University Senate

Seventh Meeting Monday, 20 April 2026, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

AGENDA- As Amended

1. Call to order — Professor Mark Zimpfer

2. Statement of Land Use Acknowledgement — Professor Mark Zimpfer

3. Approval of Minutes of 23 March 2026

4. Acceptance of Agenda

5. Remarks of the Senate Vice Chair — Professor Mark Zimpfer

6. Remarks of the President — President Mung Chiang

7. Question Time

8. Memorial Resolutions (None received for April)

9. Senate Document 25-25 Vote of No Confidence — For Action; Senators Lindsay Weinberg and Howard Zelaznik

10. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Committees — For Information; Professor Lisa Bosman

11. Consent Agenda — For Action; Nominating Committee
    a. Senate Document 25-26 Nominees for the Educational Policy Committee
    b. Senate Document 25-27 Nominees for the Community Connection Committee
    c. Senate Document 25-28 Nominees for the Faculty Affairs Committee
    d. Senate Document 25-29 Nominees for the Nominating Committee
    e. Senate Document 25-30 Nominees for the Steering Committee
    f. Senate Document 25-31 Nominees for the Student Affairs Committee
    g. Senate Document 25-32 Nominees for the University Resources Policy Committee

12. Senate Document 25-16 PSG and PGSG Resolution Calling for Expanded Voter Accessibility- Amended — For Action, University Resources Policy Committee

13. Senate Document 25-20 Senate Proposal for Withdrawal Policy Updates — For Action, Educational Policy Committee

14. Senate Document 25-21 Office of Admissions Proposal for Addition of Reentry Policy to Academic Regulations — For Action, Educational Policy Committee

15. Senate Document 25-22 Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee Joint Proposal on Childcare Challenges at Purdue — For Action, Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee

16. Senate Document 25-23 Edits to the Academic Regulations Regarding Summer Calendar — For Action, Educational Policy Committee

17. Senate Document 25-24 Scholastic Recognition Graduation with Distinction Update to Academic Regulations- As Amended — For Action, Educational Policy Committee

18. Presentation on Transportation and Public Safety — for Information, Vice President for Physical Facilities Jay Wasson

19. New Business

20. Adjournment

Seventh Meeting, Monday, 20 April 2026, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

Session 1: Present: *Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), President Mung Chiang, Mark Zimpfer (Chair of the Senate), Julio Ramirez (Vice-Chair of the Senate), Patrick Wolfe (Provost), Se'Andra Johnson (Sergeant-at-Arms), Bree Richards (Administrative Assistant), Abdelfattah Nour, Abigail Engelberth, Afsan Bhadelia, Alejandro Cuza, Ali Bramson, Alice Johnson, Amanda Darbyshire, Annmarie Nicely, Antonio Sa Barreto, Arezoo Ardekani, Arun Prakash, Ashley Bellet, Barbara Golden, Ben Dunford, Bhagyashree Katare, Bowei Xi, Brian Leung, Casey Krusemark, Changyou Wang, Cheng-kok Koh, Chris Rogers, Chris Ruhl, Corey Maley, Damon Lisch, Dan Cziczo, Dan Degnan, Darryl Ragland, David Blon, David Lui, David Ziviani, Dianne Little, Dulcy Abraham, Eric Adams, Fecri Karanki, Francoise Brosseau-Lapre, Gustavo Rodriguez-Rivera, Howard Zelaznik, Janet Alsup, Jim Dworkin, John Sheffield, Joseph Coates, Julia Chester, Julian Gallegos, Katie Jarriel, Kee-Hong Kim, Kevin Stainback, Kim Updegraff, Kyle Haynes, Lindsay Weinberg, Lisa Bosman, Lori Hoagland, Loring "Larry" Nies, Mara Faccio, Michael Smith, Mohit Tawarmalani, Moncia Torres, Morgan Hynes, Nastasha Johnson, Padinjaremadhom Ramachandran, Patricia Morita-Mullaney, Paul Mort, Rebecca Jean Siener, Rick Johnson-Sheehan, Risa Denae Cromer, Ryan Manuel, Santokh Badesha, Sarah Huber, Sarah LaRose, Scott Lawrance, Seema Mattoo, Seungyoon Lee, Severin Schneebeli, Shalom Ablavi Kpetsu, Stephanie Butram, Stephen Cameron, Stephen Martin, Suranjan Panigrahi, Tae Hong Park, Tom Brush, Tom Hacker, Tobert Rocheford, Ulrike Dydak, Vincent Duffy, Wayne Campbell, Whitney (Huidan) Yu, Ximena Bernal, Xingshan (Shawn) Cui, Yonsoo Kim*
Advisors: *Heather Beasley, Michael Cline, Melissa Franks, Cherise Hall, Shelia Hurt, Carl Krieger, Lisa Mauer, Beth McCuskey, Jamie Mohler, Haley Oliver-Jischke, Sunil Prabhakar, Alysa Rollock, Katherine Sermersheim*
Guests: *Dave Bangert, Amy Boyle, Dan DeLaurentis, Erica Downey, Julia Dussliere, Kathleen Ferrero, AJ Frigo, Jing Gao, Trenten Klingerman, Thor Leifur Leifsson, Dimitrios Peroulis, Heather Servaty-Seib, David Umulis, Jay Wasson,*
Absent: *Anthony (Tony) Smith, Brian Richert, Chan Choi, Charles Bouman, Dengfeng Sun, Euguenio Culurciello, Ganesh Subbarayanp-Shastri, Kiseop Lee, Marisol Sepulveda, Rua Williams, Sasha Tsymbaliuk, Lowell Kane.*

Session 2: Present: *Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Mark Zimpfer (Chair of the Senate), Julio Ramirez (Vice-Chair of the Senate), Se'Andra Johnson (Sergeant-at-Arms), Bree Richards (Administrative Assistant), Abigail Engelberth, Afsan Bhadelia, Ali Bramson, Annemarie Nicely, Arun Prakash, Ashley Bellet, Barbara Golden, Bhagyashree Katare, Bowei Xi, Brian Leung, Casey Krusemark, Cheng-kok Koh, Chris Rogers, Darryl Ragland, David Blon, David Liu, David Ziviani, Dianne Little, Dulcy Abraham, Eric Adams, Fecri Karanki, Gustavo Rodriguez-Rivera, Howard Zelaznik, Janet Alsup, Jim Dworkin, John Sheffield, Joseph Coates, Julia Chester, Jullian Gallegos, Katie Jarriel, Kee-Hong Kim, Kevin Stainback, Kim Updegraff, Kyle Haynes, Lindsay Weinberg, Lisa Bosman, Lori Hoagland, Loring (Larry) Nies, Michael Smith, Mohit Tawarmalani, Nastasha Johnson, Padinjaremadhom Ramachandran, Patricia (Trish) Morita-Mullaney, Paul Mort, Rebecca Jean Siener, Rick Johnson-Sheehan, Risa Cromer, Ryan Manuel, Santokh Badesha, Sarah Huber, Sarah LaRose, Seema Mattoo, Seungyoon Lee, Severin Schneebeli, Shalom Ablavi Kpetsu, Stephanie Butram, Stephen Cameron, Stephen Martin, Suranjan Panigrahi, Tae Hong Park, Tom Brush, Tom Hacker, Vince Duffy, Whitney (Yu) Huidan, Ximena Bernal, Yonsoo Kim*
Advisors: *Alysa Rollock, Beth McCuskey, Carl Krieger, Lisa Mauer, Melissa Franks, Michael Cline, Shelia Hurt, Sunil Prabhakar*
Guests: *Beth Fines, Dimitrios Peroulis, Katheleen Ferrero, Nathan Caldwell, Trent Klingerman*
Absent: *Abdelfattah Nour, Alejandro Cuza, Alice Johnson, Amanda Darbyshire, Anthony (Tony) Smith, Antonio Sa Barreto, Arezoo Ardekani, Ben Dunford, Brian Richert, Chan Choi, Changyou Wang, Charles Bouman, Chris Ruhl, Corey Maley, Damon Lisch, Dan Cziczo, Dan Degnan, Dengfeng Sun, Eugenio Culurciello, Francoise Brosseau-Lapre, Ganesh Subbarayan-Shastri, Kiseop Lee, Mara Faccio, Marisol Sepulveda, Monica Torres, Morgan Hynes, President Mung Chiang, Patrick Wolfe*

(Provost), Rua Williams, Sasha Tsymbaliuk, Scott Lawrance, Torbert Rocheford, Ulrike Dydak, Wayne Campbell, Xingshan (Shawn) Cui, Heather Beasley, Cherise Hall, Lowell Kane, Jamie Mohler, Haley Oliver-Jischke, Katherine Sermersheim.

1. Quorum being established, the meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Chair Mark Zimpfer read the following Statement of Land Use Acknowledgement, as required by Senate Document 20-55:

   The Purdue University Senate acknowledges the traditional homelands of the Indigenous People which Purdue University is built upon. We honor and appreciate the Bodéwadmik (Potawatomi), Lenape (Delaware), Myaamia (Miami), and Shawnee People who are the original Indigenous caretakers.

3. The minutes of the 23 March 2026 Senate meeting were entered as read.

4. Consideration of the April Senate Agenda was next, and Chair Zimpfer recognized Senator Lisa Bosman.

   Senator Duffy: “I move to amend the order of the Agenda by moving Senate Document 25-25 from item 17 to item 5.”

   Chair Zimpfer: “Is there a second?”

   Senator Howard Zelaznik: “Second.”

   Chair Zimpfer: “It is moved and seconded to move item 17, Senate document 25-25, to item 5.”

   The discussion began. Several Senators spoke in favor of moving item 17 to item 5, and several spoke in opposition to that amendment to the Agenda. During the discussion Senator Vincent Duffy made a motion to amend the proposed amendment by moving item 17 to item 9 rather than to item 5. Senator John Sheffield seconded his motion. Discussion of the amendment to the original amendment was held with several Senators in support of the second amendment and several in opposition. Following the discussion, the motion by Senator Duffy to move item 17 to item 9 was approved by the Senate with 60 votes in favor, 21 in opposition, with 3 abstentions. Following approval of the second amendment, the amended Agenda was approved with 70 votes in favor, 11 in opposition, with 3 abstentions. The amended Agenda places former item 9 as item 10, and so on.

5. Chair Zimpfer began his remarks, which were as follows:

   “As I wrap up my term as chair, please allow me a few minutes to share some thoughts. The Senate is and always has been advisory. We serve an important role in providing guidance and direction on all things that affect our university. However, in order to be a true advisor, we must be knowledgeable, aware of all facts, and have perspective. We have done this, in the prescription plan and working with the administration and HR to help our colleagues and community in the AI UCC adoption, in considerations and recommendations on the Mutual Defense Compact from a year ago and in navigating the time of student protest, the Senate has always served its role over the last several years. We have also failed to do this at times.

I was told this spring that I was not considered trustworthy by a few of our senators. When I asked for an explanation, I was told, ‘You are too close to administration.” You have too many conversations with administration.’ I was not even sure what that really meant. Taking time to have hard conversations, looking for possible paths forward, asking questions, taking part in debates, and trying to reach consensus as being too close. It seems like I was acting in an advisory role. I have loved the last six years plus of involvement with the Senate. Over that time, we transformed from a body that had few, if any, objectives that were accomplished for the good of our university community. Under the careful stewardship shown by Brian Leung and Susan South, which changed dramatically. The Senate began to stack wins and became truly advisory and a shared governance partner. Please do not allow this body to slip back into the previous role and lose an important communication tool for our community.

I have greatly appreciated my last two years as a Vice Chair and Chair, and I look forward to serving incoming chair Ramirez and Vice Chair Little. I hope to help you in the future. I will now yield two minutes of my time to Immediate Past Chair Brian Leung as he ends his role with the Senate. Thank you.”

Past Chair Brian Leung: “Well, Chair Zimpfer, I am not going to take two minutes because what your sentiments kind of forecast what my sentiments are. I will not share my written remarks, but I do want to say this to everyone. I want to just thank you. I really thank this Senate. You saved me. I was having some rough times five years ago, feeling professional, professional wise. Collaborating with you all has been the most important experience of my career here at Purdue. You have done so much for me, and I hope I have given you at least a little back. A couple specific things to echo what Chair Zimpfer just said.

When I was elected as a senator from the Department of English, somebody came up to me and joked, ’Condolences.’ It was funny for a minute, but then three or four other people said it in different contexts, and I did not understand why. It was because of being in the Senate that five years ago did not come with a good reputation in terms of collegiality and those kinds of things. I felt like what I wanted to contribute as long as I was going to be in the Senate is returning to a sense of collegiality and talking to people where they are, not where I wanted them to be, where I want them to be, and also kind of reestablishing connections with administration. I am not claiming any credit for it. I certainly saw it with Chair Susan South and saw it with Chair Zimpfer, how we could really take advantage in our advisory position of speaking with upper administration, collaborating with them.

I, as a representative of the Senate, have felt listened to and every single person in this space right now to end and repeat, just thank you so much for helping me feel professionally satisfied. It is not a small favor. I genuinely appreciate it. Now back to you."

Chair Zimpfer: "Thank you, Past Chair Leung. Your many, many hours of service over the last several years are genuinely appreciated by many. President Chiang, you are recognized to begin your remarks."

6. President Chiang presented his remarks.

"Chair Zimpfer for Immediate Past Chair Leung, thank you very much for what you just said. Look, you do not have an easy job, and many, many faculty, colleagues appreciate what you have been trying to do. Thank you again. I look forward to also working with the incoming Chair, Ramirez, and incoming Vice Chair Little. I also want to extend my appreciation to all the Senators who might be rotating off as we conclude the semester next week. Thank you for all of your service as well.

It is indeed a busy month. I have been in many various activities on campus and visited, for example, BIDC, where the students and staff showed me all the wonderful creativity that they have demonstrated to the RecWell Center inside CoRec, where our staff and again, student volunteers have done amazing work for the physical and mental health of our community members, and also a dinner with the Fraternity Authority and Cooperative Life, the, quote unquote, Greek life with around 7,000 undergraduate students who find their homes, physical or figurative homes in Greek life here. It is important to listen to their views as well.

It has also been busy on weekends, including the Annual Purdue Aviation Day. It was particularly good weather. The community writ large came out to the Purdue Airport for a lot of educational activities. We had the Cancer 5K run. We have had the largest, I was told, hardware hackathon in the world just last weekend. It was really of the student by the student for the students and inviting student competitors from around the country in addition to hundreds of our own.

We had the Family Weekend last weekend as well with many parents and other family members coming to campus to see our current students. We had the Springfest annual event concurrently, including the famous Bug Bowl educational exhibits organized by the Agriculture College and colleagues. We had a lot of spring games, and we sent our congratulations to our men's basketball team for reaching Elite Eight this season, post-season and at the very first game of the NCAA March Madness our very own Braden Smith broke a 33-year long record of all-time assist record that was set previously by Bobby Hurley at Duke, and he continued to set new records and ended with 1,103. The way that college athletics are going, some said that this might become one of the few records in college sports that may never be broken. That belongs to a Boilermaker named Braden Smith. Kudos to the many coaches and student athletes for their academic and athletic excellence and to our athletic staff as well.

Coming up, we do have the annual Grand Prix event. I was told by student organizers this year will be the largest ever. And then we have Day of Giving coming up next week too. In fact, I do not know whether Julie Dussliere, the Boilermaker and the CEO of Purdue for Life Foundation is here. If so, maybe I am going to ask for a recognition for her to say a few words. I know that she has a three o'clock, it is already past three, so she may not be there anymore to tell us a bit more about the campaign progress. The short answer is we are actually little ahead of our original schedule of the largest campaign ever in Purdue history and working a lot with all the benefactors. We always say if a gift means something to you, it means a lot to us. It is not about the dollar amount. Of course, once a year, we have Purdue Day of Giving at the end of the academic year where we have many on campus participation from students as well. It is important for this body to also hear what we are doing there in that regard, because those gifts would come in to support student scholarships, professorships, programs, facilities, and many other needs at the university.

With that, I am going to use my time back to Chair Zimpfer to see if Julie Dussliere is here to be recognized to say a few words about our fundraising exercise. And if not, maybe onto EVP for Research, Dan DeLaurentis, and Provost Wolfe.

Purdue for Life Foundation CEO Julie Dussliere: "Thanks so much for a few minutes of your time this afternoon. As President Chiang said, we are a little over a year into the public phase of the Victories and Heroes campaign. And recently in January, we passed the halfway mark in terms of our fundraising metric to reaching that $4 billion target that we are looking to achieve by 2030. We are not quite halfway there on the time elapsed. For those of you who like to look at linear graphs, while fundraising is not linear, we always like where we are in terms of the dollars to be a little bit ahead of where we are at in terms of the time elapse. We are in a great position. With that said, we have Day of Giving coming up in eight days, eight hours, 51 minutes. My countdown clock here on my laptop is telling me this afternoon.

While our team here in the foundation is obviously focused on our friends and alumni who are giving back to Purdue 365 days a year, Day of Giving is special in that we can engage with everyone on campus, whether it is yourselves on the faculty, administration, students, to really celebrate giving back to Purdue in terms of time, talent, and treasure. We appreciate the partnership across campus from everyone on Day of Giving to make that day special.

This year we have a couple of events that I would like to highlight. We have a student event in the evening at Ross-Ade Stadium that will focus on some fun activities for our students. They will also have the opportunity to win a full tuition scholarship. Two of those will be given away courtesy of one of our most generous donors. And that is always a great thing for our students to be present and have the opportunity to have their tuition paid for the upcoming year.

We will also be doing a significant community event this year that everyone on campus, faculty, staff, students, as well as our friends in the West Lafayette and Lafayette community have been invited to, to honor America's 250th birthday. We will have a special flag dedication ceremony for the new flagpole in Ross-Ade Stadium followed by a fireworks show. I would like to extend the invitation for everyone who might be available next Wednesday evening on Day of Giving to join us. Thank you again, for the time today. I appreciate it."

Chair Zimpfer: "Thank you for the report. It is a good update. President Chiang, back to you."

President Chiang: "Thank you, Julie, for you and the entire Purdue For Life Foundation colleagues' effort working with many alums and students. Back to Chair Zimpfer, if you would entertain recognizing both EVPR and the Provost, if they have some further updates, please."

Executive Vice President for Research Dan DeLaurentis: "This is Dan DeLaurentis returning to see all of you again. My countdown clock is at 10 days. That is the time until our first faculty forum on growing and improving our research enterprise. The second is on May 7th, so May 1st and May 7th. I mentioned those, I think, last month at the Senate meeting, but here to beat the drum and ask for all of you to encourage faculty, colleagues. These two, May 1st and May 7th are mirror image events, but they are just for faculty. We actually have 40 registrants for each of them already, but I want those numbers and would like your help in getting the word out. We will have a couple of reminders coming out in the next 10 days for both of the events.

I do also want all of you to know and spread the word that in the early summer, we are going to have a similar workshop but dedicated to our staff to hear their voices and their kind of dreams of how we get better together in the research enterprise. And we are also going to have kind of an open-to-all version of this down in Indianapolis in the early summer. And really, I have a little clarity now on content. Certainly, we are going to structure to be primarily listening and discussing, but I am going to be presenting an environment scan of both the external world and internal to Purdue, the things that have happened, the stressors, how we have tried to get better and have some tangible evidence of getting better. But it has been kind of an arms race. The more efficient and less burdensome we get better internally; there seems to be new federal or state things coming our way that just add new stressors and complexity. I really want the faculty that attend these just to get a picture from my perch of how all of these forces are playing upon us, so that we can have a full picture of the things that we can best architect to get better. That is all from me."

Provost Patrick Wolfe: "Thank you, Chair Zimpfer. I think Dan, you and Mung both spoke eloquently about records and numbers, and notwithstanding an, at times, challenging external environment. I have a few numbers to report for this year. They range from some special numbers that are maybe smaller perhaps than the assist record or the start record for our graduating seniors in men's basketball, to some that are even larger. So let me say how proud I am, first of all, that we have a Guggenheim fellowship winner this time around from electrical and computer engineering. That is an enormous credit to the university, the college, the school, and of course the individual colleague. We are upping our nominations for all sorts of things. And you will have seen from everything from AAAS to other esteemed societies that that is really, really bearing some fruit.

I will tell you, if we go in increasing order, we have about a dozen dream hires in the works this semester. The most recently announced set of hires were two people, one who joined us from Yale, and the other from Harvard. That is fabulous to see. That cuts across the life sciences and the business school. We have more underway. Of course, as soon as you bring even more to our offices, our treasurer, I, Dan, Mung, the rest of us, we will look at those. I would love to see another dozen through the door before we finish this summer.

Let me also tell you a little bit about books. If you have time this Wednesday, if you are not at the Kurt Vonnegut Museum, you might want to be at the HSSE Library, where we are going to celebrate our books' authors this time around. We have 33 books already published in this calendar year and another 153 in the pipeline. I cannot remember offhand if that would beat last year's record, but I think certainly the cumulative number of books published by Purdue authors in the past two years is greater than the sum over probably the previous decade. So that program has been, it is fair to say objectively, successful. It is always fun to see people turn up at HSSE for that event. There's good food and even better company. You will know, you can even wander the stacks and look at some of the new books that are published.

Let me tell you about a couple of things we are doing for our students. Perhaps most interestingly, Haley Oliver-Jischke talked about this a little bit last time, we have built an automated means of making graduate admissions even simpler for current Purdue undergraduates. Our BEAM program is set to admit something like 4,000 of our graduating seniors across the board to the possibility of some time with us in graduate school if that is a preferred option to them over and above what the job market brings. Of course, I was just looking at NSF fellowship numbers the other day. The program has changed this year. You will probably know if you are out there looking for graduate students across STEM subjects, you will know about NSF fellowships. And we did win a fair number of those. We are not quite at the top of the Big 10, but we are inching our way up there. That is particularly good to see.

Increasing past the thousands of BEAMS admits, let me talk for a moment about the nearly 9,000 undergraduate graduands we will have come up. We have nine ceremonies later this month, or the beginning of next month, I should say. You will know, of course, because parking and hotels and everything else get really tight across campus. I would love to see even more of you at graduation than are on the Zoom today. Boy, wouldn’t that be a wonderful sign of interest in our students? I am proud to say that we have provided Google Gemini licenses and training fully paid for all of our graduating seniors. That is for another six months after graduation.

In an employment market that looks a little bit different possibly than previous years, our graduands and graduates will have every opportunity to learn a little bit about Gemini from an investment that we have made, get smart about AI. And also pick up if you complete the seven trainings. These will be made available pretty soon now to staff and to faculty. I was just talking with IT about this earlier today. If you complete the seven paid-for Google trainings, you will be able to get a nice badge that you can put on your LinkedIn page or your CV. And so again, you saw us pop up, I am sure, on the Forbes New Ivies list, and a big part of that was making AI tools available to our students, tools, and training.

I would note that a year ago, our President asked this body to contemplate AI classroom usage policies. Perhaps Mark will have a report for us today, but otherwise, I am not sure if that is something that this body has felt itself able to action in 12 months' time. Of course, we will be in a position to roll out some new AI classroom usage guidelines for the fall. I am sure there will be great opportunities to feedback on that once there is something assembled for all of you to react to.

Continuing to look at the numbers. I said something like 9,000 graduating seniors. We are probably looking at an incoming class size that is even a little bit north of that. We are excited about that. You will know if you are involved with graduate students, we just passed the magical national deadline of April 15th. We are also right around the time that housing contracts and everything else are starting to come due for undergraduates. It has been very heartening to see the yield of students, the proportion of students saying yes to their offers continue to tick up. And that is a great sign for our entire main campus, not just on this physical footprint in West Lafayette, if you happen to be sitting here, but also in Indianapolis for those of us who are joining from Indy. We are excited about that. You may have even seen a couple of announcements from our most recent board meeting about continuing to expand and build in Indianapolis.

The last number I will leave you with is one more thing about AI. We are in the process of developing a formal proposal for well over $20 million from the Lilly Endowment for AI in Higher Education. I say possibly more because there are numerous partnership opportunities out there with other Indiana universities, everything from ethics to advising, to becoming even more efficient in how we help our faculty and students succeed, apply for grants, schedule their courses, and all of that kind of fun stuff. Watch this space by the time we are back in August. There will be lots and lots and lots going at full speed, full bore on the AI front. With that, Chair Zimpfer, I will hand it back to you."

7. The answers to pre-submitted questions were posted to the Senate website [Appendix A]. Chair Zimpfer opened Question Time.

   Chair Zimpfer: "We have a few minutes for questions from the floor. Are there any additional questions now?"

   Past Chair Leung: "Thank you, Provost Wolfe, for the AI policy upcoming. In creative writing, I actually taught in both of my courses this semester, a section on AI just to get student feedback on how they feel about AI in a creative space. Will you please make sure that as we are developing our AI policy, that there is at least one person who has an advisory capacity who is in the creative arts? I am not volunteering, but I think it would be especially useful to have somebody specifically from the creative space who can speak to that unique space and the use of AI."

Provost Wolfe: “That is fair, and I certainly welcome suggestions from this august body. I would say if I had to pre-vision where we are headed, there will need to be a range of options because, exactly to the point that you just made, teaching creative writing or teaching analytical writing, frankly, where the very act of putting pen to paper metaphorically is part of the process of structuring one's own thinking. I mean, that is quite different than a class where you might be learning the fundamentals of, if not a particular software language, then maybe, I do not know, vibe coding or something like that. I do not think there is any way that an effective policy could ever be one-size-fits-all.

On the other hand, when we talked about this a year ago, and if you were at the December meeting of our board, you will have heard a mention made of this, three, three-and-a-half years ago when we rolled out the first policy, which was instructors really get to set the agenda for use of AI in the classroom, the tools, frankly, were much less developed. They were much less mature, much less effective. And the technology cycle spins faster and faster on AI, but I think we're at the point now where certainly some of the student feedback is, ‘Well, if I have three or four or five different courses with vastly different AI policy stipulations from my instructor, then that might be very confusing.‘ If you've followed closely, even in the last few days or week or so, we've had a little bit of a challenge where a course syllabus specified some AI policies that turned out to be, shall we say, very confusing in their appropriate enforcement. In fact, many people who would ordinarily be on this call are busy spending their entire day today trying to make sure that it gets sorted out so that we do right by our students. In essence, I think it cannot be one-size-fits-all, but I think we have discovered that the let 1,000 flowers bloom approach, where across 2,500 faculty we might risk something like 2,500 different policies, it probably does not have enough guardrails around it for where the technology is now.

Brian, to come back to your point, I would certainly welcome continued suggestions. Last year, this body helped put together a tiger team, a faculty who worked on AI over the summer. That was helpful in getting us off the ground toward our AI working competency requirement. I know it is a heavy lift. We all recognize it is a heavy lift for those of us who are in the classroom, but we are going to have to produce policies for the fall that are ultimately to the benefit of our students. We are going to have to revise them, or at least monitor them, on a very, very regular basis. It clearly cannot be the same from soup to nuts, everything that Purdue does. Let me pause there because I see more hands and I am imagining if there is no more about AI, there is more about other things. Brian, I see your ephemeral thumb floating into the ether. I assume that means you are content with that response for now.”

Senator Patricia Morita-Mullaney: “Thank you so much, President Chiang and Provost Wolfe. I am from the College of Education, and we are so happy to learn of Dr. Phil VanFossen's permanent appointment as our Dean after he served us very capably as interim for the last three-plus years. When will the national search begin?”

Provost Wolfe: “That is ultimately a question for our Board. You will have noticed that the news of Phil's taking over or staying situated came right on the heels of the last get together with our board. I would say, watch the space around Board meetings. Board meets every couple of months. Of course, every matter that is so firmly on everyone's mind, you can rest assure is discussed in great detail at regular meetings of our Trustees.

Senator Katie Jarriel: “In January, there was a pre-submitted question about the 2025 COACHE survey results. At that time, the response from the administration was that there would be a series of college-level meetings during the spring 2026 semester to disseminate those. I am asking for an update, please.”

Provost Wolfe: “Those meetings are scheduled. I do not have the exact dates in front of me, but I want to say that the first one is later this week or early next week. If Sunil is on, he might be able to tell us the exact dates.”

Vice Provost Sunil Prabhakar: “We are beginning Tuesday, tomorrow with a presentation to the Deans, followed by a presentation at the department heads forum the week after, and that will be followed by a whole slew of college-wide meetings.”

8. Memorial Resolutions [None Received for April].

As there were no Memorial Resolutions received for April, Chair Zimpfer noted that we would now move to the next item on the amended Agenda, Senate Document 25-25 Vote of No Confidence. So that he could participate in the discussion of Senate Document 25-25, Chair Zimpfer stepped aside in his role of Presiding Officer and Vice Chair Ramirez took over as Presiding Officer.

9. Senate Document 25-25 Vote of No Confidence

As there were no Memorial Resolutions received for April, Chair Zimpfer noted that we would now move to the next item on the amended Agenda, Senate Document 25-25 Vote of No Confidence. So that he could participate in the discussion of Senate Document 25-25, Chair Zimpfer stepped aside in his role of Presiding Officer and Vice Chair Ramirez took over as Presiding Officer.

Vice Chair Julio Ramirez: “Thank you, Chair Zimpfer. I accept the role and I would like to recognize Senators Lindsay Weinberg and Howard Zelaznik to introduce Senate Document 25-25 for Discussion.

Senator Lindsay Weinberg: “Thank you so much, Senator Ramirez. The first thing we would like to do is make a motion to suspend the rules, so that we can act and vote on Senate Document 25-25 during the current meeting. We feel this is important in order to conduct the will of the Senate as expressed in March.” After a brief discussion, Senator Ulrike Dydak seconded Senator Weinberg’s motion.

Vice Chair Ramirez: “It has been moved and seconded to suspend the rules and adopt Senate Document 25-25 today. I would like to note that a two-thirds vote in favor is required to suspend the rules. Are there any objections to suspending the rules and voting today?"

Past Chair Leung: "Yes, I object. This is a hugely consequential vote. We have not had time to discuss this document. The other document that was passed was merely about information. That information was received and that it was a closed item. This is a separate big issue. I do not think it is responsible for the Senate to suspend the rules. Let us do our work, be deliberate, and have this as a discussion item, and vote on it at a later time when we have all had time to reflect."

After a brief discussion, Senator Bosman called for a secret ballot for the vote to suspend the rules. This request did not require a second and was granted. An attempt was made to use a Qualtrics survey to poll the voting Senators who were present via a Qualtrics survey. However, technical difficulties stalled the initial attempt to distribute the survey. Once it was successfully distributed, some Senators noted that they could open another browser window and vote more than once. Senators expressed concerns about the Qualtrics voting procedure given the technical difficulties and the ability to vote more than once. Although there were also concerns expressed about the anonymity of a Zoom poll, it was decided to hold the vote to suspend the rules using a Zoom poll. The Sergeant-at-Arms, Se'Andra Johnson, is responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of voting results. Chair Zimpfer and Secretary Camp emphasized that the Ms. Johnson and her predecessors had never divulged the results of any individual's votes in the 60+ year history of the University Senate.

The vote on the motion to suspend the rules was held by Zoom poll and carried with 56 votes in favor, with 25 in opposition, and with 3 abstentions. As abstentions are not counted as votes, the 3 abstentions were removed from the denominator leaving 81 votes cast. Therefore, the percent in favor of suspending the rules was 69.1% (56/81). Hence, the vote exceeded the two-thirds majority required to suspend the rules and Senate Document 25-25 could be considered for Action at the April Senate meeting.

Vice Chair Ramirez: "I would like to remind you that a two-thirds vote will also be needed to adopt or amend Senate Document 25-25. So now I would like to call on either Senator Weinberg or Senator Zelaznik to begin the discussion."

Senator Lindsay Weinberg: "Thank you, Senator Ramirez. I thought it would be helpful to start just by briefly reiterating what has brought us to this moment. Between February 16th and March 9th, Senate standing committees were asked to look into the issues, concerns, and allegations that were raised in the January 2026 AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement. A summary of those findings was added to Senate Document 25-19 and shared with senators at the March 23rd Senate meeting. There was a 77.9 approval percentage among Senators in favor of holding a vote of no confidence at the meeting today, so in light of that call, this resolution explicitly calls for it to be resolved that the University Senate has lost confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe's leadership. We have included responses received from the Provost on and after March 23rd. Before we discuss further, I want to acknowledge the faculty, staff, and students who have taken significant risks to speak up in the ways that felt possible over these many months, and I hope we can have a meaningful discussion in anticipation of voting. Thank you so much."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "Thank you, Senator Weinberg. Let me remind us briefly of the rules. People who speak must be recognized by the presiding officer, so do not just jump in the discussion. Raise your hand. Remarks should be either in favor or in opposition to the motion and let us not get on tangents of the matter. If I recognize you once, I will not recognize you again if there is someone else that has not been recognized and wishes to speak. Let me recognize Senator Updegraff."

Senator Kim Updegraff: "Thank you. I want to clarify the remark that was made while we were waiting about the COACHE survey, in part because the email we received about the COACHE survey last fall was that less than half of the faculty participated in that survey, something like 49 percent. Whereas at the Senate, we have a representative of every unit in colleges on campus. There is a different kind of representation in the COACHE survey versus the Senate. My other question was my understanding of the COACHE survey is that there's ratings of leadership at different levels. There is the university level or the senior level, the college level, and the department level. So that seems like a much broader rating, and it seems directly relevant to our issues today. Thank you."

Chair Zimpfer: "Thank you, Chair Ramirez. It is an ask for information directed at you, and then you can pass the question on Senate Document 25-25 that states there were reports from six university Senate standing committees. Can I ask what six committees those were, please?"

Senator Bosman: "Thank you, Vice Chair Ramirez. The six university Senate committees were all except for the Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee."

Past Chair Leung: "I speak against the document, but I feel like I need to correct something that was just said. The previous document that was passed at 77 point something percent was not about whether or not we should hold this vote today. That vote was specifically a request for information by March 9th, which had actually already been achieved before we held the vote. That is all the proposal asked for. I just want to be clear on that. I know it is small but let us be accurate. We did not have a vote pointing towards today's vote. That was just a request for information by the document writers. We agreed with it even though they had already received the information. I speak against the motion."

Chair Zimpfer: "This is my concern. I also object. This was voiced by several other Senators already today. I, as Chair, had a Senator reach out about their concerns on faculty affairs regarding Senate Document 25-19 and any follow-up discussions from Senate Document 25-19 leading to Senate Document 25-25. I did receive a response from Senator Cameron specifically asking what work had been done on Senate Document 25-19, what discussions, and that the request I received from a Senator said that no discussions had taken place. I am reading from the email, which I am happy to share. It says, Dear Mark, thank you for passing this on. No. Faculty

Affairs Committee has not specifically discussed the contents of Senate Document 25-19.' They go on to say that 'It was firmly established at this time that it was the Steering Committee's responsibility.'

The Steering Committee is to help set the Agenda for the Senate. This is my concern, if Faculty Affairs has not discussed this, how many others of the six standing committees that are quoted or stated here that reports have been received? What was the discussion then? This is definitely in Faculty Affairs' wheelhouse, but if they did not discuss this that it discussed Senate Document 25-19, then why are we rushing towards a vote? In fact, on Steering Committee, there were five to four on whether this document should even be on the Agenda for this meeting. I see concerns from committees, but yet the committees are listed in this document, Senate Document 25-25, that a report has been received and it looks like it is full steam ahead. I have grave concerns that we have actually done our due diligence. Thank you."

Senator Duffy: "Thank you, acting Chair Ramirez. I would like to add to what Past Chair Leung said about the 70% of Senators, what it says there in the rationale. I agree that it was not 78% of Senators that voted in favor of holding a no confidence vote. That is kind of misrepresenting what happened that day. We agreed to put it on the Agenda, and have it discussed that day, but that is really a misrepresentation. To follow on to what Senator Rocheford had asked for, in this case, if you will permit me, I would like to provide some additional information, but not to take a position on this as a for or against. I would like to provide the additional information on behalf of EPC, the Educational Policy Committee. The EPC would not necessarily take a position in and of itself for or against, but as a part of Senate Document 25-25, I would like to provide this information that is shared as a part of Senate Report 25-02 that was bundled with Senate Document 25-25."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "It is appropriate if it is addressing directly the document that we are considering now."

Senator Duffy: "Thank you. The EPC provided Senate Report 25-02, which is included with Senate Document 25-25, though it was not described directly so far when Senate Document 25-25 was introduced. I would like to have the opportunity here to explain a little bit of what happened in a few additional meetings that followed the past Senate meeting, but proceeded, came before steering committee's meeting on April 3rd. So additional insights and observations were made by Educational Policy Committee that have occurred through various activities of the Educational Policy Committee over the recent 18 months since I have been chair. Those were during the academic year 24/25 and during the academic year 25/26, the current year, as well as a number of other mechanisms of communication between Purdue administration and the University Senate.

This report is submitted on behalf of the EPC considering those insights, observations, and experiences that we had during that period. Following three recent EPC meetings that took place after the March Senate meeting, this report is presented here as an informational document. It is an EPC report to the University.

Senate, which we think is consistent with the way in which the original charge came. As a part of American Institute for Parliamentarian's rules, an informational document can be considered as a main motion on the agenda, but we in EPC agreed to have it bundled with Senate Document 25-25 as it was originally presented here today.

No vote was needed by EPC in order to present this if it was presented for information only. This is partly why I am not trying to take a position with this, Acting Chair Ramirez. This mechanism is invoked on behalf of EPC to support fairness, efficiency, and clarity. Various matters were discussed in EPC in recent meetings and a statement from EPC is shared as a part of this report in appendix one. That document in appendix one, that statement was revised based on all attendees' input from those three meetings over the course of that time preceding the Senate Steering Committee's meeting that was expected by us on April 3rd. We were not sure how this report might end up in Agenda, but it was considered in advance in various ways. The final wording in appendix one was based on the various ways in which this report may have been considered.

This is consistent with what we expected. The first part of the statement in appendix one is shared with regard to discoveries that were made by the EPC pertaining to university operations under provost authority. Additionally, there is a second portion of the statement in appendix one that has included that pertains to the ethics and compliance related aspects of Senate Document 25-19 as originally presented in the February meeting, and the 12 whereas statements that were referred to EPC by the Senate leadership at the February meeting of the university Senate. Appendix two in the Senate Report 25-02 contains the agenda of the three meetings that were in EPC at that time before the Steering Committee meeting met on April 3rd.

Appendix three of the Senate Report 25-02 contains information that was shared by the Senate on Friday, March 20th, and that was before the March 23rd. Senate meeting about the creation of the position that was called the Provost Fellow for Shared Governance. That position was discussed in the Chair's report at the EPC meetings, and this information is relevant to EPC due to the dual role plan that was established by the Provost Office that had been maintained for the EPC chair. The Educational Policy Committee still has the opportunity to follow up with the Provost's office to ask questions pertaining to information that was provided recently that came in similar timing to the Steering Committee's meeting on April 3rd. but came after the timing of the three EPC meetings that preceded that Steering Committee meeting. We were invited to do so by Provost Wolfe, as noted in the update in appendix one and in the Senate Report that is 25-03 that is also bundled with Senate Document 25-25. I would like to keep these independent for the moment, but I wanted to let you know that it is the wish of the educational policy committee members to be able to follow up with regard to the substance of the issues in Senate Document 25-19 and be informed of the expected academic processes pertaining to the whereas statements in Senate Document 25-19 that were referred to the EPC at the February Senate meeting.

If you will allow me, I would like to start with the appendix three, work backwards to appendix two and appendix one, because I think each of these is relevant in its own way and helps to provide additional information supportive of people's consideration, the Senator's consideration of Senate Document 25-25 as we proceed. I will stop for a minute to just request your permission to continue on the appendix three to clarify this information that had been provided to the Senate in advance of our Senate meeting on the 23rd. of March but did not end up in the discussion about Senate Document 25-19 at the time it was presented at the Senate meeting."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "Thank you, Senator Duffy. I note that the two reports that you are referring to, Senate Report 25-02 and Senate Report 25-03 are listed as references in Senate Document 25-25. If I understand correctly, your thinking is that these reports need to be available to the Senators for consideration before any action is taken on Senate Document 25-25. Is that correct?"

Senator Duffy: "Although they did go out with the Agenda, I am not sure that the Senators all had an opportunity to review and consider them, and especially because the Provost's response was not considered directly as a part of the presentation of Senate Document 25-25 and the appendices three, two, and one that are part of Senate Report 25-02 were also not presented directly as a part of Senate Document 25-25, I would appreciate the opportunity to go in a little bit of detail here and then entertain questions that may arise as I present this as an informational document without necessarily taking a position one way or the other on the vote."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "I have not recognized Senator Cameron he had his hand up. I also know Senator Bosman, but she has been recognized before. I would like to give opportunity as indicated in the guidelines for this discussion to Senator Cameron."

Senator Stephen Cameron: "Thank you, Chair. I am responding to Chair Zimpfer's reading of my email to him regarding complaints about FAC's dealing of this. He read exactly one sentence of a two-page email, which details in much more detail the actions of FAC discussing items within the motions brought by steering committee are relevant to this. I can read this entire email if we wish, but his selective reading of one sentence rather misrepresented my response. I would also note that that response was sent to the Senate President on the 3rd. of April, so two and a half weeks ago. I have received no acknowledgement or discussion of that email between then and now."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "Thank you for the clarification. Just in the interest of time and to allow others to participate in the discussion, I am going to hold on deciding whether I will invite you to read the whole document, but perhaps a brief summary of what your take is on the content as opposed to one sentence."

Senator Cameron: "The FAC has previously discussed topics covered by the resolution, including in particular the dissolution of the Honors College and the fate of the faculty associated with it, the childcare resolutions, post-tenure review, and various other topics that are covered by this. We have discussed them as individual items, not as the whole document that came from steering. FAC has discussed the topics relevant to this discussion, not this document as such."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "Senator Manuel you have not had the opportunity to speak, so please go ahead. I will recognize you."

Senator Ryan Manuel: "Thank you, Senator Ramirez. I had a quick question. Maybe it is because I am new to this role, but a question to the sponsors. What is the goal of a vote of no confidence? Given the Senate's advisory role, what is the ultimate goal here in serving as in advisory capacity? What do we hope to achieve out of this?"

Vice Chair Ramirez: "Senator Weinberg. Can you address the question, please?"

Senator Weinberg: "There are a few things that a vote of note confidence can do. First of all, it is an act of care and concern for the institution. It is something that has taken at great professional risk in a climate where there is widespread fear of retaliation and yet shows a resolve to advocate for a certain kind of boundary of acceptability so that we can move meaningfully towards repair. That is my understanding of what a vote of confidence is really about."

Senator Bosman: "I wanted to bring attention to the Senate that this resolution document has references attached, so there are actually 13 pages associated with the Senate Document 25-25, and that includes references. Anybody is able to submit information for references, and you will see in there that there's, again, maybe some selective snippets that were brought forth by EPC, but then there is also the actual printout that shows the response from the Provost. That was requested last time at the last meeting, but we did not have the information at the time. That information has been attached as references to Senate Document 25-25. Thank you."

Senator Weinberg: "I want to clarify one thing that I noticed when the emails flashed across the screen during Senator Duffy's comments. It appears as though the CC lines had been removed from that email. The entire Steering Committee, including President Chiang, had been CC'd when I first requested a response from the Provost. And that response, unfortunately, we did not receive until the morning of the March Senate meeting, and that is the only reason it was not included. It is also why it has now been subsequently included with Senate Document 25-25.

I was also hoping to ask a point of information. I was looking at the minutes from the April 2nd EPC meeting, and it seems there was a resolution for the EPC's consideration and a possible vote, but I know that this information document is being presented without a vote. I am hoping to clarify what the resolution was that was presented for a vote as a point of information. Thank you."

Senator Duffy: "Thanks, Senator Weinberg. The resolution that was presented at the previous meeting was one that offered that I could request that we remove the Agenda item for Senate Document 25-19 until we could further deliberate. The information that is coming as a part of this informational document, the report to Senate separately was submitted without the need for a vote, although all the members had an opportunity to weigh in on the wording of it. I hope that helps to clarify. One was related to Senate Document 25-19 as an Agenda item. One was related to providing additional information, this report, in regard to Senate Document 25-25, as it was expected that it would be presented to Steering Committee on April 3rd.

As a point of additional clarification, and I understand Senator Weinberg's comment and the note about the formal response by Provost Wolfe in regard to the request that came on the Thursday afternoon before spring break. I feel that the information that was made available in advance of the Senate meeting on the Friday before on the 20th of March is relevant in this case and can be considered as a part of Provost Office response, even though it does not look like a direct response to the original request that was CC'd to the others, as is noted by Senator Weinberg. I am going to now refer to this appendix three in that report.

The timing of this document is important for the colleagues to note. Again, in the context of making decisions on confidence or no confidence, I think it is important to note that on the 20th of March, after a lot of deliberation and cooperation with colleagues that were in the Senate, the Provost Office in partnership with the University Senate announced the new role to help improve faculty engagement and strengthen communication between the Senate and the Provost Office. On the 20th of March, they mentioned that the Provost's Fellow for Faculty Governance and shared governance would be tasked with certain strategic projects that were designed to analyze and promote best practices for academic shared governance, and that the Provost Office noted, particularly on Friday, that before the 23rd. March, that they were eager to work closely with the new Provost fellow and the Senate leadership to enhance the relationship between the faculty and Purdue administration. This note was sent to all Senators, was not addressed or acknowledged on the day that Senate Document 25-19 was presented on the 23rd of March.

I would like to work backwards in that document, which is Senate Report 25-02, appendix two. Appendix two is relevant. Part of the reason appendix three is relevant here, and the reason I am trying to give it to you in this order is so that you can kind of see the path by which the EPC came to its conclusion in appendix one. You will see there that there was a discussion about the first, the Agenda item 25-19 as a part of the business of the three meetings of EPC that preceded the Steering Committee meeting on April 3rd.. The EPC members gave me authority to request, if it were necessary, that removal of the Agenda item that was pertaining to Senate Document 25-25 if it seemed reasonable to do so. Based on the observations that we made at the very beginning, I left it alone. The EPC allowed me that authority after they had considered it in three separate meetings of EPC.

The informational document we discussed at that meeting to let the colleagues know and to consider the idea of bringing an informational document on behalf of EPC following the queries to the Provost's Office because the individual reports that if they were available to Steering Committee did not make their way to Senate Document 25-19 or Senate Document 25-25. We had that discussion and I did that as chair in the March meetings in EPC. The information that we had during those EPC meetings was made available to me, some of it in time for steering committee, but some of it not in time for EPC members to see. We shared the documents afterward, including this report, based on all that we had discussed during the meeting. Again, the Provost's formal reply came after our last EPC meeting, so I wanted to make that note.

Additionally, with appendix two, I wanted to bring to your attention that is a consideration for exploration of the 12 whereas statements that came to the EPC from the February meeting and Steering Committee and what came to us after the Senate meeting. We invited the VP for ethics and compliance, Alysa Christmas Rollock, to the EPC meeting. She has experience in prior Purdue admin, and she could consider a number of different aspects of this. I found out later that she is also an advisor to Faculty Affairs. Before the meeting, I asked her if she would speak on the role of the Senate and fair university process and the role of fair process in the University Senate. She agreed to address EPC in that regard. I bring this to your attention again so that the colleagues can consider her comments to the EPC that influenced EPC's notes in Appendix one before voting on no confidence.

The fourth item there is the resolution or the statement that is for consideration for you as a part of appendix one in Senate Report 25-02 that was brought to the EPC for consideration and modified in its wording. We did not need to vote because it was an informational or part of an informational document. It was shared in the EPC meetings, was considered in detail, and worded and reworded before we brought it to Senate as a part of appendix one here in the report. I would like to collaborate through with you, even though Senator Bosman said that this report is available, especially because we're trying to set aside the rules for voting today without first reading, I would like to have the formality here of reading to you more directly what is in Senate Report 25-02, the report, which is in appendix one. Again, if there is an objection right now, I will stop and leave to others. If there is no objection, I would like to go through with you because I think that the details of this are critical."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "Thank you, Senator Duffy. Let me recognize two individuals that have not risen to speak before, and then we will come back to you. Senator Jarriel."

Senator Katie Jarriel: "Thank you. I want to first state that I am speaking in favor of Senate Document 25-25. My specific statement is in response to Senator Duffy's claim that the new Provost fellow can be read as a response from the Provost Office based on the timeline of this occurring on the 20th of March. This is my read of that announcement about what that fellow's role is and will be. There was basic information lacking about what this role is, what is the specific job description? What are the tasks? What is the term of the role?

I would like to know how Senator Duffy was selected for that role, who participated in that decision making in more detail? Was there a call for Senators who might also be interested in serving in that role? And how was Senator Duffy chosen from among potential candidates? Given the overall lack of transparency about this new role, I am curious, how will this fellow ensure anonymity and build trust with Senators, faculty, and staff about concerns that are being brought forward? It was my personal conclusion upon reading that announcement email that this was yet another in a pattern of opaque and unilateral decision making coming from the Provost's Office. Thank you."

Senator Ximena Bernal: "Thank you. I would like to raise concerns about a potential conflict of interest, and I would like Chair Ramirez to consider whether Senator Duffy is in conflict of interest, given that he was selected as a Provost Fellow in a process that lacked transparency, and he has been strongly pushing the Educational Policy Committee appendices first to include it and later on to remove it. I would like to have more information about whether he is, as the appointed Provost Fellow and also the EPC Chair, in conflict of interest. Could you please comment on that?

Vice Chair Ramirez: "I believe that Senator Duffy is doing his work in dual roles."

Senator Bernal: "Thank you, Chair Ramirez. I agree that he is doing his job as the chair of the EPC. I am asking directly whether this represents a conflict of interest given that he was selected as the Provost fellow in a non-transparent process."

Vice Chair Ramirez: "I cannot comment to the process with transparency or not, but he is in both roles. I just repeat myself."

Chair Zimpfer: "Thank you, Chair Ramirez. In response to Senator Cameron, he is 100% correct. There are two pages, a two-page email, at least when you print off the email. My concern is not with how Faculty Affairs conducted their business. They are one of our most outstanding committees. My concern is the discussion points they had been scattered over the last academic year. We are not aware of all the discussions they had about the different issues that Senator Cameron listed before that they have discussed. So how are we to take as a body, how are we to take all of the discussions they had at various meetings throughout the academic year and roll those up into no discussion on Senate Document 25-19 as a collective body? That was the question I was raising."

Senator Bosman: "Thank you. I would like to object to any more comments from Senator Duffy. When we received the information documents on April 3rd., it was clear to note that EPC had not had an opportunity to review it in a committee yet. Unfortunately, the documents were not ready to be shared, and so their request was made to update the formatting only, but over the weekend, lots of new information was found. Because of this and the lack of transparency and the misinformation that is being shared, I make a request for Senator Duffy to stop speaking."

Senator Zelaznik: "Thank you, Julio. I want to say that these issues have been around for a good part of this semester and the previous year. We are spending a lot of time on what I am going to call the details of these documents, but the faculty are well aware of some of the issues in the Provost Office, and we do need to make a clear vote one way or the other, and then President Chiang can decide how to proceed. We can move on from here. Thank you."

Vice Chair Ramirez: “I recognize Senator Duffy and then Senator Zimpfer. At that point in time, I am going to ask the question if more discussion is necessary to take an action by this committee. I have entertained the discussion because it is an important matter. I believe that if you have something to say, you should have the opportunity, with respect to the motion, you should have the opportunity to speak. However, at some point in time, we need to call for the question, I believe. Let me recognize Senator Duffy and then Senator Zimpfer.”

Senator Duffy: “Respectfully, to Senator Bosman, I tried to present these information reports without taking a position here, but would like to request, especially as Provost Wolfe had provided information to Steering Committee, and that information was not previously discussed here in any detail so far at the Senate meeting, I would like to request that we call for additional information from Trent Klingerman, the Chief-of-Staff to President Mung before we deliberate further on Senate Document 25-25. Chair Ramirez, I would like to request your permission to call for additional information and for additional clarification on a number of points that did come directly from Provost Wolfe’s office which were not discussed so far.”

Vice Chair Ramirez: “I appreciate the importance of the matter, and I need to balance both the amount of information that is being provided real time to the Senators. I am sure they will consider your comments when they do whatever action is necessary. Possibly could be an amendment to the motion. That is within the range of the possible actions during this discussion here. However, at this time, let me take on Senator Zimpfer's questions.”

Chair Zimpfer: “Thank you, Chair Ramirez. I think we should all be concerned. Senator Bosman requested that Senator Duffy stop speaking, and that is part of the issue. This should be heavily debated. Senator Bosman was the sponsor or author of Senate Document 25-19, and yet as Chair of the Steering Committee, no one stopped her from speaking in the Steering Committee, even though she was the author of that. I do not feel like that is appropriate behavior or an appropriate request to have Senator Duffy silenced.”

Senator Updegraff: “In all my past speaking to the Senate, I have been limited to three minutes and often cut off, and I have been cut off before my three minutes are up. Can there be a rule where we have a time limit? Because as you mentioned, there is a lot remaining on our Agenda and we have 20 minutes left.”

Senator Zelaznik: “One, Professor Zimpfer’s comments are out of order, just to make that clear, but there are certain issues which many of us do not know a lot of the details about that need to be brought to the forefront, such as the removal of candidates for promotion one day before the Board of Trustees meeting. Actions such as that are unprecedented and lead me to worry about the competency of the Provost’s Office. Thank you.”

Recognizing the amount of time that had passed on the discussion of Senate Document 25-25, Secretary Camp suggested that a Senator could make a motion to close debate and vote immediately. The differences between this type of motion in

Roberts' Rules of Order versus the AIP Manual were clarified as follows: In the AIP Manual, a motion to close debate and vote immediately requires a second, is not debatable, is amendable, and requires a two-thirds majority vote for approval.

Following the clarification of the motion to close debate and vote immediately, Senator Sarah LaRose stated the motion: "I call the previous question to close debate and vote immediately on the main motion." Senator LaRose's motion was seconded by Senator Zelaznik.

A Zoom poll was conducted and the motion to close debate and vote immediately passed with 64 votes in favor and 20 votes in opposition with no abstentions. The 76% vote in favor surpassed the two-thirds majority requirement.

Next, a Zoom poll was conducted on the motion to approve Senate Document 25-25. The motion carried with 60 votes in favor, 21 votes in opposition, and with 2 abstentions. The abstentions were removed and the percentage of 74.1% surpassed the two-thirds majority vote required for approval.

Given the difficulties encountered with the attempt to use a Qualtrics survey for voting and in answer to a question from Past Chair Leung about this matter, it was noted that the Office of the Secretary of Faculties will be investigating the options available for secure secret electronic voting.

Vice Chair Ramirez now handed the virtual gavel back to Chair Zimpfer. At this time, Senator LaRose made a motion to recess the current Senate meeting until a date and time specified by the Senate Steering Committee. Senator Zelaznik seconded the motion. This type of motion is not debatable and requires a simple majority for approval. The motion to recess the current Senate meeting until a date and time specified by the Steering Committee carried with 56 votes in favor and 21 votes in opposition. Steering Committee Chair Bosman will convene a meeting of the Steering Committee to determine the date and time to reconvene the current Senate meeting. The April University Senate is in recess as of 4:50 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on this 20th day of April 2026.

10. Senator Bosman, Chair of the Steering Committee, presented the Résumé of Items under consideration by the various Senate Standing Committees [Appendix B].

The University Senate reconvened from its April recess at 2:40 p.m. on the 4th of May 2026. Chair Zimpfer recognized the Chair of the Steering Committee, Lisa Bosman, to present the Résumé of Items under Consideration by the various Senate Standing Committees.

Chair Bosman called on the Chair of each Senate Standing Committee to provide any updates on their respective ROI.

11. The Consent Agenda was presented to the Senate, For Action.
    a. Senate Document 25-26 Nominees for the Educational Policy Committee
    b. Senate Document 25-27 Nominees for the Community Connection Committee

c. Senate Document 25-28 Nominees for the Faculty Affairs Committee
d. Senate Document 25-29 Nominees for the Nominating Committee
e. Senate Document 25-30 Nominees for the Steering Committee
f. Senate Document 25-31 Nominees for the Student Affairs Committee
g. Senate Document 25-32 Nominees for the University Resources Policy Committee

Chair Zimpfer reminded the Senators that a Consent Agenda allows a body to group items together that are likely to be uncontroversial or to require little discussion and decide them all at once. If any member requests that an item from the Consent Agenda be pulled out for individual discussion, that request is granted without debate. There were no nominations from the floor and no requests to pull an item from the Consent Agenda. The Consent Agenda was approved by general consent.

12. Senator Lori Hoagland introduced Senate Document 25-16 PSG and PGSG Resolution Calling for Expanded Voter Accessibility- Amended, for Action.

Senator Lori Hoagland: "I move that the Senate adopt Document 25-16 PSG and PGSG Resolution Calling for Expanded Voter Accessibility- Amended" Her motion was seconded. Senator Hoagland opened the discussion of the document.

Senator Hoagland: "As we all know, the right to vote is essential to a well-functioning democracy, and it is also an important component of our civic duty. However, voting in national elections, any elections really is a challenge for students, and other universities have acknowledged this by canceling classes on election day, but that has been something here at Purdue various Senate resolutions have just decided not to support. Last year, the URPC did advance a resolution asking instructors to not have quizzes or exams on election day to help students with voting, but there was no teeth or consequences to that. In response to this, the PSG and the PGSG put together this resolution on adding some additional things to support voter accessibility on campus. We talked about this previously in the semester but put it on hold because the Purdue administration had held the town hall and did some other things to support voting resolutions.

While the students and all of us were supportive of that and happy to see that, the discussion was really all around how to enhance voter accessibility here in Tippecanoe County with having more access on campus and things like that to support voting day elections. But we do not think it went far enough in supporting the 90% of our students who are actually not registered to vote in Tippecanoe County and who do not want to, want to stay registered in their home counties, so that their votes count on local issues. This resolution has two things to help support students. First, the primary thing is adding election day class in session to the academic calendar, and we think this will increase awareness among instructors to just plan for trying not to schedule quizzes and exams. There is nothing that says they cannot, but it will maybe support greater awareness around that.

Secondly, it will suggest that the Registrar's Office does not schedule exams automatically for large classes, either the evening prior to elections or the evening of elections. This would allow students who are not registered here in Tippecanoe County to go back to their home counties either the night before an election to vote in the morning if they need to or to leave early so they can vote at home and not have to worry about getting back that night for an evening exam."

Senator Trish Morita-Mullaney: "I would like to recognize that this is a wonderful idea. I do not think that it is technically difficult to administer and will send a powerful message to faculty, instructors, and teaching assistants to allow students to engage civically in our democracy by allowing them to vote."

PSG Vice President Nicholas Neuman: "I served as the Vice President of Purdue Student Government, and was elected out last Wednesday, but I did also serve as the author of this bill. To give some more context based off of what Senator Hoagland has said, this has been reviewed by the registrar's office as well and the amendments made in the committee within URPC or upon their recommendations primarily, and this was a concern from the last Senate session, but this of course is looking to amend the Registrar's policy for large scale examinations. I think for the last Senate session, there was confusion around if this would impact individual professors and their classrooms. I did want to offer that clarification for this bill. This bill has been in the works for the past two years with Senator Hoagland and URPC and PGSG and PSG. Another limitation of this bill, while it does not include the primary election, because those are not on a set basis, this is primarily or exclusively for the actual election day as defined by the Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Thank you."

Past Chair Leung: "I have been, of course, engaged with this and thinking about this topic for the last few years. For a little bit, I was wondering why aren't students taking advantage of early voting? When I query my students, they remind me that it is not easier to get home and vote for earlier voting than it is to get home and vote on election day. So, I just wanted to introduce that as part of the conversation that there are early voting opportunities, but that still means that at some point you have to leave West Lafayette and go to vote. That is all I have to share."

Senator Kyle Haynes: "There is nothing requiring individual faculty not to schedule exams? That was a suggestion that we had last year, and I think that it would still be part of it. And just the putting it on the calendar raises that awareness. The actual prohibition of scheduling exams has to do with the Registrar's Office, and that is for the large classroom exams. That is generally not something faculty have capacity or who schedules that, that's the Registrar's Office. It would not impact faculty directly."

Past Chair Leung: "Just for our edification, I am asking the Secretary of Faculties this question. If we pass a document, I know it goes into our archive. How are the responsible parties notified about our advice to whoever? So, if this were to pass, for example, how is the passage of this sent on in an advisory way? How does that go forward?"

Chair Zimpfer recognized Registrar Sheila Hurt to answer Past Chair Leung's question.

Registrar Sheila Hurt: "Since I am an advisory member to this committee, we just follow along when there are changes made to the regulations and I pass that on to a member of my team who updates the catalog. And I would just direct the Associate Registrar who oversees evening exam scheduling to change their processes. I know that we have talked a lot about how this body is advisory, but for things like this, we usually, if the Senate votes for it and it is just in academic regulations like this, we act on it unless I was directed not to, if that answers that question. I will say when this first came up, I was a little concerned. We would normally try to avoid putting things on the academic calendar that are just information like this, but I understood what Senator Hoagland was saying. If we are asked to do that, we certainly would. We have done that before.

I did look at numbers from fall of '24. We had a total of 23 exams scheduled on the night before and the night of election night. So, while it is technically not difficult to administer, I will just offer, that means those exams have to get moved to other days, so there will be more exam conflicts that students have to deal with. So, I just hope that faculty will be understanding when students report that they have conflicts and that faculty, in addition to wanting to support students' right to vote here, would take that in mind when they are trying to deal with students who need to reschedule their exams."

Senator Wayne Campbell: "Just for point of clarification, does this initiative include recommendations on exams given during finals week? Because this is finals week, election day is tomorrow. Would this cover where we would be asking people or recommending that there is no finals on an election day during finals week?

PSG Vice President Neuman: "Yes. This resolution specifically is for the federal election day in November. It does not include primary days because primary days vary by state. Although Indiana has a specific policy, obviously primary is tomorrow, this policy does not address the primary because that is more fluid when compared to the federal election in November. That would be a potential expansion of legislation or of the policy in the future. What we were looking for was actionable baby steps that could be taken to address voter accessibility for students on campus."

Following the discussion, the motion to adopt Senate Document 25-16 carried by general consent.

While Senator Duffy was working to resolve communication technical difficulties, the Senate members were asked if they approved moving to consider Item 15, Senate Document 25-22 Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee Joint Proposal on Childcare Challenges at Purdue. There were no objections from the Senate body to adjust the Agenda as suggested. Senator Duffy will be recognized following this discussion.

13. Senate Document 25-22 was presented by Senator Morita-Mullaney, For Action.

Senator Morita-Mullaney made a motion to adopt Senate Document 25-22. Her motion was seconded. Senator opened the discussion.

Senator Morita-Mullaney: "Currently, the childcare centers are at capacity, and they are having difficulty finding willing staff for such roles. With the closure of one of these campuses, there are concerns that we will no longer be able to address the need and the demand for high quality childcare. Currently, on-campus childcare slots are 378, Purdue, West Lafayette without the PUECEC, which is proposed to close in May this month. We will go down to 258.

Our proposal is that the decision makers, whoever they may be, publish the reasons for the closure of PUECEC and its combination with the Jischke Center, furnish transparent and accurate data on the number of young children on wait lists by age level, infant, toddler, and preschool, tie university subsidies for childcare providers, teachers to earn a fair and commensurate wage relative to the greater Lafayette area to address teacher shortages, actively solicit a second external provider to take over the current PUECEC space and increase total available childcare slots on campus and continue to subsidize childcare programming. Thank you.

In answer to a question from Past Chair Leung, it was suggested that this document should be passed to the Office of the Treasurer or one of the subordinate offices reporting to the Treasurer for consideration and possible action. Chair Zimpfer emphasized that he would ensure this document is received by the appropriate administrative office, assuming it is approved by the Senate.

Senator Updegraff: "I wanted to follow up on this in part because I do not know what happened with the Senate's effort to do the town hall if that has reached anyone outside of the Senate committee. My understanding of the goal of the town hall would be to share that information with the upper administration, and I think that's why people participated. I have been receiving a lot of questions about it. That was originally part of this proposal, but we took it out because the town hall happened, but we do not have any updates on where that has gone. And I was wondering if you could update us to help this discussion."

Chair Zimpfer: "Let us come back to that question in just a minute. I want to see if Senator Zelaznik has anything to add to the discussion or other questions."

Senator Zelaznik: "The university should be ashamed of its lack of sustained effort to help our young faculty, and particularly our young faculty who are spouses and have young children. I am far removed from having young children, but I remember the struggles that we had in the mid-1980s and the numbers have gotten a little better, but we should be morally and ethically committed to providing childcare for all of our faculty and staff that require and need it. Thank you."

Past Chair Leung: "Based on what we have heard today, I want to recommend going forward for the incoming Chair and Vice Chair that as part of our process after the

Senate meeting, that we do in fact actually, with intention, notify the appropriate people when we pass a document so that we're not merely counting on awareness. That is just a suggestion for next semester, but this was, I think, a good time to, while it is on our minds, to recommend it."

Senator Morita-Mullaney: "Just to reinforce, the young couples that Senators Zelaznik was speaking to that come either pre- or post-children, childbearing, whatever may be the case, oftentimes are leaving their immediate family networks and their collegial and professional networks to come to this new place called Purdue University and therefore are more reliant on trustworthy Purdue University furnished childcare as they are not going to be familiar with the area. The fact that they have to be placed themselves on a waiting list that may never conclude suggest that they are not going to be as productive as they would like to be, nor are we being complimentary to supporting the efforts that they give to us as university scholars.

Senator Updegraff: "To expand on Senator Morita-Mullaney's point, there is also this enormous shortage in the West Lafayette area. The Purdue shortage is not just Purdue, it is the community, so that leaves them less options and it further hurts the community because we take spots that other people are also trying to secure."

Chair Zimpfer noted that he would provide an update on the results from the Childcare Town Hall during "New Business."

Following the discussion, the motion to adopt Senate Document 25-22 carried by general consent.

14. Senator Vincent Duffy introduced Senate Document 25-20, Senate Proposal for Withdrawal Policy Updates, For Action.

    Senator Duffy: "I would like to move that the Senate adopt the Senate document 25-20, which is related to that proposal for withdrawal policy updates."

    His motion was seconded, and he opened the discussion.

    Senator Duffy: "Last time we focused more on the rationale, and we worked with the Educational Policy Committee with Jeff Elliott, Jeff Stefancic, Lesa Beals from Registrar and Heather Servaty-Seib oversaw some of this as an advisor to EPC as we were looking at the documentation and answering questions associated with it. Today, I want to emphasize a little bit of the part that is related to this idea that we are clarifying on behalf of students how they can submit appeals. It is a change to the documentation in terms of regulations and the way in which course assignments are seen from policy standpoint. There is a document that is in Office of the Dean of Students, which would be related to withdrawals that students will be facing to clarify these issues. One is if there is an attempt to cancel classes in the weeks 14 through 16 after normal semester withdrawals, then that would come under this withdrawal policy.

The idea about clarifying how students can submit appeals for a prior semesters is also part of this. There is a one-year calendar timing that's also part of this. And the idea about understanding which units participate in the review of these appeals is part of this as well. So we worked with Jeff Elliot, who's the executive director of the University Undergraduate Academic Advising, Jeff Stefancic, who is a Senior Associate Dean of Students, and Jeff Elliott cooperated with Heather Servaty-Seib to try to make sure that on behalf of Teaching and Learning that this modification to policy was something that was benefiting students and the details of the documents we reviewed last time. EPC voted in favor of this 14 to zero. There were four Advisors, two students, and eight faculty that were a part of that vote."

Following the discussion, the motion to adopt Senate Document 25-20 carried by general consent.

15. Senator Vincent Duffy introduced Senate Document 25-21, Office of Admissions Proposal for Addition of Reentry Policy to Academic Regulations, For Action.

    Senator Duffy: "I would like to move that the Senate adopt the Senate document 25-21, which is related to the Office of Admissions Proposal for Reentry."

    His motion was seconded, and he opened the discussion.

    Senator Duffy: "Last time we focused more on the details of the change and the modified language and the rationale of the proposal today, I wanted to reemphasize this idea about defining the term reentry, which was done in cooperation with the colleagues from enrollment management. We worked with Kathleen Ferrero, who is Associate Director of Admissions, and Megan Dorton, Senior Associate with Admissions also, Senior Associate Director. And in that, we defined the term reentry and described the instances which a student might need to apply for reentry and the majors in which they can apply.

    The reference toward the top of the document shows the link to where this now resides in the registration and course assignment information as a part of enrollment management. And there was an effort now to shift the placement of the policy. This is partly why I am emphasizing where it resides now, shifting the placement of the policy from the Office of Admissions website to the university's academic regulations. We went through some details with this. Kathleen Ferrero's with us if questions arise. The EPC voted 11 to zero in favor of this proposal at the time. There were six faculty, four advisors, and one student on the day of the vote."

    Following the discussion, the motion to adopt Senate Document 25-20 carried by general consent.

16. Senator Vincent Duffy introduced Senate Document 25-23, Edits to the Academic Regulations Regarding Summer Calendar, For Action.

    Senator Duffy: "I move that the Senate adopt the document 25-23, which are the edits to academic regulations regarding the summer calendar."

His motion was seconded, and he opened the discussion.

Senator Duffy: “The last time we were together, we emphasized more in regard to the rationale and the proposed language for the modifications. I wanted to just confirm that the questions that were raised and the answers that we gave were confirmed either during the meeting or afterwards. There is no change based on the question and answer that we had in the first reading at the Senate in March. Today, I wanted to emphasize briefly just the proposal information that was emphasizing this idea that the modification would take place beginning in the summer of 2027. And this is, again, intended to support both instructors and students to improve the student experience and to allow some additional flexibility for programs and instructional innovation, which is really initiated many times by the faculty. EPC looked at this and felt that the proposal was basically favorable and questions that EPC members had before we brought it to first reading were all clarified. EPC voted 13 to zero with seven faculty, four Advisors, and two students on the day of the vote.”

Senator Jarriel: “I have in my notes from the last time we discussed this that Senator Williams had asked a question about study abroad courses, and I believe the response at that time that this was something that would need to be clarified. Was that something that has been followed up on since the last meeting?”

Registrar Hurt: “Last time when I got that question, I misspoke when I said that we would need to update the regulations. I talked to my team afterwards and learned that study abroad classes like that are typically considered an exception to the regs because they are not our classes. We did not change the language of the proposal, but the answer is the same that study abroad classes would continue to be allowed to be scheduled the way they are now. The ultimate answer is that nothing will change for city abroad. I was just incorrect when I said that we would amend the language. We do not need to because study abroad is an exception.”

Following the discussion, the motion to adopt Senate Document 25-20 carried by general consent.

17. Senator Vincent Duffy introduced Senate Document 25-24, Scholastic Recognition Graduation with Distinction- Update to Academic Regulations, For Action.

Senator Duffy: “I move that the Senate adopt the document 25-24, which is the scholastic recognition related to graduation with distinction.”

His motion was seconded, and he opened the discussion.

Senator Duffy: “On this one, we also worked with Jeff Elliott. And again, he is our Executive Director for University Undergraduate Academic Advising. I think of the four documents, and I appreciate the patience of the Senate in allowing us to bring both these for the first reading in March and then for the vote today. I think everyone in the EPC really felt that this was probably the most straightforward of the four documents. Last time we were together, we emphasized more on the rationale. We had a couple of questions that did kind of confirm, and we did during the meeting, stated this way, but we are able to verify afterward that there were reductions of the number of credits required in many degree programs. There is also this issue about the transfer singular articulation pathway, which was having more students coming in under transfer. We felt for many reasons that this proposal that was coming out of advising in cooperation with Office of Dean of Students, which was favorable to students.

The details of this were related to the change, reducing the minimum number of credits required to earn that distinction from 65 to 60. As Jeff Elliott mentioned last time, the original policies were back to about 1980, and we felt that this modification as requested here better reflected the needs of today's student population. I mentioned that issue of the transfer singular articulation pathway, which also requires 60 credits to be completed at Purdue. This alliance is our transfer path with what we have as students remaining with Purdue throughout their time. Details of the change were shown, described, and discussed last time. When EPC voted on this, it was 13 to zero with seven faculty, four Advisors, and two students at the time. Thank you."

Senator Zelaznik made a motion to amend the document by removing the word "only" from the first sentence of the second paragraph of the "Proposal" subheading of the document. As follows:

Current wording: "The proposed change enhances inclusivity for transfer students---many of whom enter Purdue through a Transfer Single Articulation Pathway (TSAP), which requires only 60 credits to be completed at Purdue."

Proposed wording: "The proposed change enhances inclusivity for transfer students---many of whom enter Purdue through a Transfer Single Articulation Pathway (TSAP), which requires 60 credits to be completed at Purdue."

His motion to amend the document was seconded. Discussion of the amendment occurred.

Registrar Hurt: "I think the part that we would actually change in the regulations is the part in the box. I just want to make sure I do not see the word only in there. We are just talking about the part in the proposal. Is that right? The language sort of in the preamble?"

Senator Zelaznik clarified that it was his intent with the amendment.

Registrar Hurt: "Certainly, I do not object. I mean, it is 60 credits. That makes sense to remove the word only. I would just say since what my team would update in the actual regulations is only the language that has outlined. I am not sure it matters, but if this goes in part of the official record, then yes, let us fix it."

Following the discussion, Senator Zelaznik's amendment was approved by general consent.

No additional discussion of the main motion occurred, and the motion to adopt Senate Document 25-24 was approved by general consent.

Following the approval of Senate Document 25-24, suggestions were made by incoming Chair Ramirez, Chair Zimpfer, and Past Chair Leung to ensure that there is follow-up with the appropriate administrative offices when Senate documents are passed. It was agreed that incoming Chair Ramirez and incoming Vice Chair Little will work on ensuring appropriate follow-up with the administration. Past Chair Leung also encouraged Senators to familiarize themselves with the Senate Bylaws so that they understand how the Senate operates during its meetings.

18. The scheduled presentation on Transportation and Public Safety was postponed as Vice President for Physical Facilities Jay Wasson had pre-existing commitments. He will be invited to present at the September Senate meeting.

19. New Business

Several matters were brought up during New Business that did not require approval by the Senate but served only as items for discussion.

- Senator Annmarie Nicely: "I have two main two. One is a group of questions concerning the promotion and tenure process, and it is a series of questions, and I am going to go through them very, very quickly. One is, what documentation is the faculty entitled to receive at each stage of the promotion and tenure process? What documentation are they entitled to receive? Number two, are there formal or informal avenues for seeking procedural clarifications during or after the review process? The third question in line with that, after the Board of Trustees decide, which procedural pathways remain available to the faculty? The last question in that series about promotion and tenure is, how can the Senate ensure that departments and colleges follow consistent and transparent procedures? This is a series of questions that I am not sure if anyone will be able to answer here or something to be considered for future discussion. That is one set of questions."

  Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Sunil Prabhakar responded to Senator Nicely. "Annmarie, I think what I would recommend is the first starting point would be to go to the Provost website. I am going to put that if I am able to in the chat. This website has a number of documents that address in detail procedures and other aspects of the promotion and tenure process, which I think will begin to address many of the questions you raised, but if they are not answered by what is on that website, I am happy to sit down with you and discuss the details. We are always open to continue to clarify and clean our process as we did this past semester."

- Senator Nicely: "The other question has to do with the newly formed Provost Fellow for Shared Governance. A question I received was, "is there going to be an operational plan once this office?' I know Senator Duffy is kind of working on things, but will there be an operational plan in place and will this be shared? Will it be transparent? Will it be shared with the faculty? What are the plans there as it relates to the Provost Fellow for Shared Governance? Will there be an operational plan?"

Senator Duffy: "I have been meeting with senators. We will address the issues that the Senators have raised. I can leave you my phone number, it is eight days a week. The operational plan will continue as we meet with the senators and as I continue to communicate with the colleagues in the provost office. My first line of communications was with the Teaching and Learning Office with Senior Vice Provost Haley Oliver. And dually, additional lines of communication have been made available to me through Vice Provost Sunil Prabhakar. I am standing at the ready. Anybody who contacts me, I am happy to meet. I have initiated many contacts. Some have replied, some have not. We have talked about priorities amongst the senators who have replied, and I will continue to do that.

I am really happy to serve in this role in support of communication and bridging. There are some issues that were raised in this meeting. They did not come directly to me. I am happy to be a facilitator for those communications, including childcare, things related to tenure. I have been hearing many issues from both sides. I am incredibly happy to tell you that what I have seen, especially on teaching and learning side, has just been very heartwarming for me over the last 18 months, maybe up to 24 months now, it is almost two years now in this role in EPC. What I have seen in faculty affairs, I am really, to be honest with you, happy because the questions that are raised are being answered. The issues are related many times to understanding about what it means and how we operate it at the department level. I have seen deans have also been working cooperatively on a routine basis with the Provost's Office. I think that some of what happens behind the scenes is not always so clear to the Senators, but I would also invite and welcome the Senators to continue and to initiate some of those communications with their administration, heads, associate heads, and Deans. I think as they continue to do that, the Senators will become more informed. And as Senators communicate with one another, they will also become more informed. We have outgoing Senators and incoming Senators; it is one of the important roles of the Senators to be able to communicate both with prior Senators. Senator Zelaznik is one of those examples to communicate with the incoming. It is a challenge for us having met in Zoom which separated us from one another. We have had communications with our administration; we have had communications in the Provost's Office. We have communications with these meetings with one another, but not as often among the Senators.

When we hear from our constituents, sometimes we gain understanding, but it does not get back to them. I am going to encourage, and have been doing so, those meetings between senators and their constituents, not just to find out what the constituents are saying that they are confused about or disappointed with, but to communicate back on behalf of the Provost's Office and administration, what they understand after they have gained the understanding. Again, I stand ready. It is eight days a week. I would be glad to meet with you and anybody who contacts me. I will give you my phone number. We can share it and we will continue to support in both directions back to the Senate, up to Provost and out to the administrators who are working directly with those faculties in the various academic units.

The operational plan continues to be formed as we continue to have these communications, as Provost Wolfe said, the role is an inaugural role, and it is being defined as we go. My experience is changing as we go, because as I mentioned, I had more experience with the teaching and learning side, but that continues to expand into faculty affairs and other aspects of the Senate and senator's interests and the opportunities to communicate up into admin have been increasing, not decreasing with the additional issues that have been raised through the meetings that we've been having.

Senator Nicely: "Thanks so much, Senator Duffy. I will meet with you."

- Senator Zelaznik: "I would like incoming Chair Ramirez to seriously consider having the Senate meetings go back to being in person. It is not a motion, but I believe the dialogue will be greatly increased if we have an in-person meeting, and hopefully we will still have no troubles meeting quorum. Thank you."

  Secretary Camp noted that Se'Andra Johnson has already reserved rooms in case the Senate decides to meet again in-person.

  Vice Chair Ramirez: "I strongly support the notion of seeing my colleagues face-to-face, maybe not every single meeting perhaps, but at least once a semester, because I think it would go a long way to achieving the goals of the Senate and our relationship in this shared governance with the administration."

  Senator Morita-Mullaney: "I would support returning to in-person meetings as we went online because of COVID and the pandemic is now behind us in a different way. Meeting in person I think would increase engagement and trustworthiness between administration and the Senate. Thank you."

  Senator Stephen Martin: "I agree with the desirability of meeting in person. However, I am sure I recall that there was a Qualtrics poll at some point and a pretty heavy vote to continue the Zoom meetings, which disappointed me, but democracy is democracy. Thank you."

  Senator Siener: "We meet in-person for all of our (PSG) Senate meetings. And I will say I am a big, big proponent of in-person meetings. I have seen the difference in engagement because of all of our summer meetings are virtually. The difference in engagement is extremely notable, I would say in productivity and just effectiveness overall. I am fully in support of in-person meetings."

Past Chair Leung: "I am excited that you are going to meet at least once, hopefully once in person. If that is the choice to send, it is a wise idea. Just for the record, Nush reported to me when I came on board that attendance, we were using the word engagement, but I also want to use the word attendance, and attendance did dramatically improve when we were holding them online, so keep track of that. Also, Senators have spoken to me for reasons why they prefer online and it has to do with the time of the Senate and childcare issues and their ability maybe to be at home and be at a meeting, picking up children and those kinds of things. As you are considering this, let us be sensitive to that because we can be out. We can stretch all the way to the end until five o'clock, but I am on board with it. I would actually come as an observer."

Senator Siener: "I will add that we have a standing committee. I would have to review our University Senate bylaws, but within our Purdue Student Government bylaws and constitution within our governing documents, as well as our Senate standing rules. We have a committee, a standing committee that specifically reviews removal of Senators when it comes to attendance issues. If we are struggling to meet quorum because we are not receiving attendance, then it is two. You are allowed two unexcused absences throughout the year. I would have to review. I do not know. I served as Purdue Student Government Vice President last year, so I need to brush up on that. But we have a committee that reviews any violations of attendance issues."

Senator Paul Mort: "Yes. In Materials Engineering, we often have meetings that are joint face-to-face with the opportunity to connect remotely. Is that a possibility for the Senate?"

Chair Zimpfer: "I do not think we have talked about every option. Incoming Chair Ramirez, you can correct me if I am wrong and Vice Chair Little, but we have discussed at least attempting a face-to-face again. I do not think we have talked about a mixed meeting, virtual and in-person, but that is something that the incoming Chair and Vice Chair, and I would take part as Past Chair in the conversations with the Senate team to see what that looks like, hopefully with a return to face-to-face, at least a trial balloon in the fall.

Vice Chair Ramirez: "I agree with you, Mark. The discussion has mainly been on are we going to return at some point in time to face-to-face, not the hybrid option that was mentioned by Senator Mort."

- Chair Zimpfer: "I will address the town hall question now. just a five second recap. It was well attended. We recorded so we could collect the notes. That turned into action items for me to track down additional information as well as have discussions with administration. Those have continued to come in, whether there are comments, questions, concerns, or additional data, including two yesterday. At this point, since we are rapidly running out of academic year, I will report out in written form to all Senators and all attendees of the town hall.

I have been worried that things come in every few days, so I keep hitting the pause button, but at this point, I think I would like to distribute what I have learned to date and the additional questions that have come in. And that does not mean that this would stop. It just means that I can report out before the end of the academic year and then would be happy with the consent of Incoming Chair Ramirez and Vice Chair Little, continue to work on this when we return in the fall. Obviously, we will share all the findings with both of you, but I would like to continue to take part in the fall."

Vice Chair Ramirez thanked Chair Zimpfer for his willingness to continue working on this issue in his upcoming role as Immediate Past Chair of the Senate.

Senator Updegraff: "Thanks so much for the update. Can you clarify what at this point has been shared with the administration? A lot of those parents really committed their time and energy to sharing their stories. And these changes are happening now. These classrooms are being combined in all the ways they talked about. I feel like this is a timely issue and a critical one to our faculty. I would like to be able to say more to everyone who has been asking me about what happened with the town hall. I mean, on their own, they already tried to collaborate with the provost office on many occasions. The Senate was really taking role here. I am wondering if you can tell us more about what exactly the Provost's Office knows about the town hall, what is the plan? Thanks."

Chair Zimpfer: "The Provost's Office was sent not all of the questions, because many of the questions that were raised in the town hall were duplicates, so they were put into buckets. I sent off a series of those buckets of questions and requested as much data as possible. Some of the requests I received, some via email wanting to know exactly what the employees of the childcare center were paid. We are not privy to that; the Provost's Office is not privy to that. That is a private company. They do not have to share that information. Regarding the transition of the rooms over the summer, again, that is a private company. I learned that the large motor room is officially approved by the state as a teaching room, and that at the end of the summer, it will go back to a large motor room, but I have a lot to share. I will send that out in the written update."

Senator Updegraff: "Have you received any information back from the provost office about these questions? Is that what you are going to share with us?"

Chair Zimpfer: "That is exactly correct."

Senator Updegraff: “That will come before the end of the academic year. I can let people know that?”

Chair Zimpfer: “Yes.”

Senator Morita-Mullaney: “I would like to reiterate; I asked this question during open question time during our April meeting in regard to the announcement of Dr. Phil VanFossen as our permanent Dean after three and a half years serving as a very capable interim dean. Dr. VanFossen has announced his retirement for spring of 2027, and we have no official start of a national search for his replacement when he retires. We are late to the game, so I would just like to put it on record. If you, Chair Zimpfer, could follow up with administration on the timing of that. At our last meeting, it was articulated that the board of trustees decisions on that, but my understanding is that the hiring of the Deans is at the purview of administration with approval from the board of trustees with the Board of Trustees not arbitrating on the process, so to speak. We would like clarity on timing and when. Not if, when. Thank you.”

Chair Zimpfer: “Incoming Chair Ramirez and Vice Chair Little, which should be on all of our to do lists. Noted. Thank you, Senator Morita. Any additional new business? Okay. Well, thank you all for joining with an additional meeting due to the recess. I appreciate your time, energy, and effort this past academic year. I hope you get a chance to rest over the summer, but knowing many of you, you will be just as busy over the summer as you have been during the academic year. Take care, safe travels. I hope you all enjoy a break and we will reconvene in September. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you.”

20. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

** Additional Appendix Documents Submitted Following the Meeting:*

Annual Reports

Community Connection Committee
Faculty Affairs Committee
Nominating Committee
Steering Committee
Student Affairs Committee
University Resources Policy Committee
Athletic Affairs
Budget Interpretation, Evaluation & Review
Grade Appeals Committee
Parking & Traffic Committee
Readmission & Academic Renewal
Staff Appeal Board for Traffic Regulation Committee
Sustainability Committee
University Library Committee
Academic Organization Committee
Undergraduate Curriculum Council

Status of Legislation 2025-26

Parking / Third-Party Vendors

Q: What factors are driving the administration's decision to seek third-party vendors for Purdue's parking system, and how will this transition affect costs and campus operations?

- Answer: The University is soliciting campus-wide input and evaluating whether a partner can provide additional benefits in managing and operating parking and transit on and around campus. No decisions have been made.

ADA Title II Compliance / Faculty Liability

Q: The ADA Title II Compliance frequently asked questions (FAQs) on the website https://www.purdue.edu/innovativelearning/tools-resources/accessibility/ada-title-ii-compliance-faqs/

The University's Office for Civil Rights oversees compliance with ADA and Title II and will monitor progress across the university. Failure to comply may result in significant fines, penalties, and other sanctions.

Are individual faculty personally liable for external sanctions other than those originating from Purdue University?

- Answer: There is generally no legal claim for individual liability under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, which focus on institutional compliance rather than personal liability for faculty.

To: The University Senate
From: Lisa Bosman, Chairperson of the Steering Committee
Subject: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

Steering Committee

Lisa Bosman, lbosman@purdue.edu

Advisory Committee

Mark Zimpfer, senate-chair@purdue.edu

Nominating Committee

Damon Lisch, dlisch@purdue.edu and Seema Mattoo, smattoo@purdue.edu

1. Managing committee vacancies
2. Evaluating and balancing numbers, disposition, and experience of Senators for equitable representation and task assignments.

Educational Policy Committee

Vincent Duffy, duffy@purdue.edu

1. Re-entry policy updates; to align with (admissions) practices
2. Withdrawal policy updates, supporting student success and advising
3. Graduation with distinction policy; update to (reducing) credit requirements
4. Summer Calendar Policy updates; consideration for length of term (formalizing flexibility)
5. Consideration of EPC items re: Senate res: 25-19 (formal review)
6. Scheduling in the context of Voter accessibility re: Senate res: 25-16 & URPC (University Resources)
7. AI competency; assessing and categorizing AI expectations

Community Connection Committee

Patricia (Trish) Morita-Mullaney, tmoritam@purdue.edu and Rua Williams rmwilliams@purdue.edu

- No update provided.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Françoise Brosseau-Lapré, fbrossea@purdue.edu / Stephen Cameron, cameros@purdue.edu

1. Promotion and tenure process
2. Annual reviews and post-tenure review (IC 21-39.5-2-2 and IC 21-38-3.5)
3. Childcare options for WL campus
4. Hiring and support for faculty and lecturers.

Student Affairs Committee

Abigail S. Engelberth, aengelbe@purdue.edu

1. Student Water Quality
2. Campus food insecurity
3. Assessing fall break calendar

University Resources Policy Committee

Lori Hoagland, lhoaglan@purdue.edu

1. PSG/PGSG resolutions around voting, move-in packages, and equitable parking
2. Insights to aid in a resolution around parking

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-16
26 January 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	Purdue Student Government and Purdue Graduate Student Government and University Resources Policy Committee
Subject:	Resolution Calling for Expanded Voter Accessibility
Reference:	PSG Resolution 24-01
Disposition:	University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: "By signing the ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge pledge, Purdue committed to ensuring all eligible students would be able to register to vote and cast informed ballots in the 2020 general election and beyond, while also making a commitment to foster a campus culture that supports nonpartisan student civic learning, political engagement, and student voter participation"[1]. This led to the creation of Purdue's Civics Knowledge Test, a requirement to graduate

In September of 2021, the Purdue Student Government proposed to the Purdue University Senate that "recognizing Election Day as a non-instructional day in future academic calendars would be advantageous in order to encourage civic service among the entire Purdue community"[2];

The Purdue University Senate determined that "while participation in primary and special elections are also an important means of civic engagement, the timing of these elections poses scheduling difficulties. Thus, these bodies would encourage instructional flexibility during these elections but do not recommend designation as non-instructional Days of Civic Service"[2]. As reported by WLFI, "some faculty members argued the measure would be redundant due to early voting ability, others felt losing a day of instruction would be too high a cost"[3];

---

[1] Service, P. N. (2020). *Daniels, Purdue work toward full student voter participation*. Purdue.edu. https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/archive/releases/2020/Q3/daniels,-purdue-work-toward-full-student-voter-participation.html

[2] Kang, S. D. (2021, April 19). *Senate Document 20-57*. Purdue University. https://www.purdue.edu/senate/documents/meetings/Senate-Document-20-57.pdf

[3] Hulett, P. (2021, September 13). *Purdue Senate votes against election day as civic day of service*. WLFI News 18. https://www.wlfi.com/news/local/purdue-senate-votes-against-election-day-as-civic-day-of-service/article_6dca2543-5745-55a8-8170-56b349a13db5.html

In November of 2021, Purdue University was awarded as the best Big Ten ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge 2020 voter registration action plan winner. “The award for the Big Ten’s Best Action Plan, resulting in a 20-percentage point jump in student voter turnout to 67% in the 2020 election, was announced and presented to Purdue”[4];

In the 2024 Primary Election, Tippecanoe County reported a turnout rate of 13.01% of registered voters[5]. When considering that 13% voter turnout rate, Indiana state representative Chris Campbell commented that, “6% of the votes from Tippecanoe County have come from the university polling location. That’s enough to sway an election,”[6];

On September 25th, 2024, Purdue Student Senate unanimously passed Resolution 24-03 “Purdue Voting Accessibility” to encourage Purdue University and the Tippecanoe County Board of Elections to work together in creating a voting location for General Election Day and create more opportunities for on-campus early voting[7]. This bill expands upon the sentiment expressed in Resolution 24-03;

Regarding the lack of an on-campus voting day location at Purdue during the 2024 election cycle, the Exponent reported the following: “The qualifications that Purdue has reportedly had issues with in the past . . . are parking accessibility, Purdue Police ticketing poll workers and stopping the loading and unloading of polling machines, and ‘Purdue personnel’ removing candidate signs”[8];

Purdue Student Government conducted a student survey (N=232), to which 88.7% (n=204) of Purdue students were not registered to vote in Tippecanoe County and 44.4% (n=102) had to travel to vote. Moreover, students overwhelmingly supported the creation of a voter absence policy (94.8%, n= 219) and/or a campus-wide Reading Day (89.2%, n=205). When

---

[4] Service, P. N. (2020). *Purdue’s 2020 voter registration action plan selected best in the Big Ten for ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge*. Purdue.edu. https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/archive/releases/2021/Q4/purdues-2020-voter-registration-action-plan-selected-best-in-the-big-ten-for-all-in-campus-democracy-challenge.html

[5] Staff, C. (2024, May 8). *All signs show red*. Purdue Exponent. https://www.purdueexponent.org/city_state/article_3e1eab14-0d5e-11ef-b502-d3129e0ba13f.html

[6] AND, R. (2024, September 19). *Purdue proposes campus voting locations after backlash*. Purdue Exponent. https://www.purdueexponent.org/campus/general_news/purdue-suggests-campus-voting-locations-after-backlash-corec-proposed-as-location/article_e8538ae2-75f9-11ef-9673-c79538c80719.html

[7] Packard, J., & Rice, L. (n.d.). *PURDUE STUDENT SENATE “Purdue Voting Accessibility.”* Retrieved October 29, 2024, from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/628e8fb3741fca1eabd8179e/t/6719b0a77e61fa7fc99754ca/1729736871441/Resolution+24-03+Voting+Accessibility.pdf

[8] AND, C. (2024, September 12). *Early Voting at Mackey Arena in 2020*. Purdue Exponent. https://www.purdueexponent.org/city_state/politics/purdue-voting-vote-president-campus-machine-mackey/article_abfe3c62-707d-11ef-9889-1faa7d63d5f4.html

speaking with students, multiple expressed concerns with varying departmental policies and lack of flexibility from professors as it pertains to Election Day. However, after speaking with Purdue's Office of Dean of Students (ODOS), staff expressed concerns about the organizational capacity to manage a high influx of Voter Absence requests;

Public Institutions in Kentucky, Montana, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware are mandated by state law to cancel classes on Election Day, enabling students to practice their civic duty. Similarly, though not required by state law, the University of Cincinnati has proactively canceled academic classes on Election Day. Purdue University should follow this lead as Purdue students should be enabled to practice their civic duty with the same accessibility as their peers in these states;

With Purdue's lack of an election-day policy, professors are the ultimate decision-makers in determining their respective absence policies, potentially varying across faculty and academic colleges. This poses an issue concerning flexibility for Indiana voters at the University. Additionally, this raises concerns for students who are engaging in civic processes by volunteering to work at polling locations across Indiana and neighboring states;

The Purdue Student Government acknowledges and appreciates Purdue University Resources and Policy Committee's (URPC) stance that "the university will work with the county board of elections to provide facilities support for voter registration and both early and election day voting in national elections held every other year. On voting day, no quizzes or exams will be held, so if a student misses class due to long lines, they will only need notes for the day. If the university is unable to secure an adequate number of sites to provide all students, faculty, and staff the opportunity to exercise their civic rights and vote in national elections on campus, then classes will be cancelled so they can go off campus to vote"[9];

If the Purdue University Senate plans to proceed with such a route, then the Purdue Student Government is supportive. However, if no voting location were to be offered on Purdue's campus in future election cycles, students may not have the flexibility or accessibility to practice their civil duty. While Purdue University has a robust Jury Duty Policy, another vital civil duty, the University lacks a comprehensive Voter Accessibility Policy allowing for the excusal of students from in-person academic activities to vote in primary and general elections;

---

[9] The University Resources and Policy Committee (URPC). (2024, October 21). *Senate Document 24-03*. Purdue University. https://www.purdue.edu/senate/documents/meetings/Senate-Document-24-03-Resolution-for-Voting-Facilities-and-Time-on-Campus.pdf

Election Day has amplified student awareness of the need for accessible voting options on campus and robust policies to enable students to exercise their civic duty. To leverage this heightened engagement and election-day momentum, this bill merits emergency consideration by the Purdue Student Government and Purdue Graduate Student Senate.

Proposal: That Purdue University's Office for the Vice Provost of Student Life distributes polling location information and poll worker volunteer opportunities to all Purdue students at least two weeks prior to primary and general elections.

That Purdue University's University Senate designates primary and general election days (Tuesday after the first Monday in November on even-numbered years) as "Election Day – Class in Session" on the academic calendar starting in 2026-2027.

That Election Day – Class in Session be added to the academic calendar to provide greater awareness for professors when scheduling exams, quizzes, and mandatory in-class exercises which may impede a student's ability to travel to vote.

That University Senate amend the Academic Regulations under Scheduling of Examinations, Evening Examinations subsection, Point G by adding ", the evening prior to Election Day, or the evening of Election Day; where Election Day is defined as the Tuesday after the first Monday in November on even-numbered years." to the end of the sentence.

Current: Examinations will be held on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, with the exception that no examinations will be held on the day preceding an official University holiday

Amended: Examinations will be held on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, with the exception that no examinations will be held on the evening preceding an official University holiday, the evening prior to Election Day, or the evening of Election Day; where Election Day is defined as the Tuesday after the first Monday in November on even-numbered years.

That this policy shall be continually evaluated by University Senate, the Vice Provost for Student Life, students, professors, faculty, and other appropriate entities should changes need to be made.

Committee Votes:

For (13):	**Against (0):**	**Abstained (0):**	**Absent (1):**
Daniel Cziczo Benjamin Dunford Thomas Hacker Kyle Haynes Lori Hoagland (chair) Kee-Hong Kim Richard Johnson-Sheehan Paul Mort Tae Hong Park Brian Richert Changyou Wang Donald Woodyard Howie Zelaznik			Amy Atkinson
Advisors (0):	**Advisors (0):**	**Advisors (2):**	**Advisors (0):**
		Carl Krieger Kim Pearson	
Students (2):	**Students (0):**	**Students (0):**	**Students (1):**
Ayooluwa Ojo Shayne Ryan			Elisabeth Mauermann

University Senate

Senate Document 25-20
23 March 2026

TO:	The University Senate
FROM:	Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT:	Proposed Amendment: Withdrawal from the University Policy
DISPOSITION:	University Senate for Discussion and Adoption
REFERENCE:	Purdue University Academic Regulations: Regulations and Course Assignment

RATIONALE: The current withdrawal policy lacks clarity regarding the different types of withdrawal and the units associated with each. To improve transparency and ensure consistency, this amendment proposes clear descriptions of withdrawal and appeal situations. This change aligns with current administrative processes and will enhance student, staff and faculty understanding.

This proposal is focused on clarifying and updating policy. The procedure and way it is operationalized appears on the Withdrawal website.

Withdrawals | Office of the Dean of Students - Purdue University

PROPOSAL: The University Senate modifies the Academic Regulations according to the table that follows in order to:

1. Clarifies how students submit appeals for canceling course assignments during the 14th-16th weeks of a current semester.
2. Clarifies how students submit appeals for canceling course assignments for a prior semester.
3. Provides a timeframe of 1 calendar year in which appeals for canceling course assignments for prior semesters can be submitted.
4. Indicates which units are involved in the review of these appeals.

Following other Senate documents, other related changes will be made by the Office of the Registrar, and reviewed for completeness by the Educational Policy Committee of the University Senate.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE AND LOCATION	MODIFIED LANGUAGE AND LOCATION
Academic Regulation Regulations and Course Assignment G: Withdrawal from the university	Academic Regulations Regulations and Course Assignment G: Current and Retroactive Withdrawal from the university
G. A student who withdraws, except for Military withdrawal, see section I, from the University during any semester or summer session shall secure an authorization from the dean of students, who shall present it to the registrar for proper entry upon the record. Each course on the student's schedule will be cancelled or withdrawn by the registrar in accordance with regulations governing drop or withdraw of courses. When a student withdraws from the University, the registrar will issue authorization for refunds in accordance with the existing policy regarding such refunds.	G. A student who withdraws, except for Military withdrawal, see section I, from the University during any semester or summer/winter session shall secure an authorization from ~~the dean of students, who shall present it to~~ the registrar for proper entry upon the record. Each course on the student's schedule will be cancelled or withdrawn by the registrar in accordance with regulations governing drop or withdraw of courses. When a student withdraws from the University, the registrar will issue authorization for refunds in accordance with the existing policy regarding such refunds A student who seeks to withdraw from all or part of their course assignment during the 14-16th weeks due to extenuating circumstances shall submit an appeal to the registrar. A student who seeks to withdraw from all or part of their course assignment for a prior semester (1 year maximum) due to extenuating circumstance shall submit an appeal to the registrar. Appeals are reviewed by a cross-unit committee composed of members from dean of students, central advising, student success programs, and registrar.

Committee Votes:

For:	**Against:**	**Abstained:**	**Absent:**
Meghan Bennett (S)			Ashley Bellet
Thomas Brush			Abdelfattah Nour
Vincent Duffy			Antônio Sá Barreto
Sheila Hurt (A)			Steven Scott
Bridgette Kelleher			Zion Najee-Ullah (S)
Casey Krusemark			
Yuli Lyanda-Geller			
Haley Oliver (A)			
PV Ramachandran			
John Sheffield			
Jeff Stefancic (A)			
Paschal Amusuo (S)			
Monica Torres			
Jeff Elliott (A)			

(A)- Advisor
(S)- Student

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-21
23 March 2026

To: The University Senate
From: Educational Policy Committee
Subject: Addition of Reentry Policy to Academic Regulations
Reference: [1] Purdue University Office of Admissions: Reentry
[2] Purdue University Academic Regulations: Registration and Course Assignment. B: Reentry
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption
Rationale: The current information regarding reentry lives on the website of the Office of Admissions. Although the Office of Admissions plays a role in shepherding students through the process and administering the reentry application, the Educational Policy Committee finds this policy would be more appropriately housed within the Purdue University Academic Regulations under the Registration and Course Assignment section because this policy deals with the eligibility to register for classes.

Additionally, because no formal policy exists publicly, it is only through application information shared on the Admissions website and institutional knowledge among admissions counselors and academic advisors, that students interested in returning to Purdue understand how they might qualify for reentry.

By adding the policy to the Purdue University Academic Regulations, it will increase transparency regarding the point in a student's academic journey where they would need to apply for reentry rather than simply working through the appropriate office in their college.

Proposal: The University Senate modifies the Reentry Policy according to the table that follows in order to:

1. define the term reentry;
2. delineate the instances when a student needs to apply for reentry and to which major(s) they can apply;

3. shift the placement of the policy from the Office of Admissions website to the Purdue University Academic Regulations

Original Language and Location	**Modified Language and Location**
We don't believe this policy rests in any additional location. There is mention of Reentry on the Admissions website: https://admissions.purdue.edu/become-student/reentry/	We are recommending that the policy become a part of the Academic Regulations. Registration and Course Assignment B. Reentry
The language below is from a February 2012 communication crafted by the AVP for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions and distributed to the Associate Deans, Registrar and Office of Admissions Effective immediately, re-entry students whose time away from Purdue is fewer than three consecutive academic sessions (including summer session) are not required to submit a re-entry application. These students will be able to meet directly with their academic advisor and/or register for classes without completing the re-entry process. For complete text of the communication you can use this link: New re-entry policy and procedure February 2012.docx	B. Reentry 1. Reentry refers to a student returning after an absence of three or more terms, having left in good academic standing, on academic notice, or from a disciplinary outcome of Suspension. 2. To return to Purdue, students must have left in good academic standing or on academic notice with grades or Ws on their record. Students who meet those requirements and whose time away from Purdue consists of three or more consecutive semesters, including summer, must submit a reentry application. 3. Students seeking reentry after a disciplinary suspension must meet these academic requirements and fulfill any additional conditions established by the Office of the Dean of Students. 4. Students may apply to return to the major which they were last studying or may request a change of curricula if they meet CODO requirements. 5. Students who completed a bachelor's degree at Purdue and want to pursue an additional undergraduate degree or take undergraduate courses as a non-degree student must submit a reentry application.

Committee Votes:

For:	**Against:**	**Abstained:**	**Absent:**
Sheila Hurt (A)			Meghan Bennett (S)
Ashley Bellet			Bridgette Kelleher
Jeffery Stefancic (A)			Casey Krusemark
Jeff Elliott (A)			Yuli-Lyanda-Gellar
Vincent Duffy			Zion Najee-Ullah (S)
John Sheefield			Abdelfattah Nour
Antônio C Sá Barreto			PV Ramachandran
Steven Scott			Monica Torres
Thomas Brush			
Paschal Amusuo (S)			
Haley Oliver-Jischke (A)			

(A)- Advisor
(S)- Student

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-22
23 March 2026

To: The University Senate
From: Community Connections Committee & Faculty Affairs Committee
Subject: Childcare Provisions
Reference:

Disposition: University Senate for Discussions and Adoption

Rationale: Drawing on Purdue University's values of integrity, respect, inclusion, and innovation, and in our collective efforts to recruit and retain high quality faculty and staff, the Community Connection and the Faculty Affairs Standing Committees jointly forwards the following resolution addressing high quality and affordable child for its faculty and staff.

The Early Learning Indiana group oversees two childcare centers on Purdue's campus including 1) Purdue University Education and Care Center (PUECEC); and 3) the Patty Jischke Center. The two centers report long waitlists with the longest lists in the infant and toddler age group.

In January 2025, parents learned from the Early Learning Indiana group that the Purdue University Education and Care Center (PUECEC) would be closed and combined with the Patty Jischke Center reducing future childcare slots. The likelihood of faculty and staff children obtaining a spot would be reduced as there will be less total classroom space available with the combination. The rationale for the closure of PUECEC and the combination with the Jischke Center was described as the waitlists being lower than in historic years. While lower, there still are large waitlists and parents experiencing significant hardships, impacting their capacity to be productive scholars and contributors to the Purdue community.

Presently, centers are at capacity, but there are available physical classrooms, but the centers continue to struggle to find qualified and willing staff for such roles. As such, the waitlists are further impacted by teacher shortages.

Childcare in university settings is complicated as you have incoming faculty and staff who are not familiar with the area and will rely more heavily on their employer sponsored childcare options relative to parents who have a longer term history in a given community. Further, many faculty and staff come to Purdue without a family network who can assist with childcare, increasing the need for parents to rely on employer sponsored options.

Purdue is part of the Big 10 and under present conditions is ranked 5th for number of childcare slots. With closure of PUECEC and its combination with Jischke Center, Purdue will drop to 12th; a total reduction of slots.

Big10 University	On-Campus Childcare Slots
UCLA	548
Michigan (Ann Arbor)	540
USC	469
Ohio State (Columbus)	435
Purdue (West Lafayette) - with PUECEC	**378**
Washington (Seattle)	334
Northwestern (Evanston)	308
Penn State (University Park)	300
Michigan State (East Lansing)	296
Nebraska (Lincoln)	286
Wisconsin-Madison	282
Purdue (West Lafayette) - without PUECEC	**258**
Maryland (College Park)	244
Oregon (Eugene)	237
Indiana (Bloomington)	210
Minnesota (Twin Cities)	163
Illinois (Urbana– Champaign)	149
Iowa (Iowa City)	130
Rutgers (New Brunswick)	120

Proposal:

- Purdue University contract a second external provider to take over the current PUECEC space and increase total available childcare slots on campus;
- Publish the reasons for the PUECEC closure and combination with the Patty Jischke Center;
- Furnish transparent and accurate data on the number of young children on waitlists by age level (e.g., infant, toddler, preschool);
- Tie university subsidies for childcare providers/teachers to earn fair and commensurate wages relative to the greater Lafayette area to address teacher shortages; and
- Continue to subsidize childcare programming.

Committee Votes: Community Connection Standing Committee

For	**Against**	**Abstain**	**Absent**
Trish Morita-Mullaney (co-chair)	Santokh Badesha	Lowell Kane	Ajay Bestrapalli
Rua Williams (co-chair)		Alysa Rollock (advisor)	Thomas Brown
Brittany Cruz			Brian Dilkes (sabbatical)
Alejandro Cuza			Daniel Guberman
Barbara Golden			Kiseop Lee
Mikayla Roach			Gustavo Rodriguez-Rivera
Kevin Stainback			Timothy Roth
Kim Updegraff			Shelley Dunk
Bowei Xi			

Committee Votes: Faculty Affairs Standing Committee

For	**Against**	**Abstain**	**Absent**
Françoise Brosseau-Lapré (co-chair)		Lisa Mauer (advisor)	Sunil Prabhakar
Stephen Cameron (co-chair)		Alysa Rollock (advisor)	Bhagyashree Katare
Janet Alsup		Candace Shaffer (advisor)	Annmarie Nicely Whitney
Arezoo Ardekani			
Ali Bramson			
Alice Johnson			
Nastasha Johnson			
Ryan Manuel			
Severin Schneebeli			
Lindsay Weinberg			

Senate Document 25-23
23 March 2026

To:	University Senate
From:	Educational Policy Committee
Subject:	Edits to academic regulations regarding summer calendar
Reference:	[1] Purdue University Academic Regulations: Academic Year and Calendar A: Academic Calendar
Disposition:	University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: Purdue University supports a growing range of instructional models in summer (including fully online programs, hybrid programs, early-start initiatives, and other specialty programming) that currently operate on a mix of date ranges. Misalignment between these date ranges, particularly during the summer term, creates regulatory, academic, operational, and student experience challenges. Adjusting the official academic calendar to 14 weeks will give faculty additional flexibility without requiring anyone who currently operates within the standard 12-week session to change their practices.

Proposal: The University Senate modifies the Academic Regulations regarding the summer calendar, beginning in Summer 2027, to allow for instructional innovation and an improved student experience.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE	**PROPOSED LANGUAGE**
B. Academic Calendar (revised by University Senate Document 21-23, February 21, 2022) 1. Courses are scheduled during the academic year and summer session. The academic year shall consist of two 16-week semesters. Summer session(s) may be one 4-week and one 8-week or two 6-week or other configurations as approved by the Provost's Office. In each semester/session, classes shall begin with the first instructional period of the first day.	B. Academic Calendar (revised by University Senate Document 21-23, February 21, 2022) 1. Courses are scheduled during the academic year and summer session. The academic year shall consist of two 16-week semesters. Summer session(s) **shall be a 14-week term comprised of** ~~one 4-week and one 8-week or two 6-week or other~~ configurations as approved by the Provost's Office. In each semester/session, classes shall begin with the first **day of the** instructional period ~~of the first day~~.

4. The summer session shall begin on the next Monday following the spring commencement and will be comprised of one 4-week and one 8-week, or two 6-week module(s) or other configurations as approved by the Provost Office. Courses may be scheduled during any one or any combination of modules throughout the 12-week period. There shall be no classes on Memorial Day, the last Monday in May, or on July 4, nor on the nearest class day when July 4 is not a regular class day. (University Senate Document 96-4, February 17, 1997).	4. The summer session shall begin on the ~~next~~ Monday following the **final day of the spring term** ~~spring commencement~~ and will be comprised of **at least one 14-week module**, one 4-week and one 8-week, ~~or two 6-week module(s)~~ or other configurations as approved by the Provost Office. **Graduate** courses may be scheduled during any one or any combination of modules throughout the **14-**week period**; undergraduate courses may not be scheduled during the first week after the spring semester.** There shall be no classes on Memorial Day, the last Monday in May, or on July 4, nor on the nearest class day when July 4 is not a regular class day. (University Senate Document 96-4, February 17, 1997).

Committee Votes:

For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Antonia Barreto			Abdelfattah Nour
Ashley Bellet			John Sheffield
Casey Krusemark			Thomas Brush
Haley Oliver-Jischke (A)			Yuli Lyanda-Gellar
Jeff Elliott (A)			Steven Scott
Jeffery Stefancic (A)			
Julia Chester			
Meghan Bennett (S)			
Monica Torres			
PV Ramachandran			
Paschal Amusuo (S)			
Sheila Hurt (A)			
Vincent Duffy			

(A)- Advisor

(S)- Student

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-24
23 March 2026

TO:	Educational Policy Committee
FROM:	Anneliese Kay Beswick
SUBJECT:	Proposed Amendment: Scholastic Recognition, Graduation with Distinction
DISPOSITION:	Educational Policy Committee for Discussion and Advancement to University Senate
REFERENCE:	Purdue University Academic Regulations
RATIONALE:	The current Graduation with Distinction policy, established 25 years ago, imposes restrictions on students who enter the university requiring fewer than 65 credit hours to be earned at Purdue. To promote greater fairness and equity for all students, this amendment proposes reducing the minimum number of credits to be earned at Purdue from 65 to 60. This adjustment ensures that all undergraduate students—including those transferring through a Transfer Single Articulation Pathway (TSAP)—may have the opportunity to graduate with distinction. This proposal is intended to modernize the policy and advance equity by providing all undergraduate students an equal opportunity to achieve Graduation with Distinction.
PROPOSAL:	The Educational Policy Committee is requested to consider a proposal to modify the requirements for Graduation with Distinction, reducing the minimum number of credit hours required to be earned at Purdue University from 65 to 60. This revision updates a policy originally established in 1980 to better reflect the needs of today's student population. The proposed change enhances inclusivity for transfer students—many of whom enter Purdue through a Transfer Single Articulation Pathway (TSAP), which requires only 60 credits to be completed at Purdue. Additionally, it accommodates undergraduate students who have accumulated 60 credit hours or more through a combination of Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and/or dual-credit coursework. Reducing the requirement from 65 to 60 credits modernizes the policy and promotes equity across diverse student pathways, ensuring that all qualified students are afforded the opportunity to graduate with distinction.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE AND LOCATION	MODIFIED LANGUAGE AND LOCATION
Academic Regulation Scholastic Recognition	Academic Regulation Scholastic Recognition

C: Graduation with Distinction	C: Graduation with Distinction
C: 1. A candidate for the baccalaureate degree with distinction must have a minimum of 65 hours of credit earned at Purdue University included in the computation of the overall GPA. A candidate for an associate degree with distinction must have a minimum of 35 hours of credit earned at Purdue University included in the computation of the overall GPA. 2. The minimum overall GPA for graduation with distinction in each school shall be no less than the 90th percentile of the graduation indexes of the graduates in each school, for the spring semester, provided that the index is at least 3.30. The minimum overall GPA so determined in the spring for each school shall be applied for graduation with distinction for the subsequent summer session and fall semester. In administering this rule, all baccalaureate engineering graduates will be considered as one school. 3. Of those graduates who qualify for distinction under these rules for the spring semester, the three-tenths of the baccalaureate graduates having the highest overall GPA shall be designated as graduating with highest distinction, irrespective of the schools from which they graduate. The three-tenths of the spring associate degree graduates having the highest overall GPA will be designated as graduating with highest distinction. The minimum overall GPAs so determined for graduation with highest distinction shall be applied for graduation with highest distinction for the subsequent summer session and fall semester.	C: 1. A candidate for the baccalaureate degree with distinction must have a minimum of **60** hours of credit earned at Purdue University included in the computation of the overall GPA. A candidate for an associate degree with distinction must have a minimum of 35 hours of credit earned at Purdue University included in the computation of the overall GPA. 2. The minimum overall GPA for graduation with distinction in each school shall be no less than the 90th percentile of the graduation indexes of the graduates in each school, for the spring semester, provided that the index is at least 3.30. The minimum overall GPA so determined in the spring for each school shall be applied for graduation with distinction for the subsequent summer session and fall semester. In administering this rule, all baccalaureate engineering graduates will be considered as one school. 3. Of those graduates who qualify for distinction under these rules for the spring semester, the three-tenths of the baccalaureate graduates having the highest overall GPA shall be designated as graduating with highest distinction, irrespective of the schools from which they graduate. The three-tenths of the spring associate degree graduates having the highest overall GPA will be designated as graduating with highest distinction. The minimum overall GPAs so determined for graduation with highest distinction shall be applied for graduation with highest distinction for the subsequent summer session and fall semester.

Committee Votes:

For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Antonia Barreto			Abdelfattah Nour
Ashley Bellet			John Sheffield
Casey Krusemark			Thomas Brush
Haley Oliver-Jischke (A)			Yuli Lyanda-Gellar
Jeff Elliott (A)			Steven Scott
Jeffery Stefancic (A)			
Julia Chester			
Meghan Bennett (S)			
Monica Torres			
PV Ramachandran			
Paschal Amusuo (S)			
Sheila Hurt (A)			
Vincent Duffy			

(A)- Advisor
(S)- Student

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-25
20 April 2026

To: Purdue University Senate

From: Senator Howard Zelaznik and
Senator Lindsay Weinberg

Subject: A vote of no confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe in the University Senate.

References: Resolution for a Vote of No Confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe; Provost Responses 23 March 2026 and 2 April 2026; Senate Report 25-02 from the EPC; Senate Report 25-03 from the EPC

Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: Between February 16 and March 09, 2026, Senate Standing Committees were asked to look into the issues, concerns, and allegations raised in the January 2026 AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement. A summary of findings was added to SD 25-19 and shared with Senators for the March 23, 2026 Senate Meeting; 70% of Senators voted in favor of holding a Vote of No Confidence at the April 20, 2026 Senate Meeting.

Proposal: A Vote of No Confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe.

Resolution for a Vote of No Confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe.

Whereas, at the February 16, 2026 University Senate meeting, Senate Document 25-19 was introduced in response to the AAUP Purdue's January 2026 Chapter Statement calling for the immediate resignation of Provost Patrick J. Wolfe and a vote of no confidence;

Whereas, reports from 6 University Senate Standing Committees; results from 2 college-level surveys open to faculty, staff, and administrators; feedback from 10 one-on-one meetings with faculty; and 9 emails from faculty and community members were received and summary feedback provided to the University Senate;

Whereas, in addition to confirmations of the items listed in SD 25-19, other concerns were raised regarding the Provost's handling of the College of Veterinary Medicine Dean Search and lack of follow up in communication from advisory meetings, senate meetings, and committee meetings;

Whereas, there are major areas of concern regarding delayed and adverse decision-making, lack of information transparency, a disconnected institutional understanding of faculty, and inadequate conflict resolution with institutional climate and governance implications;

Whereas, effective decision-making processes, transparent communication practices, and collaborative leadership all play critical roles in sustaining a healthy academic environment;

Be it resolved that, the University Senate has lost confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe's leadership.

From: Patrick J Wolfe
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2026 12:06 PM
To: Lisa B Bosman
Cc: Ximena Bernal; David Matthew Blon; Secretary of Faculties; President Amanda K Darbyshire; James B Dworkin; Katie Jarriel; David Liu; Stephen Martin; Julio Alfonso Ramirez; Torbert R Rocheford; Mark D Zimpfer
Subject: Re: Feedback regarding SD 25-19

Dear Senator Bosman, all,

Our President's office communicated to me your view that the Senate's Steering Committee may entertain a written response to Resolution 25-19 until noon on 3 Apr.

As I previously wrote to Senator Weinberg on 23 Mar following our return from Spring Break, I generally reject most of the premises in the AAUP local chapter letter which gave rise to Resolution 25-19.

Considering the Senate's advisory role: One would reasonably anticipate--based on Resolution 25-19's assignment of those premises to various Senate committees (Faculty Affairs Committee, Educational Policy Committee, Community Connection Committee, University Resources Policy Committee and Student Affairs Committee) to "look into the issues, concerns and allegations" raised in the AAUP local chapter letter--that one or more of those committees might have questions of me, my office, or other members of Purdue's executive leadership team.

To date I gather that no committee had any such questions. This seems puzzling, given what the most recent amendment to the resolution indicated: That all committees had submitted reports to your steering committee, and 3 committees apparently wished to have either more time or more information. As I mentioned to Senator Weinberg, I think it is safe to say that all members of Purdue's executive leadership team are willing to provide insight and information to assist the senate in its review if there are unresolved questions.

Of course, our executive leadership team cannot but defer to the process you have devised for the senate's review of, to use your words, "one of the most serious actions a University Senate can take."

Yours sincerely,

Patrick

Patrick J. Wolfe
Provost & Chief Academic Officer
Miller Family Professor
Purdue University

From: Patrick J Wolfe <patrick@purdue.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 07:32
To: Lindsay Weinberg <lweinber@purdue.edu>
Cc: Ximena Bernal <xbernal@purdue.edu>; David Matthew Blon <dblon@purdue.edu>; Lisa B Bosman <lbosman@purdue.edu>; Secretary of Faculties<secoffac@purdue.edu>; President <president@purdue.edu>; Amanda K Darbyshire <adarbysh@purdue.edu>; James B Dworkin <jdworkin@purdue.edu>; Katie Jarriel <kjarriel@purdue.edu>; David Liu <dqliu@purdue.edu>; Stephen Martin <smartin@purdue.edu>; Julio Alfonso Ramirez <ramirez@purdue.edu>; Torbert R Rocheford <torbert@purdue.edu>; Mark DZimpfer <mzimpfer@purdue.edu>
Subject: Re: Feedback regarding SD 25-19

Dear Senator Weinberg, all,

Thank you for your note and welcome back from Spring Break.

I'm not aware of any specific questions having been asked of me or my team, nor of any requests to meet. But of course if material questions should arise during whatever earnest review you undertake, which I'm certain will remain in keeping with the Senate's own rules and processes, I or my team should be happy to receive those.

Out of respect to the Senate and all who spend and have spent their valuable time working to resolve issues material to the University: Engaging directly with a set of specious premises neither comports with due process nor contributes to valuable dialog, discussion, and debate. I am sure everyone will agree that Purdue's University Senate has a long track record of productive engagement in its advisory role, and it is certainly Purdue's hope that such continues and strengthens.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick

Patrick J. Wolfe
Provost & Chief Academic Officer
Miller Family Professor
Purdue University

From: Lindsay Weinberg <lweinber@purdue.edu>
Date: Thursday, March 12, 2026 at 9:02 AM
To: Patrick J Wolfe <patrick@purdue.edu>
Cc: Ximena Bernal <xbernal@purdue.edu>, David Matthew Blon <dblon@purdue.edu>, Lisa B Bosman <lbosman@purdue.edu>, Secretary of Faculties <secoffac@purdue.edu>, President <president@purdue.edu>, Amanda K Darbyshire <adarbysh@purdue.edu>, James B Dworkin <jdworkin@purdue.edu>, Katie Jarriel<kjarriel@purdue.edu>, David Liu <dqliu@purdue.edu>, Stephen Martin <smartin@purdue.edu>, Julio Alfonso Ramirez <ramirez@purdue.edu>, Torbert R Rocheford

<torbert@purdue.edu>, Mark DZimpfer <mzimpfer@purdue.edu>
Subject: Feedback regarding SD 25-19

Dear Provost Wolfe,

In an effort to support due process and due diligence, we respectfully request your response regarding SD 25-19. We are currently collecting responses and preparing a report summarizing feedback received from constituents since February 16.

We welcome any written feedback you may wish to provide about SD 25-19 prior to the report being circulated to Senators by the close of business on Friday, March 20.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Senator Lindsay Weinberg
Senator Lisa Bosman

CC: Purdue University Senate Steering Committee

--

Dr. Lindsay Weinberg (she/her) | Clinical Associate Professor | John Martinson Honors College Purdue University | 1101 Third Street | West Lafayette, IN 47906 | Phone: 765-496-6317 | Email:lweinber@purdue.edu | *Smart University: Student Surveillance in the Digital Age* (John Hopkins University Press, 2024)

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Report 25-02
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
Subject:	EPC Report to the University Senate
Reference:	University Senate Document 25-19
Disposition:	University Senate for Information

Additional insights and observations were made by EPC by through various activities of the EPC over the recent 18 months during AY 24-25 and AY 25-26, as well as other mechanisms of communication between Purdue Administration and University Senate. This EPC Report is submitted on behalf of EPC considering those insights, observations, and experience.

Following three additional recent meetings of EPC that took place after the March Senate meeting, this report is presented as an informational document, an EPC Report to the University Senate. By American Institute of Parliamentarians (AIP) rules, an information document can be considered a main motion on agenda.

No vote is needed, if presented for information only. This mechanism is invoked in this circumstance by EPC to support fairness, efficiency, and clarity.

Various matters were discussed in EPC committee in recent meetings and a statement from EPC is shared in Appendix 1. It was revised based on all attendees input over the course of the three recent meetings preceding Senate Steering Committee meeting expected April 3.

The first part of statement is shared in regard to discoveries made in EPC pertaining to university operations under Provost's authority. Additionally, a second portion of the statement is included that pertains to the ethics and compliance-related aspects of S.D. 25-19 and the 12 whereas statements referred to EPC by Senate Leadership at the February meeting of the University Senate.

Appendix 2 contains the agenda of the three meetings. Appendix 3 contains information shared by Senate on Friday, March 20 about the creation of the position called Provost's Fellow for Shared Governance. That position was discussed in Chair's Report at these recent EPC meetings. This information is relevant to EPC, due to the dual role plan that has been maintained for EPC Chair.

EPC will still have opportunity to follow up with the Provost's Office to ask questions pertaining to information provided recently, and was invited to do so in Provost Wolfe's as noted in an update in Appendix 1 in Senate Report 25-03. It is the wish of the EPC members to follow up with regard to the substance of the issues raised in S.D. 25-19 and be informed on expected academic processes pertaining to whereas statements in S.D.25-19 referred to EPC at the February Senate meeting.

Appendix 1: Statement by Educational Policy Committee (EPC) to The University Senate following three meetings of EPC that took place after the March Senate meeting

Considering academic processes that we have observed in EPC over these past 18 months and that we observed these while working with various administrative offices that report to Provost, we would like the senate to recognize our EPC confidence in those elements of Teaching and Learning at Purdue that we have observed under Provost's authority.

EPC has also reviewed the 12 elements from original 25-19 that were referred to EPC in February Senate meeting and have so far found no impropriety based on the information we have reviewed.

Educational Policy Committee
Thursday, 2 April 2026, 1:30 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

AGENDA

1) Call to Order
2) Acceptance of Agenda
3) Chair's Report

EPC agenda items

Same agenda items for meetings: Thurs. Apr. 2 (11:30am; 1:30pm) and Fri. Apr.3 (9:15am)

4) New business

1. Update following 25-19 in Senate re: Provost's Fellow and agenda item pertaining to 25-19 carrying prior vote with rationale re-emphasized re: new info on potential conflict.

2. An informational doc can be brought on behalf of EPC following queries to Provost's Office that I made as Chair following our EPC meetings in March. That information will be available to me in time for the Steering Committee deadline of Apr. 3, noon.

3. Invited Guest: Alysa Christmas Rollock, VP for Ethics and Compliance.
   Guest to EPC at 1:30; Alysa Christmas Rollock; with experience in prior Purdue Admin.
   Topic: The Role of the Senate in Fair University Process and the Role of Fair Process in the University Senate.

4. A resolution/statement for your consideration and possibly EPC vote today (or at latest tomorrow morning). It was shared in the morning meeting of EPC.

5) Final Q&A, Adjournment

Appendix 3: Additional information shared by Provost's Office regarding continued intentions for shared academic governance with implications for EPC as noted in EPC Agenda in Appendix 2.

From: Purdue University Senate <purdueuniversitysenate@purdue.edu>
Date: Friday, March 20, 2026 at 4:26 PM
To:
Subject: Fellow for Shared Governance

Dear Senators and Advisors to the Senate,

The Provost's Office, in partnership with the University Senate, is pleased to announce a new role to help improve overall faculty engagement and to strengthen communication between the University Senate and the Provost's Office. The Provost's Fellow for Shared Governance will be tasked with certain strategic projects designed to analyze and promote best practices for academic shared governance. The Fellow will serve a one-year term.

After a nomination and selection process from current and past Senate leaders, Provost Wolfe has selected Vincent Duffy as the first-ever Fellow for Shared Governance.

The Provost's Office is eager to work closely with Vince and Senate leadership to enhance the relationship between the faculty and Purdue administration.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Report 25-03
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
Subject:	EPC Report to the University Senate
Reference:	University Senate Document 25-19, February 2026
Disposition:	University Senate for Information

Additional information has been made available to EPC Chair from Provost's Office regarding S.D. 25-19. So that information is provided here as an informational document, an EPC Report to the University Senate. And by American Institute of Parliamentarians (AIP) rules, an information document can be considered a main motion on agenda.

This EPC Report is submitted on behalf of EPC membership considering the additional information from Provost's Office in regard to S.D. 25-19 and 12 whereas statements referred to EPC by Senate Leadership at the February meeting of the University Senate. No vote is needed, if presented for information only.

This mechanism is invoked in this circumstance by EPC to support fairness, efficiency, and clarity.

EPC has not had full opportunity to review this new information in committee yet, though this report was distributed to EPC. We will bring the information in Appendix 1 to EPC for review in our next EPC meeting. However, since Senate may also have not yet seen it as a part of information pertaining to S.D. 25-19, EPC is including it here as Appendix 1 in this report.

EPC will still have opportunity to follow up with the Provost's Office to ask questions pertaining to information provided here, and was invited to do so in Provost Wolfe's update in Appendix 1. Questions from Senators following presentation of this report at the April Senate meeting can also be included in any EPC follow up, if the discussion about those is not finished at Senate in April.

Appendix 1: Information provided by Provost Wolfe to Provost Fellow and EPC Chair before expected April 6 Senate Steering Committee meeting

Excerpted:

Dear Senator Bosman, all,

Our President's office communicated to me your view that the Senate's Steering Committee may entertain a written response to Resolution 25-19 until noon on 3 Apr.

As I previously wrote to Senator Weinberg on 23 Mar following our return from Spring Break, I generally reject most of the premises in the AAUP local chapter letter which gave rise to Resolution 25-19.

Considering the Senate's advisory role: One would reasonably anticipate--based on Resolution 25-19's assignment of those premises to various Senate committees (Faculty Affairs Committee, Educational Policy Committee, Community Connection Committee, University Resources Policy Committee and Student Affairs Committee) to "look into the issues, concerns and allegations" raised in the AAUP local chapter letter--that one or more of those committees might have questions of me, my office, or other members of Purdue's executive leadership team.

To date I gather that no committee had any such questions. This seems puzzling, given what the most recent amendment to the resolution indicated: That all committees had submitted reports to your steering committee, and 3 committees apparently wished to have either more time or more information. As I mentioned to Senator Weinberg, I think it is safe to say that all members of Purdue's executive leadership team are willing to provide insight and information to assist the senate in its review if there are unresolved questions.

Of course, our executive leadership team cannot but defer to the process you have devised for the senate's review of, to use your words, "one of the most serious actions a University Senate can take."

Yours sincerely,

Patrick

—

Patrick J. Wolfe
Provost & Chief Academic Officer
Miller Family Professor
Purdue University

From: Patrick J Wolfe
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 07:32
To: Lindsay Weinberg
Cc:
Subject: Re: Feedback regarding SD 25-19

Dear Senator Weinberg, all,

Thank you for your note and welcome back from Spring Break.

I'm not aware of any specific questions having been asked of me or my team, nor of any requests to meet. But of course if material questions should arise during whatever earnest review you undertake, which I'm certain will remain in keeping with the Senate's own rules and processes, I or my team should be happy to receive those.

Out of respect to the Senate and all who spend and have spent their valuable time working to resolve issues material to the University: Engaging directly with a set of specious premises neither comports with due process nor contributes to valuable dialog, discussion, and debate. I am sure everyone will agree that Purdue's University Senate has a long track record of productive engagement in its advisory role, and it is certainly Purdue's hope that such continues and strengthens.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick

—
Patrick J. Wolfe
Provost & Chief Academic Officer
Miller Family Professor
Purdue University

From: Lindsay Weinberg
Date: Thursday, March 12, 2026 at 9:02 AM
To: Patrick J Wolfe
Cc:
Subject: Feedback regarding SD 25-19

Dear Provost Wolfe,

In an effort to support due process and due diligence, we respectfully request your response regarding SD 25-19. We are currently collecting responses and preparing a report summarizing feedback received from constituents since February 16.

We welcome any written feedback you may wish to provide about SD 25-19 prior to the report being circulated to Senators by the close of business on Friday, March 20.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Senator Lindsay Weinberg
Senator Lisa Bosman

CC: Purdue University Senate Steering Committee

Senate Document 25-26
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject:	Nominees for the Educational Policy Committee
Reference:	Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition:	Election by the University Senate
Proposal:	For the four openings on the Educational Policy Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	**Years**	**Department/School**
Brandon Keehn	3	Speech, Language, & Hearing Sciences
Muiris MacGiollabhui	1	Honors College
Suranjan Panigrahi	2	Electrical & Computer Engineering Technology
James Tanoos	3	Engineering Technology

Committee Votes:

For:	**Against:**	**Abstained:**	**Absent:**
Dulcy Abraham Afsan Bhadelia Mara Faccio Fecri Karanki Damon Lisch (Co-Chair) Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair) Abdelfattah Nour Darryl Ragland Mohit Tawarmalani	N/A	N/A	

Senate Document 25-27
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject:	Nominees for the Community Connection Committee
Reference:	Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition:	Election by the University Senate
Proposal:	For the six openings on the Community Connection Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	**Years**	**Department/School**
Natasha Duncan	1	Honors College
Yaohua Feng	3	Food Science
Marcial Gonzalez	3	Mechanical Engineering
Chrystal Johnson	3	Curriculum & Instruction
David Schoorman	3	Management
Howard Zelaznik	3	Health & Kinesiology

Committee Votes:

For:	**Against:**	**Abstained:**	**Absent:**
Dulcy Abraham Afsan Bhadelia Mara Faccio Fecri Karanki Damon Lisch (Co-Chair) Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair) Abdelfattah Nour Darryl Ragland Mohit Tawarmalani	N/A	N/A	

Purdue University | University Senate

Senate Document 25-28
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject:	Nominees for the Faculty Affairs Committee
Reference:	Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition:	Election by the University Senate
Proposal:	For the four openings on the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	**Years**	**Department/School**
Ulrike Dydak	3	Health Sciences
Mark Hastak	3	Civil & Construction Engineering
Michael Jenkins	3	Forestry & Natural Resources
David Peterson	3	Sociology

Committee Votes:

For:	**Against:**	**Abstained:**	**Absent:**
Dulcy Abraham	N/A	N/A	
Afsan Bhadelia			
Mara Faccio			
Fecri Karanki			
Damon Lisch (Co-Chair)			
Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair)			
Abdelfattah Nour			
Darryl Ragland			
Mohit Tawarmalani			

Senate Document 25-29
20 April 2026

To: The University Senate
From: University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject: Nominees for the Nominating Committee
Reference: Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition: Election by the University Senate
Proposal: For the two openings on the Nominating Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	Years	Department/School
Michael Campion	3	Management
Euzeli Dos Santos	3	Electrical & Computer Engineering

Committee Votes:

For:	Against:	Abstained:	Absent:
Dulcy Abraham Afsan Bhadelia Mara Faccio Fecri Karanki Damon Lisch (Co-Chair) Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair) Abdelfattah Nour Darryl Ragland Mohit Tawarmalani	N/A	N/A	

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-30
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject:	Nominees for the Steering Committee
Reference:	Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition:	Election by the University Senate
Proposal:	For the four openings on the Steering Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	**Years**	**Department/School**
John Howarter	3	Materials Engineering/Environmental & Ecological Engineering
Stephen Martin	3	Economics
Kali Rubaii	3	Anthropology
Rodrigo Salgado	3	Civil & Construction Engineering

Committee Votes:

For:	**Against:**	**Abstained:**	**Absent:**
Dulcy Abraham Afsan Bhadelia Mara Faccio Fecri Karanki Damon Lisch (Co-Chair) Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair) Abdelfattah Nour Darryl Ragland Mohit Tawarmalani	N/A	N/A	

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-31
20 April 2026

To: The University Senate
From: University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject: Nominees for the Student Affairs Committee
Reference: Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition: Election by the University Senate
Proposal: For the four openings on the Student Affairs Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	Years	Department/School
Chitta Das	3	Chemistry
John Evans	3	Agricultural & Biological Engineering
Ronald Stephens	3	Interdisciplinary Studies
Michael Zoltowski	3	Electrical & Computer Engineering

Committee Votes:

For:	Against:	Abstained:	Absent:
Dulcy Abraham Afsan Bhadelia Mara Faccio Fecri Karanki Damon Lisch (Co-Chair) Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair) Abdelfattah Nour Darryl Ragland Mohit Tawarmalani	N/A	N/A	

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Senate Document 25-32
20 April 2026

To:	The University Senate
From:	University Senate Nominating Committee
Subject:	Nominees for the University Resources Policy Committee
Reference:	Bylaws of the University Senate
Disposition:	Election by the University Senate
Proposal:	For the four openings on the University Resources Policy Committee, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees. The faculty members elected will serve for the number of years specified.

Name	Years	Department/School
Marisa Erasmus	3	Animal Sciences
Amy Marconnet	3	Mechanical Engineering
Raghu Pasupathy	3	Statistics
Cara Putman	3	Management Administration & Instruction

Committee Votes:

For:	Against:	Abstained:	Absent:
Dulcy Abraham Afsan Bhadelia Mara Faccio Fecri Karanki Damon Lisch (Co-Chair) Seema Mattoo (Co-Chair) Abdelfattah Nour Darryl Ragland Mohit Tawarmalani	N/A	N/A	

Community Connection Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Co-Chairs: Trish Morita-Mullaney, Rua Williams

Charge: The Community Connection Committee provides guidance in all aspects of climate, recruitment, retention, inclusion, and equal opportunities for access and success.

Membership:
Voting
Jaekwon Akins jakins@purdue.edu
Santokh Singh Badesha sbadesha@purdue.edu
Jay N Bestrapalli abestrap@purdue.edu
Alejandro Cuza-Blanco acuza@purdue.edu
Brian Dilkes bdilkes@purdue.edu
Barbara L Golden barbgolden@purdue.edu
Kiseop Lee kiseop@purdue.edu
Trish Morita-Mullaney tmoritam@purdue.edu
Mikayla Angelique Roach roach29@purdue.edu
Gustavo Rodriguez-Rivera grr@purdue.edu
Timothy D Ropp tropp@purdue.edu
Maria Soledad Sepulveda marisep@purdue.edu
Kevin M Stainback kstainba@purdue.edu
Kimberly A Updegraff kupdegra@purdue.edu
Rua Mae Williams rmwilliams@purdue.edu
Bowei Xi xbw@purdue.edu
Advising
Lowell B Kane Lowell@purdue.edu
Lisa Mauer mauer@purdue.edu
Alysa Rollock acrollock@purdue.edu
Not voting
Thomas R B Brown trbrown@purdue.edu
Brittany L Cruz blcruz@purdue.edu
Daniel A Guberman dguberma@purdue.edu

Co-Chairs 2024-2025: Senators Geraldine Friedman, Brian Dilkes

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:
Mondays at 2:30 PM
9/22/2025
10/27/2025
12/1/2025
2/2/2026
3/2/2026
4/6/2026

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

1. **Name and Content change.** The Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Standing Committee (EDIC) discussed a name and content change to the committee given federal and state laws related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. A name and content change to the committee was proposed in Fall 2025 and was introduced for first reading in November 2025 with a resolution about name and content change adopted and voted upon by Senate in January 2026. The new name of the standing committee is the *Community Connection Standing Committee* (CCC).

2. **Three Purdue Cultural Centers.** The Latino, Asian American and Native American Student Cultural Centers were absent from Purdue's Master Facility Plan. A new dormitory was proposed in its location and the three cultural centers appeared to be absent from the Master Plan. In the Fall of 2025, this was introduced by Chair Mark Zimpfer at the Advisory Committee in Hovde where Provost Wolfe stated that there were errors in the plan and stated that the cultural centers were a part of the long-term plan of the administration. Yet, no communication was made to the supervisor nor directors of centers. In Fall 2025, a resolution was introduced about the inclusion of the three centers in the Master Plan and that they would be located in relative proximity to their current location given its accessibility to the student community who frequent the centers. A resolution was introduced in Fall 2025 and passed and adopted in January 2026 and communication with the centers was made by Provost Wolfe in April 2026 about their certainty within the Master plan.

3. **Joint resolution on Purdue childcare.** The PUECEC was announced for a May 2026 closure in Spring 2026; combining them with two other Purdue childcare centers raises concerns among faculty that this would lengthen wait lists, particularly for young infants and toddlers, creating a significant strain on current and newer faculty hires with young children. Rationale provided for this closure, as described by the external contractor, was that "waiting lists were shorter." Concerns persisted among faculty with children in the center or awaiting to have their children admitted is that this would only elongate waitlists and not meet the current need for accessible and affordable childcare.

   In Spring 2026, in collaboration with the Faculty Affairs Committee, a Joint Resolution was put forward asking for the following:
   - Re-analyze the reasons for closures and combination of PUECEC and Patty Jischke centers.
   - Furnish transparent and accurate data on the number of young children on waitlists by age level (e.g., birth to 12 months, 12-24 months, 36 months and above).
   - Address the need for fair and commensurate wages for the greater Lafayette area to address teacher shortages;
   - Increase spots for children reducing waitlists; and

- Subsize childcare programming to address above needs.

The resolution was introduced in March 2026 for its first reading and was adopted and passed in May 2026.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year.*

1. Identify and vote upon a new chair for the 26/27 school year;
2. Continue to monitor the Master Facilities Plan to ensure the continued inclusion of Purdue's cultural centers;
3. Revisit the limitations of Purdue's furnished childcare for faculty and staff;
4. Continue to monitor federal, state, and local policy provisions that may impede the overall goals of the CCC which were refreshed in Fall 2025 and adopted in January 2026.

Chairs: Françoise Brosseau-Lapré & Stephen Cameron

Charge: The Faculty Affairs Committee is concerned with matters that pertain primarily to the responsibilities, rights, privileges, opportunities, and welfare of the faculty, collectively and as individuals. Topics in its area of responsibility include tenure, procedures for academic promotions, orientation of new faculty members, insurance and health program planning, academic responsibilities, and standards of appointment.

Membership:
1. Janet Alsup
2. Arezoo Ardekani
3. Ali Bramson
4. Françoise Brosseau-Lapré (co-chair)
5. Stephen Cameron (co-chair)
6. Alice Johnson
7. Nastasha Johnson
8. Bhagyashree Katare
9. Lisa Mauer (Associate Vice Provost; advisor)
10. Ryan Manuel
11. Annmarie Nicely
12. Sunil Prabhakar (Vice Provost; advisor)
13. Alyssa Rollock (Vice President for Ethics and Compliance; advisor)
14. Candace Shaffer (Associate Vice President, Benefits & Payroll; advisor)
15. Severin Schneebeli
16. Lindsay Weinberg
17. Whitney Yu

Chairs 2024-2025: Françoise Brosseau-Lapré & Anish Vanaik

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:
All on Teams (except meeting on April 27), from 3:30-5:00pm
September 15
October 27
December 1
February 2
February 23
March 30
April 27

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

Summary:

1. September meeting
    a. Lecturers Advisory Committee – organized group as of June, 2025
    b. Presentation and discussion re: Research Misconduct Policy document
    c. Presentation and discussion re: Research Faculty Policy
    d. Presentation re: AI Use Policy

2. October meeting
    a. Discussion AI Use Policy and changes to the document
    b. Lecturers Advisory Committee – presentation by Heather Servaty-Seib, Jennifer Hall, Kelley Bailey
    c. Post-Tenure reviews: update from VP office
    d. Discussion regarding the reorganization of the Honors college

3. December meeting
    a. Presentation of draft guidelines and discussion on clarifications & changes to the P&T process document

4. February 2 meeting
    a. Presentation and discussion of how Elements will be used for annual reviews.
    b. Presentation and discussion of revised guidelines for P&T process (clarifying timelines at each step)
    c. Discussion of changes to medical coverage and significant impact for some employees

5. February 23 meeting
    a. Security breach through Anthem
    b. Presentation of draft policies and procedures for Post tenure reviews
    c. Childcare availability on campus; presentation by CCC to consider joint sponsorship of a resolution
    d. AAUP statement calling for vote of no confidence for Provost Wolfe

6. March meeting
    a. Discussion of Childcare Resolution Amendments (25-22)
    b. Presentation and discussion of now two documents (instead of 1) for Policy and Operating Procedures for Post Tenure Reviews
    c. AAUP statement calling for vote of no confidence; guest presentation by Lisa Bowman, senate steering chair, to discuss how the vote will take place

7. April meeting

   a. Update on documents prepared by each college/Dean for annual reviews and minimum productivity requirements; changes and amendments, possibility for more feedback, timeline of implementation
   b. Report on Panel A and Panel B (from VPFAC); discussion regarding how Panel A proceeded (more cases flagged for discussion but no impact on outcome)

Faculty committee work summary: (if applicable) *include any documents that were forwarded to Standing Committee and/or Senate along with decision (passed, failed)*

1. Responses to items in Senate Document 25-19 Resolution for Standing Committees to Look Into Issues, Concerns, and Allegations raised in the AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement and Report Back to the Steering Committee (forwarded to Senate Standing Committee)
2. Senate Document 25-22 Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee Joint Proposal on Childcare Challenges at Purdue (passed)

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year*

1. Changes to Procedures and Policies for Promotion & Tenure and Post-Tenure Reviews
   a. Working with administration to clarify procedures and policies
      i. Flowcharts for annual reviews, as well as Post-tenure reviews
      ii. Whether there are "standard minimum requirements" as each college develops their documents, and timeline for implementation of these changes

2. Childcare options on campus
   a. Closure of the on-campus ECEC

3. Hiring practices at Purdue
   a. Dream hires program
   b. Proportion of TT faculty, clinical faculty, lecturers

4. Representation for Lecturers
   a. Lecturers Advisory Board – proposal to FAC

5. Implementation of Senate Bill regarding the minimum number of graduating students in degree programs
   a. Closure of programs
   b. Reorganization of programs

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Academic Organization Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair: Mark Wilson, Clinical Assistant Professor of Health Sciences

Charge: The committee shall be concerned with changes in academic organization having a significant impact on the intellectual atmosphere and functioning of the university on all of its campuses, e.g., elimination or consolidation of existing departments and schools; and the establishment of interdepartmental institutes and centers. In performance of this task the committee shall, where appropriate, work with officers of the administration, ad hoc committees and faculty involved in contemplated changes.

Membership:

Ashley Bellet, Design, Art, and Performance
Sally Bane, Aeronautics and Astronautics
Krystal Hans, Entomology
Esra Tepeli, School of Construction Management Technology
Timothy Reese, Department of Statistics

Chair 2024-2025:
Mark Wilson, Clinical Assistant Professor of Health Sciences

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: Meetings occurred on an as needed basis.

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

The Academic Organization Committee considered one proposal over 2025-2026 academic year. This proposal involved a restructuring within the Department of Organizational Leadership within the College of Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science of Purdue Northwest.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year*

The committee maintain contact with the Office of the Provost to facilitate proposals being introduced to the committee for consideration.

University Senate

Grade Appeals Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair: Ryan Reeves

Charge: University Grade Appeals Committee

Membership:
24 Faculty Members
10 Undergraduate Members
7 Graduate Members
Names Listed on Following Page

Faculty Members (24)

Chiu, Wan-Ting
Dye, Deborah K
Johnson, Rebecca C
Rodriguez-Rivera, Gustavo
Koh-Knox Sharp, Cynthia P
Zahner, Sigrid Kirsten
Ohland, Matthew W
Maria Julia Bello Bravo
Wu, Steven Yu-Ping
Kruse, Lydia R
Jengelley, Dwaine H
MacGiollabhui, Muiris
Vanesa M Canete Jurado
Zwicky, David A
J.T. Eagan
Darbishire, Patricia Lynne
Brenda Sarmiento Quezada
Bryan J. Duarte
Oakes, William C
James Vincent Canino
Ekenstedt, Kari J
Chupp, Brian K
Leitch, Stephen R
Wallace, Sarah A

Undergraduate Student Representatives (10)

Reeya M Ramasamy
Ayush Reddy Kadigari
Ainsley Kaye Blazek
Dario Abusada
Julia Rose Hoyer
Daniel Nabielec
Diya Kothapalli Pradhan

Charles James Herr
Yara Zaidoun Hijaz
Sadie A Poirier

Graduate Student Representatives (6)

Victor Anthony Gutierrez
Benjamin Lam
Allen Roy Murray
Mikayla Angelique Roach
Holder Kai
Chappidi Abhishek Kumar

Chair 2024-2025: Ryan Reeves

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: 4/8/2026

The committee held one formal meeting in late spring. This structure reflects the nature of the committee's work, which requires continuous engagement from members throughout the academic year due to the ongoing flow of grade appeals. During this reporting period, the committee operated with stable policy and established procedures, and there were no substantive issues that required additional formal meetings outside of regular appeal activity. The annual spring meeting serves several purposes, including providing a comprehensive overview of committee activity, identifying patterns and trends observed in appeals, ensuring transparency in the actions of the committee chair, and conducting the annual election for the chair position.

Committee work summary:

The committee continues to observe a relatively stable rate of grade issuance across the Purdue University system. However, the overall rate of grade appeals appears to be declining. This decline has not translated into a reduced workload for the committee, but it has changed the nature of the appeals being reviewed. The committee continues to see a consistent balance between decisions to uphold grades as issued and those resulting in grade changes, with no significant deviation in that distribution.

What has shifted more noticeably is the structure and complexity of appeals. In prior years, the committee commonly reviewed what could be considered "standard" appeals, where a student challenged a grade through the school-level process before elevating the appeal to the university level. During this reporting period, that pattern has become less common. Instead, the committee is seeing a higher proportion of complex and atypical cases. For example, during the Spring 2026 semester, multiple appeals were initiated by instructors challenging school-level decisions. In these cases, the committee determined that grade adjustments were warranted. These situations were particularly consequential at the graduate level, where grade outcomes can directly impact a student's academic standing. The committee has navigated these cases consistently and objectively.

The committee also encountered cases where new and material information emerged during the university-level process that had not been identified during earlier stages. In one instance, evidence of academic misconduct became apparent during the appeal, resulting in a change to the outcome after the appeal had been initiated. Additionally, a procedural concern emerged in a small number of cases where school-level participation in the appeal process was absent. In these situations, the lack of institutional response limited the available evidence and effectively prevented a standard adversarial review. To address this, the committee chair exercised limited executive action authority to resolve the appeals. These actions were not taken unilaterally, but rather with the input and advisement of a representative group of committee members to ensure transparency and consistency. All such actions are documented and shared with the full committee during the annual meeting.

Overall, while the volume of appeals may be declining, the committee's work has become more complex, requiring greater procedural flexibility and careful judgment in the handling of non-standard cases.

Goals / Next Steps:

- Continuing coordinated efforts between the committee, Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR), Educational Policy Committee (EPC), and other oversight stakeholders to maintain an efficient and consistent grade appeal process.
- Maintain a strong working relationship with the Dean of Students and OSRR to streamline communication, improve information flow, and ensure alignment across the multiple entities involved in appeal tracking and documentation.
- Focus on incremental efficiency improvements to reduce appeal resolution timelines while preserving objectivity and procedural integrity. The committee remains committed to resolving appeals in a timely manner, recognizing that prolonged processes can negatively impact students and faculty.
- Sustain current progress in reducing appeal lifecycle timelines, with many cases now being resolved in approximately 15 to 19 days, compared to longer timelines in prior cycles.
- Explore the continuation of a voluntary summer review period to adjudicate appeals outside of the traditional academic calendar, depending on member availability.
- Maintain stable committee procedures, with no major policy or structural changes anticipated in the upcoming cycle.
- Continue collaboration with undergraduate and graduate student government bodies to ensure strong and consistent student representation on the committee.
- Emphasize steady, incremental improvement rather than large-scale procedural changes, recognizing that the committee has reached a point of operational stability and maturity.

Readmission and Academic Renewal Committee Annual Report 2025-2026

Chair: Co-chairs Megan Dorton and Dr. Kathleen Ferrero (As of October 2025) Previous to that time, Chair, Ja'Niah Downing; Vice-chair, Dr. Kathleen Ferrero

Charge: The primary charge is to hear appeals from students whose readmission application was denied by the academic college or school for which they were requesting readmission. This committee is also responsible for hearing requests for Academic Renewal.

Membership:

Melissa Casner
Wan Ting Chin
Earl Coleman
Bethany McGowan
Amber Neal-Stanely
Temitope Adeoye Olenloa
Terron Phillips
Sarah Renkert
Kayce Solari Williams
Yaguang Zhang

Chair 2024-2025: Megan Dorton (until March 2024), Janiah Downing (March-End of year)

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: We do not meet in person. All conversations, voting, and decisions are made via email. In rare circumstances we will meet as a group. This did not occur this past calendar year.

Committee work summary: This year we codified the Reentry process and moved forward a proposal from the Educational Policy Committee to the University Senate which would add this policy to the Purdue University Academic regulations. This will be read into the minutes in the March meeting with a vote expected at the April meeting.

Goals / Next Steps: We will review the Academic Renewal policy and process. Conversations across the campus are indicating a potential desire to make changes to this policy.

Purdue University | University Senate

Steering Committee
Annual Report
2025-26

Chair: Lisa Bosman

Charge: The Steering Committee proposes the agenda for every session of the Senate. It ensures distribution of the agenda to each member of the Senate at least five days before each regularly scheduled meeting. The Steering Committee, with the assistance of the Secretary of Faculties, provides for distribution along with the agenda, a report of items being brought to the University Senate by the Steering committees, along with the action taken on each item, by vote.

Membership: Ximena Bernal, David Blon, Lisa Bosman, Mung Chiang, Amanda Darbyshire, Jim Dworkin, Katie Jarriel, David Liu, Stephen Martin, Julio Ramirez, Torbert Rocheford, Mark Zimpfer, Joe Camp*

Chair 2026-2027: Lisa Bosman

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: 1st Monday of the month at 4pm, Zoom

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

1) Coordinated several speakers for informational presentations at the University Senate Meetings:
    a. Athletic Affairs
    b. Cornerstone Integrated Liberal Arts
    c. John Martinson Honors College
    d. Entrepreneurship Education Initiatives
    e. Books Initiative
    f. Childcare Challenges at Purdue- A Faculty Perspective
    g. Institute for Sustainable Development
    h. Teaching and Learning at Purdue
    i. Strategies to Support Flexible Attendance
    j. Transportation Safety
2) Resolutions Forwarded to Senate that Passed

Educational Policy Committee
Senate Document 25-20: Senate Proposal for Withdrawal Policy Updates
Senate Document 25-21: Office of Admissions Proposal for Addition of Reentry Policy to Academic Regulations
Senate Document 25-23: Edits to Academic Regulations Regarding Summer Calendar

Senate Document 25-24: Scholastic Recognition Graduation with Distinction- Update to Academic Regulations
Senate Document 25-08 Proposal for Faculty Mid-Semester Grade Reports
Community Connection Committee
Senate Document 25-22: Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee Joint Proposal on Childcare Challenges at Purdue
Senate Document 25-10: Name Change
Senate Document 25-11: Full Giant Leaps Master Plan Omission
University Resources Policy Committee
Senate Document 25-13 Resolution in Support of a University-wide Sustainability Task Force
Senate Document 25-14 Resolution in Support of Renewable Energy Resources for Campus
Senate Document 25-16 PSG and PGSG Resolution Calling for Expanded Voter Accessibility
Faculty Affairs Committee
Senate Document 25-22: Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee Joint Proposal on Childcare Challenges at Purdue
Steering Committee
Senate Document 25-09 Reapportionment of the Senate
Nominating Committee
Senate Document 25-18: Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the Senate
Senate Document 25-17: Nominees for the Nominating Committee
Senate Document 25-15: Nominee for Advisor to the Senate
Senate Document 25-07: Nominees for the University Resources Policy Committee
Senate Document 25-06: Nominees for the Nominating Committee
Senate Document 25-05: Nominees for the Faculty Affairs Committee
Senate Document 25-04: Nominee for Advisor to the Educational Policy Committee
Senate Document 25-03: Nominee for the Educational Policy Committee
Senate Document 25-02: Nominee for the University Resources Policy Committee
Senate Document 25-01: Nominees for the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee
Student Affairs Committee
n/a

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year*

1) **PSG & PGSG:** Consider meeting with PSG and PGSG leadership early in the AY to help facilitate their voices being heard.
2) **Information Sessions:** The following informational presentations were discussed as possibilities for the 2025-2026 AY but time did not allow. These can be considered for the 2026-2027 AY.
    - Research Streams: Executive Vice President for Research
    - Purdue Indy Updates: Senior Vice Provost for Purdue University in Indianapolis

Student Affairs Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair: Abigail S. Engelberth

Charge: The Student Affairs Committee is concerned with matters related to the general social, cultural, and practical welfare of all students of the University. Specific non-classroom matters of concern to this committee include, but are not limited to, University Placement Service, intercollegiate athletics, counseling, scholarships, loans, conduct and discipline, health, living conditions, student political activities and organizations, Student Senate actions and recommendations, extracurricular activities, provision of equal rights and opportunities, and any other matters that would enhance students' university environment for learning and living.

Membership: Heather Beasley, Joseph Coates, Ulrike Dydak, Abigail S. Engelberth, Melissa Franks, Loring (Larry) Nies, Tae Hong Park, Michael G. Smith, Christian Rogers, Oleksandr Tsymbaliuk, Rua Williams, Seung Yoon Lee, Beth McCuskey (Advisor), graduate and undergraduate student representatives from PSG and PGSG.

Chair 2024-2025: Abigail S. Engelberth

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: The committee met approximately once per month during the academic year, primarily via Teams.

Committee work summary:

Review and Feedback on Senate Documents
Senate Document 25-19
The Student Affairs Committee reviewed Senate Document 25-19 with a focus on claims asserting impacts on students. While the committee appreciated the opportunity to provide input, members noted that many statements were presented at a level of generality that limited the committee's ability to assess student-facing impacts.
SAC emphasized that its role is not investigative, and effective review requires clarity regarding affected units, timeframes, governance processes, and observable effects on students. The committee recommended that future requests for standing committee input include greater specificity to enable constructive, evidence-based feedback aligned with committee charges.

Resolutions and Student-Initiated Issues
Resolution 25-08: In Support of Purdue Students Experiencing Food Insecurity
The committee discussed a student resolution addressing food insecurity, including

access to resources and student awareness. SAC reviewed existing university infrastructure, including the Basic Needs program, ACE Campus Food Pantry, Swipe Out Hunger, and related outreach efforts.

Committee discussion emphasized that many requested actions were already in place or underway, and that the primary challenge appeared to be visibility and student awareness rather than the absence of resources. The committee recommended direct communication and collaboration with the units responsible for food assistance to improve outreach and reduce stigma, rather than legislative escalation at that stage. SAC communicated these findings to student authors and encouraged continued engagement with relevant campus offices.

Resolution 25-09: In Support of Quality Water for All Students

The committee reviewed concerns related to student water quality and facilities communication. SAC discussed current operational protocols for water testing, incident response, and communication during maintenance or disruptions. The committee identified gaps in information regarding responsibility, data sources, and methodology used to characterize the scope of reported issues.

SAC elected to defer advancement of the resolution pending additional clarification and verification, including consultation with facilities and administrative operations and further discussion with student representatives involved in drafting the resolution.

Ongoing Student Affairs Topics

Transportation and Parking

The committee continued to monitor transportation and parking issues, particularly following the transition from CityBus campus loops to the Purdue Campus Connector system. Student representatives shared survey feedback regarding late-hour transportation, route capacity, and off-campus access for graduate students.

Committee discussion noted that many early concerns had been addressed through consultation with administrative units, with improved service usage and responsiveness following student input. SAC recognized the role of student advocacy and ongoing communication in shaping transportation improvements and agreed to continue monitoring unresolved concerns.

Graduate Student Funding and Financial Pressure

SAC discussed changes in graduate fellowship allocation models, declining availability of travel grants, and variability in support across colleges. The committee noted that recent funding restructuring provided colleges with greater flexibility but may result in thinner distribution of resources.

Members emphasized the importance of gathering additional data and hearing directly from responsible administrative units to better understand both short-term impacts and longer-term trends affecting recruitment, equity, and student success.

Study Abroad Affordability

The committee discussed increasing costs associated with study abroad programs and the loss of prior subsidies and scholarships. SAC noted concern that rising costs may reduce access and threaten program viability if participation declines. The committee identified relevant administrative contacts and expressed interest in further discussion regarding financial aid structures and affordability.

Transfer and Spring-Start Student Support
SAC reviewed issues related to onboarding, advising consistency, and mentorship for transfer and spring-start students. Committee members discussed the scale of the population and existing advising and orientation structures, while recognizing student interest in clearer guidance and improved navigation of academic systems.

Academic Break Structure and Student Well-Being
The committee discussed the alignment of fall break and Thanksgiving scheduling, balancing instructional continuity, student mental health, and logistical considerations. SAC agreed that any potential calendar changes would require broad input from students, faculty, and staff. The committee supported exploring a unified survey approach in coordination with governance and student groups.

Student Success Technologies and Advising Tools
SAC received updates on the rollout of My Purdue Plan and related student success platforms. Committee discussion focused on awareness, training, and the role of advisors and faculty in helping students effectively use available tools.

Goals / Next Steps:

- Continue serving as a forum for student-initiated concerns requiring cross-unit coordination or escalation.
- Monitor transportation and parking developments and student feedback.
- Gather additional information on graduate funding trends and student support mechanisms.
- Encourage improved visibility and communication around existing student resources.
- Support data-informed discussion of academic calendar structures and student well-being.

Closing

The Student Affairs Committee remains committed to bringing a student-focused perspective to shared governance and to engaging constructively on issues affecting students' academic and lived experiences. The committee appreciates collaboration with student governments, administrative partners, and other standing committees in advancing student welfare across the university.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Athletic Affairs Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair: Matt Conaway, Professor, Purdue Bands & Orchestras

Committee Charge: https://www.purdue.edu/senate/committees/standing-committees/studentAffairs/athleticAffairs.php

Membership:

- Matt Conaway (Chair, Senate Appointment)
- Tony Albrecht (Alumni Representative)
- Emma Bailey (Student-Athlete Representative)
- Mike Bobinski (Executive Vice President / Director of Athletics)
- Rachel Clark (Senate Appointment)
- Tiffini Grimes (Deputy Athletics Director / Senior Woman Administrator)
- Ken Halpin (Deputy Athletics Director / Chief Operating Officer)
- Kyle Haynes (Senate Appointment)
- Gary Henriott (Alumni Representative)
- Sue Holder Price (Community Liaison)
- Ed Howat (Senior Associate Athletics Director – Student Services)
- Eric Holloway (Senate Appointment)
- Kathy Martin (Senate Appointment)
- Owen Martin (Campus Student Member)
- Beth McCuskey (Presidential Liaison / Vice Provost – Student Life)
- Jacqueline McGill (Associate Athletics Director – Compliance)
- Tae Hong Park (Student Affairs Liaison)
- Peyton Stovall (Associate Athletics Director – Student-Athlete Development)
- Marcy Towns (Faculty Athletic Representative)
- Phillip VanFossen (Faculty Athletic Representative)
- Calvin Williams (Associate Athletics Director – Sport Administration)

Chair 2024-2025: Ernest R. Blatchley III

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:

1. August 28, 2025
2. October 15, 2025
3. December, 2025 – Information provided from Athletics with no votes taken. The materials provided from Athletics Administration were approved as minutes at our February 5 meeting by unanimous consent of the committee.
4. February 5, 2026
5. April 16, 2026

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

- Annual presentation to the University Senate on student success
- Approval of competition schedules (and revisions) along with waivers for missed classes beyond the allowable limit
- Overview of student-athlete success initiatives in areas such as community service, civic engagement, resume building, networking, campus inclusion, and internships
- Ongoing discussions related to legislation/litigation affecting student-athletes and the overall health of the department (NIL, changes to NCAA and B1G governance, transfer rules, revenue sharing, and anti-trust legislation.)
- Discussion of financial standing of the athletics department with emphasis on student scholarships and support
- Review of a variety of compliance topics throughout the year, including transfer portal, NIL, revenue-sharing, sports wagering, to ensure Purdue's policies and practices in these areas are clear, consistent, and protect the student-athletes.
- Discussions of conference scheduling to ensure that student-athlete academic success and support remain consistent, and that missed class time is at the forefront of competition scheduling conversations.
- Selection of recipients of Big 10 scholarships and awards.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year*

- Continue discussion of legislation and governance changes that may affect student-athletes and the financial health of the department as it relates to NIL, revenue sharing, etc.
- Continue discussion about impact of conference expansion on competition schedules and how this might affect the current missed class time policies. The FARs and SWA remain engaged in these conversations and will be prepared to share feedback as the first year of the expanded conference is underway.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

University Resources Policy Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair: Lori Hoagland

Charge:
The University Resources Policy Committee is concerned with, but not limited to consideration of the following matters: planning optimal utilization of the physical facilities of the University, including buildings, the library, scientific and other equipment and educational aids; studies of staff needs, utilization, and planning; interdepartmental cooperation of improved facilities and staff utilization; and nonacademic planning, including architecture, landscaping, parking, and traffic.

Membership:

Lori Hoagland (Chair)	Horticulture and Landscape Architecture
Amy Atkinson	CSSAC Advisor, Heat and Power Administration
Daniel Cziczo	Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences
Benjamin Dunford	Management
Thomas Hacker	School of Applied and Creative Computing
Kyle Haynes	Political Science
Richard Johnson-Sheehan	English
Kee-Hong Kim	Food Science (VAD committee liaison)
Carl Krieger	Advisor, Residential Education
Elizabeth Mauermann	PSG Representative, HHS
Paul Mort	Materials Engineering (BIER committee liaison)
Ayooluwa Ojo	PSGS Representative, Animal Sciences
Tae Hong Park	Visual and Performing Arts (Sust. committee liaison)
Kim Pearson	Advisor, Office of VP for Administrative Operations
Brian Richert	Animal Sciences
Shayne Ryan	PSG representative, PPI
Changyou Wang	Mathematics
Donald Woodyard	MaPSAC Representative, Veterinary Hospital
Howard (Howie) Zelaznik	Health and Kinesiology

Chair 2026-2027: Tae Hong Park

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:
UPRC committee meetings were arranged in August 2025, as following:
- Zoom meetings for all
- 4:00PM – 5:00PM om Mondays

- Each meeting was held at least 2 weeks prior to the next Steering Committee meeting so we could have time to discuss, draft, and submit documents to SC for their review and scheduling.
- Meeting dates scheduled were:
  09/22/25
  10/27/25
  11/24/25
  01/12/26 – *cancelled due to lack of material to discuss*
  3/2/26 – *rescheduled from meeting scheduled in February*
  3/30/26

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

In 2025-26

- 9/22 – Committee member introductions; overview of the URPC's charge; unfinished business from last year (concerns around parking/safety of scooters); new ideas/concerns (new campus transit systems, space concerns around campus (unused spaces), dangerous intersections; PSG/PGSG voting concerns) – decided to reach out to Amber Chellis-Omeda to discuss new campus plan & and PSG VP & Pro Temp to speak at next meeting
- 10/27 – Amber scheduled to come but did not show up (*tried to get her to come to next meeting but she stopped responding*); PSG VP (Nic) and Pro Temp (Liv) came and provided their insights on campus transit (getting better), shared concerns around pedestrian/biking/scooter safety, and concerns around voting. Reached out to Parking and Traffic for insights and agreed to review new voting resolution.
- 11/24 – Reviewed and discussed PSG/PGSG voting resolution (25-16), and two resolution co-advanced with the sustainability committee around a sustainability taskforce (25-13) and renewable energy (25-14); all three advanced to senate floor 25-13 and 25-14 passed, 25-16 pulled for more consideration and potential revision
- 1/12 – Canceled
- 3/2 – Joint meeting with BIER committee with Andrew Bean, Assoc. VP of Finance and Accounting. He gave a great presentation on the Purdue's budget and there was lots of great discussion. Opportunities for better engagement between with BIER and URPC – involve us in ideas to overcome state/fed budget shortfalls, entrepreneurship, etc. and request to provide greater granularity in future presentations/discussions.
- Discussed URPC response to 25-19 – AAUP call for no confidence in Provost Wolff via email.
- 3/30 – Discussed whether voting resolution (25-16) needed revision – decided to send back to senate with minimal changes – it ended up passing. Also discussed new resolution from PSG covering parking transparency (26-04) – and questions were raised around costs, efficiencies, selling spots to students, and new proposal

for administration around selling Purdue parking to a private entity. Also discussed upcoming vote of no confidence including questions/concerns to pass on to steering.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year*

- Follow up on PSG parking resolution and proposal to privatize parking
- Follow up on safety concerns for pedestrians – try reaching out again to Amber or others who can discuss this issue.
- Follow up on questions around space on campus and some recent surveys around campus on space use
- Consider another joint meeting with BIER and Andrew Bean around budget
- Consider reaching out to other committees (e.g., in the past sustainability always very active and Tony Gillund, director of sustainability has provided helpful presentations).
- Consider inviting new PSG VP and Pro-temp to a meeting. Very helpful to hear their perspectives and work with them to pass student-centered bills.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Budget Interpretation, Evaluation, and Review Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair:

Lori Hoagland from URPC (*acted in an unofficial capacity*)

Charge:

The Committee shall be charged with collecting and analyzing data about Purdue's revenues and appropriations and conveying information about Purdue's budgetary policies to the Senate. Furthermore, with coordination and consultation with the University Resources Policy Committee, this Committee will collaborate with the fiscal officers of the administration to examine and evaluate budgetary policies.

Membership:
Andrew Bean (Associate Vice President, Finance & Accounting)
Cherise Hall (Office of the Provost/V-Provost for Enrollment Management)
John Morgan (Chemical Engineering)
Cody Mullen (Public Health)
Paul Mort (URPC Liaison, Materials Engineering)
Eva Nodine (Vice President/Deputy CFO)
Howard Zelaznik (URPC Liaison, Health and Kinesiology)
Xinyu Zhang (Environmental & Ecological Engineering)

Chair 2026-2027:
TBD

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:

- 2/3/26
- 3/2/26 (joint with URPC meeting)

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*
2/3 – Hoagland (URPC chair) organized a meeting since a chair had never been identified, and the committee was not active. During the meeting, the committee members introduced themselves and discussed the history and charge of the BIER committee. Challenges discussed including grad housing, HR benefits, changes in state budget, potential changes in indirect costs. Andrew Bean agreed to give a presentation covering the current budget.

3/2 – Joint meeting with BIER committee with Andrew Bean, Assoc. VP of Finance and Accounting. He gave a great presentation on Purdue's budget and there was lots of great discussion. Opportunities for better engagement between with BIER and URPC – involve us in ideas to overcome state/fed budget shortfalls, entrepreneurship, etc. and request to provide greater granularity in future presentations/discussions.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year.*

- Try working with the Office of Financial Planning & Analysis on how BIER/URPC can provide faculty input to address financial challenges.
- Explore methods to enhance the transparency university budget for the university community, fostering improved productivity and efficiency.
- Identify a chair for the 2026-27 session.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Staff Appeal Board for Traffic Regulation
Annual Report
2025-26

Chair: Stephanie Winder

Charge: Members of the board should become thoroughly familiar with the Motor Vehicle, Bicycle, and Traffic Regulations at Purdue University. The board shall hear and determine all appeals made to it by staff members on charges of violations of the regulations cited.

Membership: Stephanie Winder, Matthew Stephens, Shankar Thangamani, Melanie Beasley, Hanyu Chen, Kaylee Gad, Amy Nagle

Chair 2025-2026: Stephanie Winder

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: 10/16/25, 11/17/25, 1/29/26, 3/30/26

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

- Adjudication of appeals sent to it by Parking Operations for staff citations that have already been upheld by Parking Operations.
- Provide consultation with Parking Operations concerning constituent interactions with vehicle registration/permitting system as well as other parking issues.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year.*

- Outside of standard adjudications, no goals or next steps are planned.

Sustainability Committee
Annual Report
2025-2026

Chair: Michael Johnston

Charge: The purpose of the committee shall be to set five-year goals to advance the sustainability of the university, guided by Purdue University's Sustainability Strategic Plan including but not limited to reducing overall energy consumption and transitioning to greater utilization of clean and renewable sources of energy, determine measurable objectives for achieving these goals, and evaluate progress in meeting the objectives.

Membership:
- Subhra Bansal
- Nicholas Beaver (PSG Representative)
- Kai Benford (PSG Representative)
- Shivam Dave (PSG Representative)
- Rashmi Deodeshmukh
- Genell Ebbini
- Hannah Folarin (PGSG Representative)
- Terri Griffin (CSSAC representative)
- Bryan Hubbard
- Prateek Jaiswal
- Michael Johnston (Chair)
- Kevin Kircher
- Davi Corderio Moreira
- Tae Hong Park (Vice-Chair)
- Kwonsik Song
- Manaal Tafseer (PFW Student Representative)
- Amanda Taylor (MaPSAC Representative)
- Shuyi Weng

Chair 2024-2025: Michael Johnston

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: The entire committee met on 8 Sep. 2025 and 24 Nov. 2025. We had numerous additional subcommittee meetings.

Committee work summary: We passed two resolutions out of our committee, which were then taken up and passed by the URPC. These became SD 25–13 and 25–14, both of which the Senate passed unanimously at the meeting on 16 Feb. 2026.

Goals / Next Steps: We have three main goals for next year: 1) To advocate for adoption of SD 25–13 and 25–14; 2) To liaise with Prof Jonathan Day (HHS) to advance materials related to sustainable travel practices; 3) To liaise with Tony Gillund and the Office of Sustainability.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Visual Art and Design Committee
Annual Report
2025-26

Chair: Laura Bittner
Assistant Professor of Practice (interior design)
Patti & Rusty Rueff School of Design, Art, and Performance
bittnerl@purdue.edu

Charge: 1. Study and promote a heightened cultural atmosphere on campus through the visual arts in cooperation with appropriate academic departments and/or campus organizations. It shall plan and develop a program of acquisition, maintenance, and display of arts and artifacts for the University that will create an atmosphere in which students, staff, and citizenry can gain a heightened appreciation of the diversity of visual art forms and its creators.

2. Review general design criteria for proposed new structures; evaluate and suggest alternatives where appropriate. Advise the vice president for physical facilities on matters of building and landscape design concerns from the user's viewpoint. Periodically review overall campus appearance and make recommendations for improvements relating to architectural and landscape. design and planning.

Membership:

Banda, Jorge	PUB HEALTH	2028
Bittner, Laura	DAP	2026
Johnson, David	POLY Science	2026
Kaufman, Ralph	MATH	2027
Karanki, Fecri	AVIATION	2028
Kaur, Upinder	AG ENG	2027
Kim, Kee-Hong	FOOD SCIENCE	2027
Kpetsu, Shalom	PGSG Rep	2026
Krishna, Ashima	HONORS	2028
Kucera, Julia	PSG	2026
Reifel, Tracy	CSSAC	2026
Schukraft, Jennifer	MaPSAC	2028
Swanson, Nathan	HONORS	2028
Kwam, Erika	GALLERY	N/A
Slocum, Angela	ADVISOR	N/A
Leavitt, Allison	FACILITIES	N/A

Chair 2024-2026: Professor Laura Bittner
Assistant Professor of Practice (interior design)
Patti & Rusty Rueff School of Design, Art, and Performance
bittnerl@purdue.edu

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: Monthly meetings, September, October, November 2025. Small group meetings in February and March 2026.

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

We have been working on a few key ideas:

- Promote awareness of the VAD committee through an introduction letter to be sent to School and Department Heads, as well as college Deans.
- Promote the Process Guidelines for Discovered or Uncatalogued Art Items on Campus with the goal of adding more art to campus buildings and increasing exposure to art using the Lonsford gift and working with Purdue Galleries.
- Create a walking tour of art available on campus (working with the Purdue Graphic Design Faculty and the Arboretum)
- Create a call for an artist to create sculpture to display in Pickett Park, possibly a faculty member.
- Develop a way to promote art on campus by displaying top artwork from students, the School of Design, Art, and Performance (identifying buildings, proposals, etc.) to hang for one school year. Artwork would rotate each year.
- Promote art and design, including Purdue Galleries and new Purdue building designs, via Boiler TV, exponent, social media, PU calendars.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year.*

Our goal is to start implementing key ideas:

- Work with Purdue Facilities and Purdue Galleries to identify designated areas/building on campus appropriate for the placement of Art through the use of the Lonsford gift.
- Finalize a walking tour of art available on campus (working with the Purdue Alumni Center and Facilities)
- Finalize a call for an artist to create sculpture to display in Pickett Park, possibly a faculty member.
- Confirm a way to promote art on campus by displaying top artwork from students the School of Design, Art, and Performance (identifying buildings, proposal, etc.) to hang for one school year. Artwork would rotate each year.
- Confirm a way to promote art and design, including Purdue Galleries and new Purdue building designs, via Boiler TV, exponent, social media, PU calendars.
- Identify designated areas/building on campus appropriate for the placement of Art using the Lonsford gift.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY | University Senate

Parking & Traffic Committee
Annual Report
2025-26

<u>Chair 2024-2026</u>: Josh Widhalm, Associate Professor of Horticulture and Director of the Center for Plant Biology

<u>Charge</u>: "The committee shall make a continuing systematic review of parking and traffic needs and possible solutions in the light of the University growth, faculty and student needs, and campus beautification, including regulations for the control of parked vehicles and traffic flow. It shall recommend policies for parking and traffic movement. It shall advise the president on plans and regulations for parking and traffic movement."

<u>Membership</u>: The committee included representation from faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students (via PSG and PGSG). Members designated as *ex officio* were invited by the chair, Josh Widhalm, and are considered non-voting members. Votes were recorded when at least ten (10) voting members were present. The committee was comprised of the following individuals:

- Joshua R. Widhalm – Horticulture and Landscape Architecture (committee chair)
- Steven T. Carn – Parking Facilities
- Jessica Robertson – Associate Vice President, Auxiliary Services (*ex officio*, non-voting)
- Anita Jane Lowery – Parking Facilities
- Ashleigh Briane Stingley – Parking Facilities
- Camille M. Shoaf – Campus Master Planning & Sustainability
- Francis Willow Quinn Corvin – Student (Disability access liaison; *ex officio*, non-voting)
- Wylie Jo Gilbert – Purdue Student Government
- Xinxuan Li – Purdue Student Government
- Zachary Knepper – Purdue Graduate Student Government
- Jeffery P. Stefancic – Dean of Students
- Adam J. Keyster – Capital Program Management
- Emily Bramson – PURA
- Emily Ryen Jones – Student Success (MaPSAC rep)
- Jennifer L. Schukraft – School of Management Admin & Instruction (MaPSAC rep)
- Thomas R. B. Brown – Daniels School of Business (CSSAC rep)
- Abidemi Mary Ajuwon – Nursing
- Amanda Ward – Nursing
- Anthony Gillund – Energy Development & Sustainability
- Anthony N. Standifer – Police Department
- Bradley D. Anderson – Fire Department
- Christa Pazera – University Residences / Resident Life
- Diane M. Schrader – Infrastructure
- Elizabeth A. Moore – Dean of Students

- Eric W. Adams – Research Computing
- Jenna Bednarski – Nursing
- Kristi S. Brown – Capital Program Management
- Lesley D. Wiete – Police Department
- Marcus Drake Smith – Capital Program Management
- Pamela Roxanne Yameogo – [Department not specified]
- Peter Richard Celeste – Student Success
- R.L. Walker – City of West Lafayette
- Sofia K. Babcock – [Department not specified]
- Vishal Shrivastav – Electrical & Computer Engineering
- Steven Clingenpeel – Operations and Maintenance (*ex officio*, non-voting)
- Brian Richert – Animal Sciences

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:
- September 19, 2025
- October 15, 2025
- November 19, 2025
- February 3, 2026
- March 12, 2026
- April 29, 2026

Committee work summary:
While the committee is not a decision-making body, it serves as a vital communication link between the Purdue community and campus leadership. This year, the committee reviewed parking availability, permit allocation, accessibility at parking areas and bus stops, pedestrian safety, bike and scooter management, parking technology, communication gaps, and the implications of major growth in the southwest corridor of the Purdue West Lafayette campus. Where appropriate, discussions were relayed to relevant decision-makers, with progress communicated back to stakeholders.

Key topics and developments:
1. **Accessibility, ADA parking, and bus stop access**
    - Accessibility was one of the committee's most sustained topics throughout the year. Throughout the year, members raised concerns about inaccessible bus stops, limited usable ADA infrastructure, the need for improved signage, blocked ramps, wheelchair loading areas, unpaved lots, and need for stronger enforcement for violations affecting disabled community members.
        - The committee recommends that the ADA parking in the gravel lot at the Lynn Building have paved access to the building.
    - In the spring, discussion continued around shared or reserved accessible parking options, better (bus) driver training for wheelchair lift use, documentation of inaccessible stops, and clearer loading and unloading markings.
        - The need for improved bus driver training was communicated to SP+

2. **Graduate student and student parking access**
   - Student access to parking remained a recurring concern, especially for graduate students navigating permit availability.
   - The committee discussed pressures on garage and commuter parking, the transition to a lottery-based permit system, and the need for clearer communication about assignments, permit timing, and options for students who begin in January or who are not initially offered expected permit types.
   - A central webpage for transportation and parking information emerged as a priority, reflecting concern that decentralized information is creating avoidable confusion for students navigating parking and campus transit.
   - The committee considered specific student use cases, including veterinary students working in clinical settings, students seeking weekend transportation options, and broader concerns about aligning parking access with actual patterns of academic and campus use.

3. **Pedestrian safety and campus circulation**
   - Pedestrian safety remained an active concern over the year. The committee discussed unsafe intersections, though many fall under the jurisdiction of the City of West Lafayette. The committee discussed the need for communication with campus planning and the City of West Lafayette regarding crossings and traffic studies.
   - At the October meeting, there was discussion linking pedestrian safety to changing circulation patterns around bike and scooter lanes, with attention to the challenge of improving signage without over signage. These conversations reflected a broader committee interest in making circulation safer and easier to understand for pedestrians, drivers, cyclists, scooter users, and those with mobility needs.

4. **Bikes, scooters, and micromobility management**
   - The committee repeatedly discussed micromobility issues, especially where scooter parking conflicts with accessibility or orderly circulation.
   - In November, members discussed bikes and scooters blocking ADA ramps and the need for better rack placement, signage, and enforcement.
   - In March, attention focused on improper VEO scooter parking near the Horticulture/Nelson bike-rack area, with action items calling for updated geofencing, no-park zones, and clearer physical guidance.

5. **Parking operations, enforcement, and technology**
   - Several meetings included updates on parking operations and the role of technology in improving user experience.
   - In October, members discussed permit sales, ParkMobile-related issues, and possible stronger consequences for repeat abuse of accessible parking spaces.

    - In November, the committee reviewed improvements in communication that appeared to reduce vehicle relocations and towing concerns around football game weekends.
    - In February, Parking Operations reported that scan-and-pay citations had increased payment within six days of issuance, and the committee discussed rollout of Tempo on-demand parking for non-gated garages. Members also recommended evaluating occupancy counters for garages and larger commuter lots to more transparently communicate parking availability.
    - In March, the committee reviewed a software problem in gated garages that had caused incorrect transient charges and noted that affected charges had been erased. The committee also adopted Purdue Student Government Resolution 26-04 supporting greater transparency around parking availability and garage. counters, reinforcing the year's emphasis on better data and communication. tools.

6. **Parking availability, construction pressure, and southwest campus growth**
    - A central topic discussed throughout the year was the discrepancy between continued southwest campus growth in the Discovery Park District and available nearby parking capacity. One issue of particular concern is parking for the new Nursing and Pharmacy Education Building, the loss of existing surface parking in that area, and the likelihood that Harrison Street Garage would be expected to absorb additional demand despite already serving a heavily used part of campus.
    - Resolution 26-01, dated April 29, 2026, was passed by the committee, which supports planning, siting, and development of a new parking garage in the southwest corridor near the Nursing and Pharmacy Education Building and Discovery Park District. The resolution argues that continued academic, research, clinical, residential, and innovation-related growth in that part of campus justifies additional shared parking infrastructure and that a new garage could also reduce pressure on interior-campus facilities.

Recommendations and goals for 2026-2027:

- Continue evaluating ADA parking and bus stop accessibility, including documentation of problem locations and coordination with the Disability Resource Center, student advocates, Parking Operations, transit providers, and campus and city partners where relevant.
- Support the development of more centralized and user-friendly transportation information so students, employees, and visitors can more easily understand parking, transit, and permit options.
- Monitor implementation of parking technology improvements, including on-demand parking tools, garage availability information, and communication systems that reduce confusion and unnecessary citations or relocations.
- Continue committee attention to pedestrian safety, especially at crossings and circulation pinch points affected by construction, micromobility, and changing traffic patterns.

- Improve bike and scooter parking management through better geofencing, signage, enforcement, and physical design that protects pedestrian and ADA access.
- Advance discussion with Senate leadership and university administration on long-term parking strategy for the southwest corridor, including the planning rationale set forth in Resolution 26-01.

Undergraduate Curriculum Council

Annual Report

2025-2026

Chair: Dr. Jeneen Fields, Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, College of Agriculture

Charge: The Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC) is a subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), of the University Senate. The UCC is responsible for the administration and oversight of the core curriculum. As a faculty-led committee, the UCC determines and oversees the operational guidelines associated with the implementation elements of the university core curriculum. The UCC establishes the guiding rules for meeting foundational outcomes, approves foundational learning outcome (FLO) courses, regulates and monitors approved courses to assure they satisfy the foundational outcomes, reviews the list of foundational and embedded outcomes, to ensure relevance and reviews courses from transfer students to assess suitability to meet the standards for the core curriculum.

The University Senate defines and limits the UCC's duties, responsibilities and powers, and hears appeals to the UCC decisions; the UCC is directly responsible to the Senate via the Educational Policy Committee (EPC).

There are four guiding principles for the Undergraduate Curriculum Council:

1. The curriculum is faculty governed.
2. Learning outcomes within the outcomes-based curriculum are designed to prepare students for continuous learning and expertise within disciplines. The PWL curriculum will be outcomes-based.
3. The curriculum maintains high and rigorous academic standards within each discipline.
4. The curriculum maintains a design mechanism to facilitate flexibility for the academic programs and the students to meet the learning outcomes.

Membership:

Chair 2025-2026: Dr. Jeneen Fields, Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, College of Agriculture

Voting Members		
Name	**Role**	**College/Unit**
George Adams	Voting Faculty Member	Science
Jasmine Begeske	Voting Faculty Member	Education
Françoise Brosseau-Lapré (Chair- Elect)	Voting Faculty Member	Health and Human Sciences
Steve Byrn	Voting Faculty Member	Pharmacy
Harry Denny	Voting Faculty Member	Liberal Arts
Jeneen Fields (Chair)	Voting Faculty Member	Agriculture
Heather Howard	Voting Faculty Member	Libraries
John Howarter	Voting Faculty Member	Engineering
(Vacant)	Voting Faculty Member	Veterinary Medicine
Tawfiq Salem	Voting Faculty Member	Polytechnic
Andres Vargas (Past -Chair)	Voting Faculty Member	Daniels School of Business
Lindsay Weinberg	Voting Faculty Member	Honors College
Non-Voting Members		
Nurgul Aitalieva	Non-voting PFW Rep	PFW, Public Administration
Vacant	PSG Rep	
Haley Oliver -Jishcke	Non-voting Provost Guest	Provost's Office
Britain Hamm	Non-Voting Rep	Liberal Arts Counseling & Student Svcs - Advising
Kim Whatley	Non-voting Registrar Rep	Registrar's Office
Se'Andra Johnson (recorder)	Non-voting Provost Admin	Office of the Provost (Recorder)
Ryan C. Jones	Non-voting Registrar Rep	Registrar's Office
Jaime Keyster	Non-voting Academic Advisor Rep	Academic Advisor, Biology
Sharon Morphew	Non-voting Registrar Rep	Credit Evaluation
Dani Parsons	Non-voting Academic Advisor Rep	Academic Advisor, Honors College

Bryan Price	Non-voting IDA+A Rep	Institutional Data Analytics and Assessment (IDA+A)
Heather Servaty-Seib	Non-voting Provost Rep	Provost's Office
Kim Watley	Non-voting Registrar Rep	Registrar - Curriculum and Catalog
Anne Weiss	Non-voting IDA+A Rep	Institutional Data Analytics and Assessment (IDA+A)
Daniel S. Wilbur	Non-voting PNW Rep	PNW, Communication and Creative Arts
Not assigned	Non-voting EPC Liaison EPC Liaison	EPC Liaison

Meeting Schedule for Past Year: The UCC Leadership meets on the third Wednesday of each month to discuss UCC business and set agenda items. The entire UCC held Monthly (usually the third Wednesday of the month). Given the effectiveness of the schedule, I believe they will continue follow the leadership and total UCC monthly meetings next year.

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

- In Fall of 2025, the UCC was tasked by the Purdue Board of Trustees and Office of the Senior Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning, to develop guidelines and work with faculty to consider courses for the implementation of the new Artificial Intelligence Working Competency FLO. Being the first University in the nation to incorporate an AI FLO into all student curricula, this was a major undertaking. The UCC received initial ideas and suggestions from the Purdue Tiger team assembled by former Senior Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning, Jenna Rickus. Our new Senior Vice Provost for Teaching & Learning, Haley Oliver-Jischke, Senior Associate Vice Provost for Teaching & Learning, Heather Severty-Seib were critical in providing clarity and communication to ensure alignment between the faculty and administration to meet the development and implementation goal for the AI FLO by Fall 2026.

Summaries taken from all meeting minutes.

1. Structure and Approvals: Each meeting began with the approval of the agenda and previous meeting minutes, ensuring procedural consistency and transparency.
2. Panel Assignments and Responsibilities: Significant panel reassignments and the establishment of responsibilities for assessing transfer courses and distributing decisions were regularly discussed.

3. Course Proposal Reviews: Various course proposals were reviewed, with some approved and others requiring further information or revisions, highlighting the committee's rigorous evaluation process.
4. FLO/ELO Assessment Updates: Regular updates on FLO (Foundational Learning Outcomes) and ELO (Embedded Learning Outcomes) assessment processes, including recruitment for testing phases and finalization of assessment documents.
5. Dr. Jeneen Fields became Chair on June 1, 2026, and Dr. Andres Vargas transitioned to the role of Past UCC Chair. Dr. Françoise Brosseau-Lapré was elected as Chair Elect, making up a full and operative UCC Leadership Team.
6. The College of Veterinary Medicine had a vacancy all year after requesting representation several times.
7. In Fall of 2025 , the UCC leadership met with, Senior Vice Provost for Teaching & Learning, Haley Oliver- Jischke and Heather L. Servaty-Seib, Senior Associate Vice Provost for Teaching & Learning to discuss the AI Working Competency Initiative and the work that would be needed to accomplish implementation.
8. UCC Chair, Jeneen Fields organized several evening work sessions to facilitate discussions and allocate tasks for determining the important components of the initiative as well as a timeline.
9. The UCC successfully delivered a framework for the AI Working Competency FLO to the Provost who added some language and implemented the initiative.
10. In January 2026, the UCC worked with the Registrar and Libraries to facilitate training for IMPACT AI. IMPACT AI to prepare courses for the implementation of the AI Working Competency FLO.
11. A Total of 25 courses were approved for the training, and 23 courses were completed and submitted for final approval.
12. Additional courses were submitted that did not go through IMPACT AI, making a total of 29 courses which will be approved for Purdue student enrollment in the Fall.
13. Chair Elect 2026-2027 Voting: Dr. Nastasha Saunders was elected as the Chair Elect for the upcoming year, following a structured nomination and voting process.
14. Summer Assessment Volunteers and Stipends: Volunteers were sought for summer assessment tasks, with approved stipends for participation in evaluating core courses and foundational learning outcomes.
15. Committee Involvement and Leadership: Discussions on future leadership roles within the committee and the benefits of participation, encouraging members to engage in committee work and leadership opportunities.

Summer PWL FLO and ELO Assessment

- In 2024-2025, the UCC worked closely with IDA+A to collect evaluation materials for courses that are part of the core curriculum that meet the following FLOs. Noted as a catch-up year for reviews.

- Behavior & Social Sciences (BSS)
- Science (SCI)
- Oral Communication (OC)

During Summer 2025, a group of UCC faculty (Nurgal Aitalieva, Françoise Brosseau-Lapré, Jeneen Fields, Jamie Keyster, Tawfiq Salem and Daniel Wilbur) and IDA+A staff (Anne Weiss and Bryan Matthew) reviewed the BSS, SCI and OC.

During Summer 2026, a group of UCC (Nurgal Aitalieva, Françoise Brosseau-Lapré, Jeneen Fields, Jamie Keyster, Jasmine Begeske and Daniel Wilbur) and IDA+A staff (Anne Weiss and Bryan Matthew) will review the WC IL-OC and ELOs.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year.*

11. In summer 2024, a group of UCC faculty will examine these 3 mappings and create an evaluation rubric.
12. Create articulation agreements with colleges and universities that would allow the UCC to evaluate courses before a student has taken them.

.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year*. Will be listed in the Transition Report.

Co-chairs: Seema Mattoo and Damon Lisch

Charge: The primary charge is to identify and recruit candidates to fill vacancies in standing and faculty committees of the University Senate, as well as the position of Vice Chair of the Senate. This involves evaluating and balancing numbers, disposition, and experience of Senators for equitable representation and task assignments. Candidates for the standing committees and the Vice Chair of the Senate are then voted on by the full Senate during regularly scheduled meetings. Non-voting advisors for each committee are also identified and recruited to serve on various committees.

Membership:

Dulcy Abraham	Senator
Afsan Bhadelia	Senator
Darryl Ragland	Senator
Joseph Camp**	Ex-Officio (non-voting)
Damon R. Lisch	Senator (Co-Chair)
Seema Mattoo	Senator (Co-Chair)
Mara Faccio	Senator
Fecri Karanki	Senator
Abdelfattah Nour	Senator
Mohit Tawarmalani	Senator

Co-Chairs 2025-2026: Seema Mattoo and Damon Lisch

Meeting Schedule for Past Year:

The following meetings were held (via Zoom):
9/29/2025
10/27/2025
2/2/2026
3/2/2026
3/30/2026

Committee work summary: *include any documents that were forwarded to Senate along with decision (passed, failed), as well as any information you have on the implementation of passed legislation.*

Replacements were identified for all faculty and committees that required them, as well as advisors to those committees. Importantly, candidates for the position of vice-chair of the senate were identified and one of them, xxx, was duly elected by the full Senate. Relevant Senate documents for all of these nominations are available on the Senate web site.

Goals / Next Steps: *include any information that would be helpful to the committee members in the coming year.*

Given the number and variety of positions to be filled, the co-chairs will continue maintain a single, regularly updated document indicating current members of all committees, positions needing to be filled, candidates for those positions, recruitment of those candidates and their final status.

Senate Document	*Title*	*Origin*	*Senate Action*	*Implementation*
25-01	**Senate Document 25-01** Nominees for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 8 September 2025	Elected
25-02	**Senate Document 25-02** Nominee for University Resources Policy Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 8 September 2025	Elected
25-03	**Senate Document 25-03** Nominee for Educational Policy	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 8 September 2025	Elected
25-04	**Senate Document 25-04** Nominee for Advisor to the Senate	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 20 October 2025	Elected
25-05	**Senate Document 25-05** Nominees for the Faculty Affairs Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 20 October 2025	Elected
25-06	**Senate Document 25-06** Nominees for the Nominating Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 20 October 2025	Elected
25-07	**Senate Document 25-07** Nominees for the University Resources Policy Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	* Nominees Elected 20 October 2025	Elected

25-08	**Senate Document 25-08** Modifications to revise and clarify Mid-Semester Academic Progress section of the Purdue. University Academic Regulations	Presented By Educational Policy Committee	* Approved 17 November 2025	In Compliance
25-09	**Senate Document 25-09** Reapportionment of the Senate for AY 2026-2027	Presented By Steering Committee	* Approved 17 November 2025	In Compliance
25-10	**Senate Document 25-10** Name and Mission Change of the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee	Presented By Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee	* Approved 26 January 2026	In Compliance
25-11	**Senate Document 25-11** Full Giant Leaps Master Plan Omission of three (3) student cultural centers	Presented By Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee	* Approved 26 January 2026	Awaiting Administration Response
25-13	**Senate Document 25-13** Resolution in Support of a University-wide Sustainability Task force.	Presented By University Resources Policy Committee	*Approved 16 February 2026	Awaiting Administration Response
25-14	**Senate Document 25-14** Resolution in Support of Renewable Energy Resources for Campus	Presented By University Resources Policy Committee	*Approved 16 February 2026	Awaiting Administration Response
25-15	**Senate Document 25-15** Nominee for Advisor to the Senate	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 26 January 2026	Elected
25-16	**Senate Document 25-16** PSG and PGSG Resolution Calling for Expanded Voter Accessibility	Presented By University Resources Policy Committee	*Approved 20 April 2026	Awaiting Administration Response
25-17	**Senate Document 25-17** Nominee for the Nominating Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 26 January 2026	Elected

25-18	**Senate Document 25-18** Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the Senate	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominee Elected 23 March 2026	Dianne Little Elected
25-19	**Senate Document 25-19** AAUP Purdue Chapter Calling for a Vote of No Confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe in the Senate	Presented By Senators Lisa Bosman and Lindsay Weinberg	*Approved 20 April 2026	
25-20	**Senate Document 25-20** Senate Proposal for Withdrawal Policy Updates	Presented By Educational Policy Committee	*Approved 23 March 2026	In Compliance
25-21	**Senate Document 25-21** Office of Admissions Proposal for Addition of Reentry Policy to Academic Regulations	Presented By Educational Policy Committee	*Approved 23 March 2026	In Compliance
25-22	**Senate Document 25-22** Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee Joint Proposal on Childcare Challenges at Purdue	Presented By Community Connection Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee	*Approved 20 April 2026	Awaiting Administration Response
25-23	**Senate Document 25-23** Edits to Academic Regulations Regarding Summer Calendar	Presented By Educational Policy Committee	*Approved 20 April 2026	In Compliance
25-24	**Senate Document 25-24** Scholastic Recognition Graduation with Distinction Update to Academic Regulations	Presented By Educational Policy Committee	*Approved 20 April 2026	In Compliance
25-25	**Senate Document 25-25** Vote of No Confidence	Presented By Senator Lindsay Weinberg and Senator Howard Zelaznik	*Approved 20 April 2026	
25-26	**Senate Document 25-26** Nominees for the Educational Policy Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected

25-27	**Senate Document 25-27** Nominees for the Community Connection Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected
25-28	**Senate Document 25-28** Nominees for Faculty Affairs Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected
25-29	**Senate Document 25-29** Nominees for the Nominating Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected
25-30	**Senate Document 25-30** Nominees for the Steering Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected
25-31	**Senate Document 25-31** Nominees for the Student Affairs Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected
25-32	**Senate Document 25-32** Nominees for the University Resources Policy Committee	Presented By Nominating Committee	*Nominees Elected 20 April 2026	Elected