

From: [Cooky, Cheryl A](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 11:41:46 AM

FYI...

From: "Thomas, Richard K"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 10:44 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A"
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Rick

—

Richard Thomas
Professor of Design, Art and Performance
zounds@purdue.edu
Zoundsproductions.com
Music as a Chariot now available at <http://www.routledge.com/9781138295773>

On Jan 16, 2019, at 9:22 AM, Cooky, Cheryl A <ccooky@purdue.edu> wrote:
Dear CLA colleagues,
Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,
Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.
University Senate, Vice Chair
Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu>
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A" <ccooky@purdue.edu>
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution. I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Resol....pdf>

From: [Cooky, Cheryl A](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 12:29:58 PM

From: "Brower, Jeffrey E"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 12:01 PM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A"
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Jeff Brower
Professor, Philosophy Department
brower@purdue.edu

From: "Cooky, Cheryl A"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:22 AM
To: CLA-All Faculty
Cc: "Landry, Steven J"
Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Dear CLA colleagues,
Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,
Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.
University Senate, Vice Chair
Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A"
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

***If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate**

Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.*

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Jonathon Peterson](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Fwd: [Math-faculty] Note from Faculty Colleague
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:13:24 PM
Attachments: [20181119 Senate Doc 18-02 PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Resol....pdf](#)
[Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities \(PGSS Ratified 3.28....pdf](#)
[ATT00001.txt](#)
[Attached Message Part](#)

Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

In addition to some of the concerns you mention, I found Article 1 #5 to be a bad idea. Students certainly should be free to pursue education that furthers their career goal. If a student wants to write a thesis in Topic A, but no faculty members are experts in that topic, should one of the faculty be forced to advise them in this topic? Maybe I'm misunderstanding this statement in the Graduate Student Bill of Rights, but that is what came to my mind when I read it.

Thanks,

Jonathon Peterson, Associate Professor, Dept of Mathematics

peterson@purdue.edu

496-3578

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:[Math-faculty] Note from Faculty Colleague

Date:Wed, 16 Jan 2019 20:01:34 +0000

From:Stroud, Kristi L

To:math-faculty@purdue.edu

Please see the forwarded email below, Note that if anyone is interested in responding, please be aware of the quick turn around time requested.

--

Kristi Stroud
Administrative Assistant to the Head
Department of Mathematics
College of Science
Purdue University
(765)494-1908
Kstroud@purdue.edu

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the

Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty “signatures” (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry
Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering
Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory
Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)
Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering
Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.
West Lafayette, IN 47907
765-494-6256

From: [Kelly, Daniel R](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Fwd: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:44:15 AM

Hi Steven,

I am in favor of reconsideration. Let me know if you need anything else, or if this email suffices for one of the 75 required signatures.

Dan

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Powell, Manushag" <mnppowell@purdue.edu>
Date: January 16, 2019 at 7:17:50 AM PST
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A" <ccooky@purdue.edu>, CLA-All Faculty <cla-allfaculty@purdue.edu>
Cc: "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu>
Subject: **Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02**

For background, this Bill of Rights was also presented to the Graduate Council last year. The Council declined to endorse it because of potential liability issues: that is, what if a student feels their rights as laid out here have been violated? The Council asked that PGSG solicit the opinion of university legal council before proceeding; to the best of my knowledge that issue was not resolved.

Nush

Manushag N. Powell
Director of Graduate Studies
Associate Professor of English
University Faculty Scholar
Purdue University
mnppowell@purdue.edu

[*British Pirates in Print and Performance*](#)
[*Performing Authorship in Eighteenth-Century English Periodicals*](#)

From: Cooky, Cheryl A
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:22 AM
To: CLA-All Faculty
Cc: Landry, Steven J

Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Dear CLA colleagues,

Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,
Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.

University Senate, Vice Chair

Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu>
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A" <ccooky@purdue.edu>
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Sellke, Thomas M](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: I agree with Landry petition
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 3:57:38 PM

“I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02”

Thomas Sellke
Professor
Dept of Statistics
tsellke@purdue.edu
4-6034

P.S. Thanks for doing this. The document you describe sounds totally crazy!

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate’s, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty “signatures” (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is**

binding on the University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Buster Dunsmore](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:39:02 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

=====
Dr. H. E. Dunsmore | Associate Professor
Department of Computer Science | dunsmore@purdue.edu
Purdue University | <http://www.cs.purdue.edu/people/bxd>
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2107 |
=====

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate *ill-considered and irresponsible*. I therefore am generating this petition to *request reconsideration of the document*.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by *tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January* to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers *all* students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights - it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- *There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a *very bad idea*, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague - who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently "regular and constructive?" Who decides whether students have been given "a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?" Who decides whether students have been given "fair treatment and attribution?"

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is

reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry
Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering
Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory
Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)
Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering
Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.
West Lafayette, IN 47907
765-494-6256

From: [Nof, Shimon Y.](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 6:23:55 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

=====

[Shimon Y. Nof, Ph.D., D.H.C.](#)

[Director - PRISM Center; Professor, School of IE, Purdue University](#)

315 N. Grant St., W. Lafayette, IN 47907-2023 USA

Tel: 1-765-494-5427 nof@purdue.edu

[Revolutionizing Collaboration through e-Work, e-Business, and e-Service, Springer \(2015\)](#)

[Best Matching Theory & Applications, ACES Series, Springer 2017](#)

From: [Gu, Chong](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:05:17 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Chong Gu
Professor of Statistics
Department of Statistics
College of Science
chong@purdue.edu
765-494-4049

From: [Anderson, Myrdene](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: petition to reconsider ...
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:43:27 AM

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Myrdene Anderson
Anthropology
Stone hall

From: [Bergmann, Michael](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 7:24:19 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Michael Bergmann

Professor of Philosophy

bergmann@purdue.edu

From: [Powell, Manushag](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: PGSG Bill of Rights
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:21:46 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Manushag N. Powell
Associate Professor of English
Purdue University
mpowell@purdue.edu

From: [Beckerman, Janna L](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [Botany-Faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:01:57 AM

Hi Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02 and that proper channels and processes be used to develop such a document, with input and representation from all colleges at Purdue.

Regards,

Janna Beckerman
Professor
Dept. Botany and Plant Pathology
765.427.9980

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 8:29 AM -0600, "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it

even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Sara McComb](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 6:48:09 PM

Hi Steve,
I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Sara McComb
Professor
Schools of Nursing and Industrial Engineering
smccomb@purdue.edu

From: [Hunter, Susan R](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:18:02 PM

Hi Steve,
I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.
Thank you,
-Susan
--

Susan R. Hunter, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Industrial Engineering
Purdue University

From: IE-faculty on behalf of "Landry, Steven J"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 5:04 PM
To: "ie-faculty@purdue.edu"
Subject: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow.

I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered.

See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,
Steve

From: Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM
To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Andrew L. Liu](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:17:54 PM

Hi Steve,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Thanks,

Andrew

--

Andrew L. Liu, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Industrial Engineering
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
Telephone: (765) 494-4763 (O)
Email: andrewliu@purdue.edu
<http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~liu334/>

Landry, Steven J

January 16, 2019 at 5:04 PM

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow. I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered. See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,

Steve

From: Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate

must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be

encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

IE-faculty mailing list

IE-faculty@ecn.purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/ECN/mailman/listinfo/ie-faculty>

From: [Wachs, Juan P](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:11:57 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Juan P. Wachs, Ph.D.
Associate Professor,
James A. and Sharon M. Tompkins Rising Star Professorship
Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering
Adjunct Professor of Surgery, IU School of Medicine
School of Industrial Engineering
Purdue University
315 N. Grant Street
West Lafayette, IN 47907
765 496-7380 (tel)
765 494-1299 (fax)
<http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~jpwachs/>
<https://engineering.purdue.edu/isat/>

From: IE-faculty on behalf of Steven J Landry
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 5:04 PM
To: "ie-faculty@purdue.edu"
Subject: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

From: [Gesualdo Scutari](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:09:06 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Gesualdo Scutari

On Jan 16, 2019, at 5:04 PM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow.

I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered.

See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,

Steve

From: Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu' <agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu>

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes

the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

IE-faculty mailing list

IE-faculty@ecn.purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/ECN/mailman/listinfo/ie-faculty>

From: [Honnappa, Harsha](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:05:26 PM

Steve,

You have my support on this matter. Please consider my signature as added to the list.

Harsha
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 16, 2019, at 5:04 PM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow.

I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered.

See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,
Steve

From: Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu' <agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu>

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know

what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907
765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

IE-faculty mailing list

IE-faculty@ecn.purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/ECN/mailman/listinfo/ie-faculty>

From: [Mario Ventresca](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:05:05 PM

Hi Steve. **I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02**

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 5:04 PM Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow.

I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered.

See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,

Steve

From: Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM
To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu' <agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu>
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe

that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

IE-faculty mailing list

IE-faculty@ecn.purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/ECN/mailman/listinfo/ie-faculty>

From: [Lee, Seokcheon](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 6:51:22 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Seokcheon

On Jan 16, 2019, at 5:04 PM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow.

I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered.

See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,
Steve

From: Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu' <agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu>

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-

sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

IE-faculty mailing list

IE-faculty@ecn.purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/ECN/mailman/listinfo/ie-faculty>

From: [ANIRBAN DASGUPTA](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: FW: Note from Faculty Colleague
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:56:30 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate document 18-02.

Thank you.

Anirban DasGupta

Professor of Statistics

dasgupta@purdue.edu

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 3:24 PM Wallenfang, Jesse <jwallenf@purdue.edu> wrote:

Hello everyone,

Please see the note from Professor Landry below and the attached documents that he references. If you would like to join his petition, please note the short turnaround time – he will need to receive your response today in order to include it in his petition.

Thank you,

Jesse Wallenfang

Administrative Assistant to the Head

Purdue University

College of Science

Department of Statistics

HAAS Building Rm 132

West Lafayette, IN 47907-2066

P: 765-494-3141

F: 765-494-0558

From: scienceheadsassistants-bounces@lists.purdue.edu [mailto:scienceheadsassistants-bounces@lists.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Teel, Angela J.

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 2:54 PM

To: 'Science Heads Assistants' (scienceheadsassistants@purdue.edu)

Subject: Note from Faculty Colleague

Please distribute to your faculty as you feel is appropriate. Please note the quick turnaround being requested if you do decide to send.

Thanks!

Angie

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain

things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

--

Anirban DasGupta
West Lafayette, IN

From: [Robert Channon](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:12:32 PM

While reserving judgement on the underlying matter, I support the petition for reconsideration of Senate Document 18-02. A matter of this import should certainly have received wider distribution and more extensive discussion within the University. Judging by the description of the process, that did not happen, and the considerations raised in the petition should be further aired. If they are not significant, the resolution will succeed again in the reconsideration, and if they are significant, reconsideration and/or revision is appropriate. Wider consideration of the issues and implications is a beneficial thing.

Robert Channon
Associate Professor of Linguistics and Russian
School of Languages and Cultures
channon@purdue.edu
(765) 496-1683

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 9:22 AM Cooky, Cheryl A <ccooky@purdue.edu> wrote:

Dear CLA colleagues,

Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,
Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.

University Senate, Vice Chair

Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu>
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A" <ccooky@purdue.edu>
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently "regular and constructive?" Who decides whether students have been given "a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?" Who decides whether students have been given "fair treatment and attribution?"

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Lempert, Laszlo](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Note from Faculty Colleague
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:10:17 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Laszlo Lempert
Distinguished Professor of Mathematics
lempert@purdue.edu

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things.

(See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Boudouris, Bryan W](#)
To: [Elias I. Franses](#); [Landry, Steven J](#)
Cc: [Linda Wang](#); [Corti, David S](#); [Kim, Sangtae](#); jsirola@purdue.edu; [Jim Caruthers](#); [Doraiswami Ramkrishna](#); [Varma, Arvind](#); [Morgan, John A](#); [chongli yuan](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:30:27 PM

Dear Professor Landry,

While I agree with the general sentiment of the document (i.e., graduate students should be treated fairly and with compassion by the university so we can help them achieve their personal, educational, and professional goals), I do agree with you that the language needs modification in order to prevent disputes from regularly occurring and occupying a significant amount of faculty and staff time. For instance, it is not clear to me that the issues regarding leave have been screened by the university-level human resources team. Moreover, this was clearly written with thesis-orientated graduate students in mind; however, this neglects the growing enrollment of graduate students in non-thesis MS programs. For example, I am technically the advisor for all of the Professional MS students in the Davidson School of Chemical Engineering. If all of these students wished to change their major professor for some reason (as outlined in the document), it could create significant issues. Thus, I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Bryan W. Boudouris
Robert and Sally Weist Associate Professor
Director of the Professional MS Program
Davidson School of Chemical Engineering
Purdue University
1051 Forney Hall of Chemical Engineering
480 Stadium Mall Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907
Office: (765) 496-6056

From: Elias I. Franses [<mailto:franses@ecn.purdue.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:33 AM
To: Landry, Steven J
Cc: Linda Wang ; Corti, David S ; Boudouris, Bryan W ; Kim, Sangtae ; jsirola@purdue.edu; Vivek Narsimhan ; Jim Caruthers ; Doraiswami Ramkrishna ; Varma, Arvind ; Morgan, John A ; chongli yuan
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

“I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.*

I fully agree with your concerns. The demands in this document are outrageous and impossible to enforce. It may lead to a continuous strife and bureaucratic morass.

In fact I support that the document be withdrawn from any consideration, and that it not be binding to the university.

It may destroy the graduate program.

The students should not have the "right" to change academic advisor. It can be allowed ,of course, but not mandated.

That should depend on the graduate committee and the availability of funds.

Elias Franses

Professor of Chemical Engineering

--

Elias I Franses
Davidson School of Chemical Engineering
Purdue University
1029C Forney Hall of Chemical Engineering
480 Stadium Mall Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2100
Office: (765) 494-4078

From: [decarlo](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:26:12 PM

Professor Landry,

I quite agree with you.

I believe the request needs to be reconsidered and the implications carefully evaluated. My suggestion is that a complete rewrite would be a minimum outcome.

Some Points I thought of:

1. In regards to graduate degrees that are completely course based, the structure of expectations is very well delineated. There is a student bill of rights in existence for courses.

2. In regards to TAs assigned to help with courses (vs teaching a course), I think the responsibilities vary from school to school (dept to dept) and course to course as well as from professor to professor (in regards to expectations). The key limit however is an average of 20 hours per week for half time. When the number regularly exceeds 20 hours per week, abuses become present. My experience is that the average is often less, and in many cases much less.

Human resources needs to weigh in on policy when for example a TA has a baby or a married male TA becomes a father.

3. The real problem takes place in regards to RAs and novel research that are pre-requisites for some masters degrees and I believe ALL PhD degrees. One aspect that I believe is critical, and can become an expectation, is regularly (weekly) scheduled individualized meetings (something akin to a piano lesson) as well as group meetings among a professors' grad students.

(a) I told my son not to go to Stanford despite a rather substantial offer. He declined the offer. They called. He of course blamed me because I told him that he would have trouble meeting regularly with his advisor, maybe once a month, due to all the "business" activities that the professors have. He went to Colorado Boulder. He is an associate prof at Drexel in Philadelphia now.

(b) (True story with a theatrical exposition.) A long time ago in a not so far off galaxy, there was a professor with an outstanding PHD student whose committee I was asked to be on. After suggesting a reconsideration since I would actually read and comment on the thesis, he said Yoda Man. Well, Luke (fictitious) was very good, and gave Yoda Man the thesis to read about two months before the scheduled defense. After a week of reading Yoda Man called Luke and suggested we meet. During a four hour meeting at a local coffee shop Yoda Man and Luke rewrote Chapter 1 (75 pages to 40 with many force-ful clarifications. Looked like a light sabre went through Chapter 1) After 3 more 4 hour meetings the first 3 chapters were redone, Luke now understood, and Yoda Man also understood. Luke wanted Yoda Man to do the remaining chapters but that was a "Vadar" he had to confront on his own. Some six months later a big conference was approaching and Luke was taken ill or his wife was having their first child. So the advisor (who had 17 grad students by the way) called Yoda Man and asked him if he could help him understand what Luke had done. Yoda man declined.

4. There are problems. How to legislate to prevent such problems in an environment, where “quantity” is the primary metric, is way beyond my CPU power.

Good luck.

Ray DeCarlo
Professor ECE
Former Chair, Purdue University Senate

PS. My youngest daughter is also a professor at Loyola in Chicago, and a mother of two, who believes it is critical to meet regularly with her grad students.

> On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

>

> Colleagues,

>

> At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate’s, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

>

> I find the action by the Senate *ill-considered and irresponsible*. I therefore am generating this petition to *request reconsideration of the document*.

>

> If 75 faculty “signatures” (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by *tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January* to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

>

> *If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.*

>

> Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

>

> More specifically:

>

> . The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers *all* students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

>

> . *There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a *very bad idea*, even if the university should do these things.

>

> . This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

>

> . There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example

Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

>

> There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

>

> I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

>

>

> Thank you and regards,

>

> Steven J. Landry

> Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

> Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

> Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

> Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

> Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

> West Lafayette, IN 47907

> 765-494-6256

>

> <20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Resol....pdf><Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities (PGSS Ratified 3.28....pdf>

From: [Marinero, Ernesto E](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 2:58:16 PM
Attachments: [20181119 Senate Doc 18-02 PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Resol....pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)
[Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities \(PGSS Ratified 3.28....pdf](#)
[ATT00002.htm](#)

Hi Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Professor Ernesto E. Marinero
Schools of Materials and
Electrical and Computer Engineering,
Purdue University.
tel.: 765 494 4068
email: emarinero@purdue.edu

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a

separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Kim, Young L](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:08:06 PM

Dear Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Young Kim, Associate Professor, youngkim@purdue.edu

From: Engfaculty-list [mailto:engfaculty-list-bounces@ecn.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were

not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [srinivasan chandrasekar](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 2:22:29 PM

Dear Steve

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

srinivasan chandrasekar
Professor of IE
chandy@purdue.edu, 494 3623

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the**

University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Kenley, Charles Robert](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 2:32:14 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

--

C. Robert Kenley, PhD, ESEP, INCOSE Fellow
Associate Professor of Engineering Practice
School of Industrial Engineering
Purdue University
Room 370, 315 N Grant St, West Lafayette, IN, 47907-2023
Phone: +1 765 494 5160 • Mobile Phone: +1 765 430 3774
E-mail: kenley@purdue.edu
Web: <http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~ckenley/>

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is**

binding on the University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Tan, Hong Z](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:45:42 PM

Thank you for your efforts, Steve.

I support the petition for reconsideration of this senate document.

Best,

Hong

Prof. Hong Z Tan | School of Electrical & Computer Engineering | Purdue University
IEEE Fellow (2017)
[Homepage](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Engfaculty-list on behalf of "Landry, Steven J"

Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 8:52 AM

To: "'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'"

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad**

idea*, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Abraham, Dulcy M](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:48:19 PM

Steve, very pertinent points. I agree with the sentiment raised in the Graduate Bill of Rights document. However, I believe that having careful consideration of the provisions, and careful vetting by faculty and staff who will be involved in ensuring that the responsibilities are handled well, are paramount to ensuring the success, viability and acceptance of such a Bill. Suggestion: the Grad Committees in each college could review the Bill, and provide input to the Grad Council, before the Bill is brought back to the Senate for its review.

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

- Dulcy M. Abraham, Professor and Graduate Chair, Burke Graduate Program
Lyles School of Civil Engineering
Email: dulcy@purdue.edu; 765-494-2239
Best wishes,
- Dulcy.

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of

rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Abhi Deshmukh](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:11:50 PM

Steve,
I support the petition to reconsider Senate document 18-02.
Abhi

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do

these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Grant, Richard H](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:03:16 PM

I agree that this should be reconsidered. Particularly articles 2.4, 3.4, and 5.1

Richard H Grant

Professor of Applied Meteorology and Graduate Program Chair

Department of Agronomy, Purdue University

915 W. State St, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2054

Research Office: 215 LSPS; tel 765-494-8048

Graduate Office: 3424C LILY; tel 765-494-4026

From: agronomy-faculty-group-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Bennett, Gary W](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Cc: [Bennett, Gary W](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:02:58 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Gary W. Bennett, Professor
Dept. of Entomology
Smith Hall
765-494-4564

From: on behalf of "Landry, Steven J"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:29 AM
To: "'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu"
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with

Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Fritch, John W.](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 12:10:11 PM
Attachments: [20181119 Senate Doc 18-02 PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Resol....pdf](#)
[Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities \(PGSS Ratified 3.28....pdf](#)

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

John Fritch

Associate Professor, Libraries

49-46735, jfritch@purdue.edu

From: Cooky, Cheryl A
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:22 AM
To: CLA-All Faculty
Cc: Landry, Steven J
Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Dear CLA colleagues,

Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,

Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.

University Senate, Vice Chair

Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu>
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A" <ccooky@purdue.edu>
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [T.N.Vijaykumar](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:02:30 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

T. N. Vijaykumar
Professor, ECE
vijay@purdue.edu

On 1/16/19 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff

(see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

• This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

• There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Venkatesh Merwade](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 12:03:05 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Venkatesh Merwade, Professor
Lyles School of Civil Engineering
Purdue University
765-4942176
vmerwade@purdue.edu

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on

faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Liu, Chunghorng Richard](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 12:40:14 PM

Steve:

I agree with you and support your petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

Richard Liu

From: Engfaculty-list on behalf of Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:51 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very**

bad idea*, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Lemenager, Ronald P.](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 11:39:04 AM

I support re-consideration of this document.

Ron

Ronald P. Lemenager, PhD, PAS

Charter Diplomat; American College of Animal Nutrition

Professor and Beef Extension Specialist; Nutrition and Management

Department of Animal Science; Purdue University

W. Lafayette, IN 47907

Email: rpl@purdue.edu

Cell: 765-427-5972

From: anscfacpap-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: [Ansfacpap] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff

(see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Jim Braun](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 12:28:49 PM

Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Jim Braun, Herrick Professor of Engineering, jbraun@purdue.edu

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose

responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Abdel-Khalik, Hany S](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 11:02:47 AM

Steven:

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

**Hany Abdel-Khalik, Associate Professor, School of Nuclear Engineering. abdelkhalik@purdue.edu
765.496.9718**

Abdel-Khalik, Hany S.,

Associate Professor, School of Nuclear Engineering, Purdue University

400 Central Drive, NUCL Bldg., 132D, West Lafayette, IN 47906

Ph: (765)496-9718, Email: abdelkhalik@purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/NE/people>

Associate Editor, Annals of Nuclear Energy

<https://www.journals.elsevier.com/annals-of-nuclear-energy/>

From: Engfaculty-list [mailto:engfaculty-list-bounces@ecn.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it

even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Robert B. Jacko](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:58:07 AM
Attachments: [jacko.vcf](#)

“I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02”

Professor Robert Jacko

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

> * “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” *

--

Robert B. Jacko, Ph.D., P.E.
Professor of Civil Engineering
Environmental Engineering Area
Faculty Affiliate, Ecological and Environmental Engineering
Lyles School of Civil Engineering
Hampton Building (HAMP)
Purdue University
550 Stadium Mall Drive
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907
765-494-2199

From: [Liceaga, Andrea M](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:59:17 AM

To whom it may concern,

I have read the "Graduate Student Bill of Frights & Responsibilities" document and support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Sincerely,

Andrea Liceaga, Ph.D.
Associate Professor,
Protein Chemistry & Bioactive Peptides Lab
Food Science Dept.
Purdue University
Tel. (765) 496-2460

From: fsfaculty-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are

set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [San Martin-Gonzalez, Fernanda](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:58:02 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

M. Fernanda San Martin-González, Ph D

Associate Professor Food Science
Purdue University
Philip E. Nelson Hall of Food Science
745 Agricultural Mall Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2009
(765) 496-1140
fsanmartin@purdue.edu

From: fsfaculty-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are

set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Sam Midkiff](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:55:24 AM

Consider this my signature. Thanks for doing this.

Sam Midkiff
Professor, School of Electrical and Computer Engineering

On 1/16/19 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in

mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Sandhage, Kenneth H](#)
To: [Trice, Rodney W](#)
Cc: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:55:54 AM

-Rod-

Good point.

While the intentions may be good for a proposed Graduate Student Bill of Rights, the devil will be in the details. This needs more thoughtful discussion.

Cheers,

Ken H. Sandhage

Reilly Professor of Materials Engineering

School of Materials Engineering

Purdue University

West Lafayette, IN 47907

Office Phone: (765) 446-1101

Fax: (765) 446-1102

From: Rod Trice [mailto:rtrice@purdue.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:53 AM
To: Landry, Steven J
Cc: Sandhage, Kenneth H
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02. There is much language in this document that is worrisome; much of the bill of rights of staff and students is subject to interpretation and difficult to measure. For example, "Graduate students have a right and should be encouraged to pursue academic and professional training that is relevant to their personal career path and that will make them competitive for their career goals after the completion of their program." How does one evaluate this?

Prof. Rodney Trice, Professor, rtrice@purdue.edu and 765 494 6405

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.*

From: [Rod Trice](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Cc: [Sandhage, Kenneth H](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:53:02 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02. There is much language in this document that is worrisome; much of the bill of rights of staff and students is subject to interpretation and difficult to measure. For example, "Graduate students have a right and should be encouraged to pursue academic and professional training that is relevant to their personal career path and that will make them competitive for their career goals after the completion of their program." How does one evaluate this?

Prof. Rodney Trice, Professor, rtrice@purdue.edu and 765 494 6405

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.*

From: [Kim, Sangtae](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:47:26 AM
Importance: High

Steven,

As a faculty member, **I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02** and have appended my full, formal title and contact information to this email.

--- Sang

Sangtae "Sang" Kim, PhD

Distinguished Professor

Jay and Cynthia Ihlenfeld Head

Charles D. Davidson School of Chemical Engineering

Purdue University

Tel: 765-494-4075; Fax: 765-494-0805; Email: kim55@purdue.edu

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of

rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Sinha](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:32:34 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Kumares Sinha
Olson Distinguished Professor
School of Civil Engineering

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff

(see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

• This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

• There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Mintert, James R](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:31:35 AM

Steve,

Thanks for your email.

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

James Mintert, Ph.D.

Professor of Agricultural Economics &

Director, Center for Commercial Agriculture

403 W. State Street

Purdue University

West Lafayette, IN 47907

jmintert@purdue.edu

www.purdue.edu/commercialag

www.purdue.edu/agbarometer

From: [Arrieta Diaz, Andres](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:46:52 AM

Dear Prof. LAdry

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Contact Infor: Andres F. Arrieta, Assistant Professor, 585 Purdue Mall Office 3061H.

Best regards

Andres

Andres F. Arrieta, PhD

Assistant Professor
School of Mechanical Engineering and Ray W. Herrick Laboratories
Purdue University
585 Purdue Mall, West Lafayette, IN, USA
Engineering.purdue.edu/ProgrammableStructures
Email: aarrieta@purdue.edu
Phone: +1-765 494 5972

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly

identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Julio Ramirez](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:30:35 AM

I support the decision to reconsider Senate document 18-02.

Julio Ramirez
Kettelhut Professor in Civil Engineering
Lyles School of Civil Engineering

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the**

University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Patton, Aaron J](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:16:14 AM

Like you, I support the rights of our students but it seems as these protections already exist in part in the Purdue University Bill of Student Rights (West Lafayette Campus). Further, proper procedures were not followed to amend the current student bill of rights. I also agree that more widespread faculty input as well as guidance from the graduate school is needed prior to any new policy proposal.

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Aaron Patton

Professor

ajpatton@purdue.edu

--

Aaron J. Patton, Ph.D.

Professor of Horticulture

Assistant Department Head

Turfgrass Extension Specialist

[Purdue University](#)

Department of Horticulture & Landscape Architecture

Horticulture Building, 625 Agriculture Mall Drive

West Lafayette, IN 47907-2010

(765) 494-9737 Fax: (765) 496-6335

turf.purdue.edu [@PurdueTurfDoc](#)

purdueturf tips.blogspot.com

<https://www.amazon.com/author/aaronpatton>

Executive Director, Midwest Regional Turf Foundation

www.mrtf.org [@TurfFoundation](#)

[Purdue Turf Doctor App, Available on iOS and Android](#)

[2018 Turf Weed Control for Professionals, Now Available](#)

From: hlafacul-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: [Hlafacul] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Cover, Jan A](#)
To: [Cooky, Cheryl A](#)
Cc: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:24:33 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

J. A. Cover
Philosophy
BRNG 7142
49-44288
jacover@purdue.edu

On Jan 16, 2019, at 9:22 AM, Cooky, Cheryl A <ccooky@purdue.edu> wrote:

Dear CLA colleagues,
Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,
Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.
University Senate, Vice Chair
Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J" <slandry@purdue.edu>
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A" <ccooky@purdue.edu>
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Yu, Wenbin](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:11:10 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Wenbin Yu

=====

[Professor, Purdue/AAE](#)
Director, [Composites Design and Manufacturing HUB](#)
Associate Director, [Composites Virtual Factory HUB](#)
[CTO, AnalySwift LLC](#)
Follow my research at [cdmHUB](#), [YouTube](#), [Linkedin](#), [ResearchGate](#)
701 West Stadium Avenue
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2045
Tel: (765) 494-5142; Fax: (765) 494-0307

=====

From: Engfaculty-list [mailto:engfaculty-list-bounces@ecn.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights.

Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Singh, Shweta](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:00:05 AM

Steve,

I support your petition. Graduate students must follow proper procedures and if the bill was passed without faculty inputs, we cannot abide by its terms. As you mentioned, subjective and vague terms may have implications in future that Senate must look carefully into.

Thanks & Regards,
Shweta

Shweta Singh | Assistant Professor | Purdue University
Agricultural & Biological Engineering | **LILY 2112**
Environmental & Ecological Engineering

Email : singh294@purdue.edu (Primary) | singhosu@gmail.com
Phone no: 765-496-1390 (O) | 812-567-6590 (C)

From: Engfaculty-list on behalf of Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:51 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Miller, Jeffrey T](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:09:56 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Jeff Miller, Chem Eng Professor

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Slabaugh, Carson D](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:57:40 AM

Steven,

I share your concerns here, particularly those relating to the ambiguity (subjectivity) of the conditional statements and the precedent this sets in terms of the student/faculty relationship. Therefore, I support your petition for a more thorough (re)consideration of Senate Document 18-02.

Thank you for your attention to this.

—

Carson Slabaugh
Assistant Professor
School of Aeronautics and Astronautics
Purdue University
engineering.purdue.edu/SlabaughGroup/

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and

1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Macheret, Sergey O](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:02:25 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Sergey Macheret

Professor, Aeronautics and Astronautics

macheret@purdue.edu

From: Engfaculty-list [mailto:engfaculty-list-bounces@ecn.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to

prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Yung Shin](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:47:15 AM

I agree with your email.

Thanks.

Yung C. Shin, Ph.D., FSME, FASME
Donald A. & Nancy G. Roach Professor of Advanced Manufacturing
Editor-in-chief, Lasers in Manufacturing and Materials Processing
School of Mechanical Engineering
585 Purdue Mall, Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
(765)494-9775 (phone), (765)494-0539 (fax)
<http://engineering.purdue.edu/ManLab/>
<http://engineering.purdue.edu/CLM/>
<http://engineering.purdue.edu/LAMPL/>

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Buczowski, Grzegorz A](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:00:20 AM

Hi Steven,

I completely agree with your e-mail and I support your efforts on this. I hope you can get 75 signatures by tomorrow.

Regards,

Grzegorz Buczowski

From: entm.faculty-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were

not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Bay, Jennifer L](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:38:05 AM

Hi there,

I wanted to chime in and say that I agree that many of the points in the Graduate Student Bill of Rights need to be more clearly articulated and discussed with graduate faculty across the university. I'm also wondering how this bill of rights will be enforced? I am definitely in favor of reconsidering the document as it is written.

Thanks for bringing it to our attention!

Best,

Jenny Bay

Dr. Jennifer Bay

Associate Professor of English
Professional & Technical Writing Program
Purdue University
jbay@purdue.edu

From: "Cooky, Cheryl A"

Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:22 AM

To: CLA-All Faculty

Cc: "Landry, Steven J"

Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Dear CLA colleagues,

Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,

Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.
University Senate, Vice Chair
Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J"

Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM

To: "Cooky, Cheryl A"

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently "regular and constructive?" Who decides whether students have been given "a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?" Who decides whether students have been given "fair treatment and attribution?"

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Sandhage, Kenneth H](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:48:17 AM

Dear Steven,

Given the thoughtful concerns that you have raised, it seems to me that more discussion is needed regarding the proposed graduate student bill of rights.

Hence, I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Sincerely,

Ken H. Sandhage

Reilly Professor of Materials Engineering

School of Materials Engineering

Purdue University

West Lafayette, IN 47907

Office Phone: (765) 446-1101

Fax: (765) 446-1102

From: Engfaculty-list [mailto:engfaculty-list-bounces@ecn.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers

all students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Rickert, Thomas J](#)
Cc: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:36:49 AM

Dear Steve Landry,
I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Thomas Rickert

Thomas Rickert
Professor of English
Purdue University
trickert@purdue.edu

From: Cooky, Cheryl A
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:22 AM
To: CLA-All Faculty
Cc: Landry, Steven J
Subject: FW: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Dear CLA colleagues,
Per request, I am forwarding this email from Steve Landry regarding Senate Document 18-02. Please contact Dr. Landry directly should you have questions or concerns about the proposal.

Thank you,
Cheryl

--

Cheryl Cooky, Ph.D.
University Senate, Vice Chair
Purdue University

From: "Landry, Steven J"
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 9:14 AM
To: "Cooky, Cheryl A"
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with

Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by Wednesday, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907
765-494-6256

From: [Young, Bryan G](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:47:49 AM

Dear Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02. Thank you for sharing your insight on this important subject.

Kind regards,

Bryan

Bryan Young

Professor of Weed Science

Department of Botany and Plant Pathology

Purdue University

1351 Lilly Hall of Life Sciences

915 West State Street

W. Lafayette, IN 47907

Email: BryanYoung@Purdue.edu

Voice: 765.496.1646

From: botany-faculty-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: [Botany-Faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights.

Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Ramani, Karthik](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:34:53 AM

So the 18-02 is a new document to support the PGSG main document. The main PGSG one being already well set and followed. The 18-02 extends it and re-interprets it in ways that are not good for faculty and staff, as well as had little consideration. Is this correct?

This was not clear from the original email as to what the 18-02 that was passed is actually is. Or perhaps i did not understand it well.

In any case I am supportive. How are you getting all the signatures? You need to characterize what the negative aspects can be. I have been around long enough and i can see some negative implications. Others may not - so some explanation will be needed - but best to take it to the faculty meetings - some shopping around will be needed. Not sure you will get 75 quickly.

Best,

Karthik

On Jan 16, 2019, at 9:11 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

As far as I know, 18-02 was not changed after its first discussion. There were certainly no substantive changes. The document is fairly simple – it just supports the PGSG document, and it was done with very little consideration and probably few of the Senators actually read it.

Thanks!

Steve

From: Ramani, Karthik <ramani@purdue.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:09 AM

To: Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu>

Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Dear Steve,

What were areas of the 18-02 were changes from the earlier ones? If they can be in yellow - it is easier to see what was amended?

I do consider this can imbalance the faculty student relationship and negatively affect research progress that is best for the student.

I agree with your statement “Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. “

I am supportive of the reconsideration and deeper look by the senators and this be brought up in the faculty meeting to discuss in each college.

Best Regards,

Karthik

Karthik Ramani

Donald W. Feddersen Professor of Mechanical Engineering

Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering (by courtesy)

Professor of Educational Studies, College of Education (by courtesy)

C Design Labs: <https://engineering.purdue.edu/cdesign/wp/>

Toy Design: <https://engineering.purdue.edu/toydesign/wp/>

Product Design: <https://engineering.purdue.edu/productdesign/wp/>

Ziro from ZeroUI: <https://www.ziro.io>

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J

<slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***.

I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic)

of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,
Steven J. Landry
Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering
Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory
Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)
Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering
Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.
West Lafayette, IN 47907
765-494-6256
<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and
Responsibilities Resol....pdf>

From: [Mashtare, Michael L](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:32:41 AM

Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Best,

Michael L. Mashtare Jr., Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

Agronomy and Environmental and Ecological Engineering

Purdue University

Lilly Hall of Life Sciences, Room 2414

(765) 494-1840

From: agronomy-faculty-group-bounces@lists.purdue.edu [mailto:agronomy-faculty-group-bounces@lists.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the

Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Elias I. Franses](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Cc: [Linda Wang](#); [Corti, David S](#); [Boudouris, Bryan W](#); [Kim, Sangtae](#); jsirola@purdue.edu; [Vivek Narsimhan](#); [Jim Caruthers](#); [Doraiswami Ramkrishna](#); [Varma, Arvind](#); [Morgan, John A](#); [chongli yuan](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:32:57 AM

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

“I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.*

I fully agree with your concerns. The demands in this document are outrageous and impossible to enforce. It may lead to a continuous strife and bureaucratic morass.

In fact I support that the document be withdrawn from any consideration, and that it not be binding to the university.

It may destroy the graduate program.

The students should not have the "right" to change academic advisor. It can be allowed ,of course, but not mandated.

That should depend on the graduate committee and the availability of funds.

Elias Franses

Professor of Chemical Engineering

--

Elias I Franses
Davidson School of Chemical Engineering
Purdue University
1029C Forney Hall of Chemical Engineering
480 Stadium Mall Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2100
Office: (765) 494-4078

From: [Jain, Neera](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:30:33 AM
Importance: High

Dear Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Sincerely,

Neera Jain

Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical Engineering

neerajain@purdue.edu

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very**

bad idea*, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Dave Cappelleri](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:22:48 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

David J. Cappelleri, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Purdue University
Mechanical Engineering
585 Purdue Mall
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2088
E-mail: dcappell@purdue.edu
Phone: 765.494.3719
Fax: 765.494.0539
website: www.multiscalerobotics.org

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 8:52 AM Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all***

students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Rao, Suresh C.](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:06:53 AM

Steve:

I concur with your concerns, and agree that the senate should further discuss this issue.

Over the past two decades at Purdue, I have seen enough cases of poor mentoring, and abuse given the asymmetric power dynamics between grad students & faculty mentors, and even incompetence. For international grad students (which is easily the majority for PhD candidates in COE), this is especially problematic, since they do not have too many options (visa constraints; financial issues; "family honor" issues, etc.). They suffer silently, and just wait to graduate and leave. That is clearly unacceptable. Perhaps, in such cases we do need formal protections. These poor mentors need to be "mentored".

On the other end of the spectrum, I have also known many extraordinary faculty mentors, who do their best to help the grad students achieve their own professional goals, while also help meet the grant/project goals (if the student is paid on RA). We need to recognize that PhD students are not hired "technicians" on a project. PhD students are our future colleagues!

Suresh

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights
(https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html),

passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Dengfeng Sun](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Cc: [Sun, Dengfeng](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:21:14 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Dengfeng Sun
Associate Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics
Email: dsun@purdue.edu
Phone: (765) 494-5718
<http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~dsun/>

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 8:52 AM Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights**

that is binding on the University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [J. Stuart Bolton](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:01:51 AM

Dear Steve,
I support the reconsideration of Senate Document 18-02.
Thank you for your efforts,
Stuart

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were

not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not be encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Johnson, David R](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:17:01 AM

Steve,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02. Thank you for clearly outlining your reasoning and providing some of the institutional history behind this.

Best,

David Johnson

Assistant Professor, IE/POL

765-494-7122

davidjohnson@purdue.edu

David R Johnson
Assistant Professor, Industrial Engineering & Political Science
Purdue University
davidjohnson@purdue.edu

From: Engfaculty-list on behalf of Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:51 AM
To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of

rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Ambrose, Rose Prabin Kingsly](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:00:04 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Kingsly Ambrose, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering

Purdue University

Ph: +1-765-494-6599

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/FFP>

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/CP3>

From: Engfaculty-list **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Eckhard Groll](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:16:20 AM

Steve,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Eckhard A. Groll
Reilly Professor of ME
Associate Dean for UGrad and Grad Education
College of Engineering
ARMS 3027
Phone: 765-496-2201
E-mail: groll@purdue.edu

Thank you for leading this effort.

Eckhard

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html),

passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Kevin Trumble](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:14:46 AM

Steven,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Kevin Trumble

Prof. of Materials Engineering

driscol, 4-4114

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose

responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Corless, Martin](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:05:32 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Martin Corless
Professor
Aeronautics & Astronautics

From: [Yih, Yuehwern](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:01:29 AM

Steve, this email is my signature on the petition to request reconsideration of the document.

Yuehwern

Y. Yih, Ph.D.

Academic Director LASER PULSE (Long-term Assistance and Services for Research, Partners for University-Led Solutions Engine) Consortium

Associate Director, Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Professor, School of Industrial Engineering

Purdue University

315 N. Grant Street

West Lafayette, IN 47907

From: Engfaculty-list on behalf of Steven Landry

Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 8:52 AM

To: "engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu"

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is**

binding on the University*. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Gintaras V Reklaitis](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:01:26 AM

Steve

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Rex

G.V. Rex Reklaitis
Burton and Kathryn Gedge Distinguished Professor
Davidson School of Chemical Engineering
Forney Hall of Chemical Engineering
Purdue University
West Lafayette IN 47907-2100
(T) 765-494-9662 (F) 765-494-0805
reklaiti@purdue.edu



www.purdue.edu/giantleaps

On Jan 16, 2019, at 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J <slandry@purdue.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow*, *Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

<20181119_Senate_Doc_18-02_PGSG Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
Resol....pdf>

From: [Pedro Irazoqui](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:59:49 AM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Pedro P. Irazoqui, Ph.D.
Professor and Head (interim) of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Reilly Professor of Biomedical Engineering
Director, Center for Implantable Devices
Purdue University

On 16 Jan 2019, at 8:51, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student

bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

| 765-494-6256

From: [David S. Ebert](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Cc: ["Dr. David S. Ebert"](#)
Subject: RE: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:34:21 PM

Steve,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

David S. Ebert, Professor, ECE

Dr. David S. Ebert, Silicon Valley Professor of ECE, Purdue University
Director, Purdue Visualization and Analytics Center
Interim Director, Center for Education and Research in Information Assurance and Security (CERIAS)
Director, Visual Analytics for Command, Control, and Interoperability Environments
<https://www.purdue.edu/discoverypark/vaccine/>
ebertd@purdue.edu <http://www.ece.purdue.edu/~ebertd>

From: Engfaculty-list [mailto:engfaculty-list-bounces@ecn.purdue.edu] **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:52 AM

To: 'engfaculty-list@ecn.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it

even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Ghafoor, Arif](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 6:15:35 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Arif Ghafoor
Professor
School of ECE

On 1/16/2019 8:51 AM, Landry, Steven J wrote:

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document, 18-02, was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by the end of the day tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in

mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Gary J. Cheng](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re: Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:24:34 PM

Dear Steve,
I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Gary

*Gary Cheng
Associate Professor
School of Industrial Engineering
School of Materials Engineering (by courtesy)
Purdue university*

From: [Wu, Wenzhuo](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Re:[IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:12:01 PM

Hi Steve,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Thanks!

Wenzhuo Wu
Ravi and Eleanor Talwar Rising Star Assistant Professor
School of Industrial Engineering, Purdue University
315 N. Grant Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907
765 494-7082 (tel); 765 494-7972 (fax); Email: wenzhuowu@purdue.edu
Webpage: <https://engineering.purdue.edu/wugroup>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: [IE-faculty] Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

From: "Landry, Steven J"

To: ie-faculty@purdue.edu

CC:

Colleagues,

If you haven't replied already in support of my petition and are inclined to do so, please do so immediately. The Senate has gone back on its word to me and has moved up the deadline they gave me to midnight tonight instead of tomorrow.

I only need about 10 emails of support of the petition and am reaching out to you specifically to put me over the minimum number to get this reconsidered.

See below for the detail. All I need is an email with your signature block indicating that **"I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02."**

Regards and thanks,

Steve

From: Landry, Steven J
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM
To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'
Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the

Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty “signatures” (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that “I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02” along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that “no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body” is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.
- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure

rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256

From: [Honorio Carrillo, Jean F](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 6:46:02 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Full Name: Jean F. Honorio Carrillo
Title: Assistant Professor
Department: Computer Science
E-mail: jhonorio@purdue.edu
Phone: 765-496-6757

From: [Caldwell, Barrett S.](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 6:15:51 PM

I support the petition to reconsider Purdue University Senate Document 18-02.

Barrett S Caldwell, PhD
Professor of IE (and AAE), Purdue University
Jefferson Science Fellow, U.S. Dept. of State, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Office
of Japan Affairs (EAP/J)

From: [Zachary J Hass](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 8:20:51 PM

Steve,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02.

Best,

Zach

Zachary Hass, PhD
Assistant Professor
Schools of Nursing and Industrial Engineering
Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering Core Faculty
Purdue University
P: 765-494-4020
E: zhass@purdue.edu

From: [Lee, Linda S](#)
To: [Landry, Steven J](#)
Subject: Support to Reconsider the Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02
Date: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:32:42 AM

Dr. Landry,

I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02. While I am a huge component of graduate student success and well-being, I too am concerned about some of the legal ramifications in the future with regards to some of the wording in the proposed PSGS student bill of rights. The document does serve as all overall summary of best practices and responsibilities for facilitating a good environment for our graduate students, good faculty-graduate student relationships and optimal potential for graduate student success. However, in its current format as a binding bill of rights is concerning and requires more discussion for increased and even review by Purdue legal if appropriate.

Linda S. Lee

B480 Lilly Hall, West Lafayette, IN 47907; Office: (765) 494-8612; Cell (765) 414-3086; lslee@purdue.edu
Purdue University Dept. of Agronomy, Professor of Environmental Chemistry
Interdisciplinary Ecological Science & Engineering (ESE) Graduate Program, Program Head, www.purdue.edu/ese
Division of Environmental Ecological Engineering, Courtesy Faculty Appointment

From: agronomy-faculty-group-bounces@lists.purdue.edu **On Behalf Of** Landry, Steven J

Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 9:28 AM

To: 'agcollege.faculty@lists.purdue.edu'

Subject: Petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02

Colleagues,

At the last Senate meeting of the fall semester, the attached document was passed, indicating the Senate's, and thereby your, support for a graduate student bill of rights, which was created by the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG). That document is also attached. Please read that document and the Senate resolution.

I find the action by the Senate ***ill-considered and irresponsible***. I therefore am generating this petition to ***request reconsideration of the document***.

If 75 faculty "signatures" (emails responses) are collected, the University Senate must reconsider its actions. I need these signatures (emails) by ***tomorrow***, ***Thursday, 17 January*** to comply with Senate deadlines for reconsideration.

If you agree, please respond to this email by tomorrow, indicating your support for reconsideration. A simple email stating that "I support the petition to reconsider Senate Document 18-02" along with your name, title, and contact information, will be sufficient.

Although I do not disagree with the sentiments in the student document, I believe supporting this bill of rights would be highly detrimental to faculty and staff. Moreover, I do not believe that most Senators read the student document, nor did they know what they were endorsing.

More specifically:

- The statement that "no Purdue University-sponsored document fully describes the rights and responsibility (sic) of the graduate student body" is completely false. The student bill of rights (https://www.purdue.edu/studentregulations/student_conduct/studentrights.html), passed by the Board of Trustees in 1970, with revisions in 1975 and 1997, covers ***all*** students, including graduate students. The need for a separate graduate bill of rights is not clearly identified, and much of the document is duplicative of the student bill of rights. Moreover, there is a clear process (Article 21) for amending the Bill of Student Rights – it even calls out the PGSG as one organization that can initiate amendments.

- ***There is no provision anywhere that students can establish their own bill of rights that is binding on the University***. The PGSG bill tries to impose responsibilities on faculty and staff (see Article 2, #2 and Article 3, #1 for examples), and even tries to prescribe how salaries are set (Article 2, #4.) Encouraging or endorsing students in mandating such things is a ***very bad idea***, even if the university should do these things.
- This document was generated with minimal faculty involvement. PGSG seemed to work with Graduate Council members and Senate committee members, but Colleges and Schools were not consulted.
- There are several places where students are requiring staff and faculty to do certain things. (See for example Article 3, #1.) These statements are vague – who decides whether, for example, feedback to graduate students is sufficiently “regular and constructive?” Who decides whether students have been given “a fair opportunity to improve performance and address deficiencies?” Who decides whether students have been given “fair treatment and attribution?”

There can be differences on whether what the students are requesting is reasonable or not, but in any case (a) they should not encouraged to try to publish edicts to try to enforce compliance with their will, and (b) they should be encouraged to follow the existing process to amend the existing student bill of rights. I personally am very supportive of students, but they should at least attempt to follow proper procedure, and faculty should encourage PGSG to follow this proper procedure rather than endorse this document.

I attempted to have my senate representative stop this from being passed, but it passed with very little discussion in a rush using a show of hands.

Thank you and regards,

Steven J. Landry

Professor and Acting Head, School of Industrial Engineering

Co-director, Purdue Systems Collaboratory

Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics (by courtesy)

Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering

Purdue University 315 N. Grant St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907

765-494-6256