC could submit an amended version of the 18-02 taking into consideration your concerns and put that forward to the senate for a vote.

Chris shared the SAC changes from the spring with David and changes were made and those were put those forward for action.

Let me know if you have additional questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Deb

Deborah Nichols, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Human Development & Family Studies  
1202 W. State Street  
Hanley Hall, Room 223  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
765.496.0137 (office)  
765.602.6388 (cell)

---

**From:** Landry, Steven J <[slandry@purdue.edu](mailto:slandry@purdue.edu)>

**Sent:** Friday, October 18, 2019 8:55 AM

**To:** Prokopy, Linda S <[lprokopy@purdue.edu](mailto:lprokopy@purdue.edu)>

**Cc:** University Senate Chair <[senate-chair@purdue.edu](mailto:senate-chair@purdue.edu)>; Nichols, Deborah L <[deborahnichols@purdue.edu](mailto:deborahnichols@purdue.edu)>; Sanders, David A <[retrovir@purdue.edu](mailto:retrovir@purdue.edu)>

**Subject:** 18-02

Linda,

I notice 18-02 is on the agenda.

I again oppose endorsement of this document, and am requesting that the faculty affairs committee oppose this action. Again, my opposition is not due to the contents of the document; I actually agree with pretty much everything in it. I agree that graduate students have not been well protected against malicious faculty and the administration; I actually think it is even worse than graduate students realize.

However, endorsing this non-binding document will ensure that graduate student rights/desires are actually ignored. The administration, Graduate School, and faculty can say that they did something for graduate students, when in fact they did not, as this document will be roundly ignored as graduate student whining written out in a document that has no effect on anyone.

PGSG should utilize the existing process to amend the **\*binding\*** student bill of rights. I know that is slow and difficult, and they are likely not going to get everything in there that they want, but that is not a reason not to do this properly and effectively. Such an amendment would ensure that all parties are properly informed and empowered to weigh in on the individual elements of the document.

There **\*is\*** an existing process to address graduate student concerns. It is **\*improper\*** for PGSG to try to circumvent this process, and **\*disingenuous\*** of the Senate (and other parties) to endorse this as if that adds any level of enforceability to the document.

I imagine you probably support this, but I hope you understand that I actually think this will be a symbolic and counterproductive action. It will not help graduate students at all, but it will enable the Graduate School and the administration (and faculty) to say they did something for graduate students when in fact they did nothing. For other faculty, it will just come off as whiny graduate students, and they may actually treat them worse than before.

Lastly, most of the elements of the petition have **\*not\*** been addressed. Faculty members signed a petition that Senate endorsement was against their will, effectively, and now the same process is being followed to try to ram this through the Senate. If this passes, I will be forced to **\*again\*** attempt to get it rescinded. I don't want to have to go through that again.

I'm also sending this to my Senate representative, and hopefully if you do not raise this concern he will.

Steve