

Third Meeting, Monday, 21 November 2022, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor Colleen Brady
2. Statement of Land Use Acknowledgement Professor Colleen Brady
3. Approval of [October 2022 Meeting Minutes](#)
4. Acceptance of Agenda
5. Remarks of the President President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.
6. Question Time
7. Remarks of the Senate Chair Professor Colleen Brady
8. [Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Committees](#) For Information
Professor Elizabeth A. Richards
9. Senate Document 22-09 Reapportionment of the University Senate For Action
Professor Elizabeth A. Richards
10. Senate Document 22-05 Endorsement of the Authorship of Scholarly Works Standard For Action
Professor David Sanders
11. Senate Document 22-08 Addressing the negative impact of Indiana Senate Bill 1 on Purdue students, staff, and faculty For Action
Professor Alice Pawley
12. Senate Document 22-10 The University Senate's right to direct communication with the Faculty For Discussion
Professor Alice Pawley
13. Libraries Report and Open Access Publishing For Information
Dean Beth McNeil

14. New Business

15. Adjournment

Third Meeting
Monday, 21 November 2022, 2:30 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

Present: *Manushag N. Powell (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), President Mitchell E. Daniels Jr., Colleen Brady (Chair of the Senate), Brian Leung (Vice-Chair of the Senate), Jay T. Akridge (Provost), Se'Andra Johnson (Sergeant-at-Arms), Bradley Alge, Paul Asunda, Ashley Bellet, Ximena Bernal, Françoise Brosseau-Lapré, Thomas Brush, Michael Campion, Yingjie (Victor) Chen, Min Chen, Laura Claxton, Matt Conaway, Patricia Davies, Brian Dilkes, Daniel Frank, Jennifer Freeman, Geraldine Friedman, James Greenan, Lori Hoagland, Stephen Hooser, Katie Jarriel, Hyunyoung (Young) Jeong, Nastasha Johnson, Erika Birgit Kaufmann, Yuan Kim, Cara Kinnally, Neil Knobloch, David Koltick, Nan Kong, Eric Kvam, Jenn Linvill, Damon Lisch, Julie Liu, David Love, Angeline Lyon, Oana Malis, Rose Mason, Richard Mattes, Shannon McMullen, Lin Nan, Deborah Nichols, Abdelfattah Nour, Robert Nowack, Jan Olek, Erik Otárola-Castillo, Alice Pawley, Elizabeth Richards, Brian Richert, Mark Rochat, Chris Ruhl, David Sanders, Dennis Savaiano, Steven Scott, Juan Sesmero, Alexander Seto, John Sheffield, Michael Smith, Qifan Song, Susan South, John Springer, Kevin Stainback, Dengfeng Sun, Howard Sypher, Anish Vanaik, Tony Vyn, Eric Waltenburg, Jeffrey Watt, Ann Weil, Denise Whitford, Rod Williams, Kipling Williams, John Yaninek, Yuan Yao, Dabao Zhang, Mark Zimpfer, **Advisors:** Heather Beasley, Stephen Beaudoin, Keith Gehres, Laurie Hitze, Peter Hollenbeck, Lowell Kane, Carl Krieger, Lisa Mauer, Beth McCuskey, Jamie Mohler, Jenna Rickus, Alys Rollock, James Sadler, Katherine Sermersheim, and Kris Wong Davis.*

Absent: *Dulcy Abraham, Kathleen Abrahamson, Burton (Lee) Artz, Saurabh Bagchi, Jonathan Bauchet, Peter Bermel, Charles Bouman, Sabine Brunswicker, Eugene Chan, Michael Cline, Todor Cooklev, Chittaranjan Das, Abigail Engelberth, Alan Friedman, Andrew Jensen, Alexander Kildishev, Andrew Lu Liu, John McConnell, Terrence Meyer, Pete Pascuzzi, Li Qiao, Julio Ramirez, Joseph Robinson, Gustavo Rodriguez-Rivera, Yumary Ruiz, Antônio Sá Barreto, Jennifer Scheuer, Thomas Siegmund, Joseph Sobieralski, Rusi Taleyarkhan, Darci Trader, Mario Ventresca.*

Guests: *Amy Boyle (Assoc VP for Human Resources), President Elect Mung Chiang, Jen Conklin (Captioner), Ed Dunn (IT), Dean Beth McNeil (Libraries), Abbey Nickel (MarComm), Candace Shaffer (VP for Human Resources), Isabel (Izzy) Southgate Weber (PSG).*

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:31pm.
2. Chair Colleen Brady 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 17 October 2022 Senate meeting were entered as read.

4. The agenda was accepted by general consent. Chair Brady reminded Senators that it takes time to process people for attendance and admission to the Zoom call, and so it is extremely helpful to our goal of starting on time if attendees can log in to the call by at least 2:25 instead of waiting until 2:30.
5. President Daniels [[Appendix A](#)] reminisced about the importance of the Senate to his Purdue experience, starting back when past-Chair Paul Robinson hosted three separate receptions to enable him to meet with every Senator even before his first day as President. He expressed thanks to current and past members for their work and their input. He then reminded the Senate of some of the key collaborations that Purdue's administration and the Senate had worked on in past years: the Child Care Task Force (2013); the Ad Hoc Panel to Evaluate Security (2014, led by Patty Hart); the addition of ABA therapy for autism to insurance coverage (2015); the Student Growth Task Force (2013-15); the Purdue Smoking Policy (2016); the IT policy for non-academic uses of bandwidth in classrooms (2018); and the COVID-19 pandemic response (2020-21).

President Daniels presented some information on admissions. Applications were running ahead of projections by about 10%, and the projected final number for the year was in excess of 70,000 applications. He noted that while this is a positive trend, it means Purdue will not be able to offer places to a larger proportion of the applicants than ever in our history.

He addressed an matter that he hoped the Senate would continue to work on: the critical thinking skills of Purdue undergraduates. Beginning in 2013, and rooted in the work of Senate and faculty committees, the Student Intellectual Growth Task Force had administered three different tests to try to measure the critical thinking growth among Purdue undergraduates. While two tests had been tried and found unsatisfactory, the test being used since 2017, the [California Critical Thinking Skills Test](#) (CCTST), had been administered to a full cohort across their Purdue careers. This is not a content nor a knowledge test, but a measurement of whether students can read a short passage and answer deductive or analytical questions attached to it. Sample questions were provided in the slides. Purdue graduates seem to be advancing from "moderate" critical thinkers as first-year students to become "strong" thinkers by senior year, but President Daniels felt there was no reason they should not be at the highest, "superior" level. He encouraged the Senate to consider how to increase the investment of seniors in taking the test, how to make Purdue's critical thinking objectives more explicit, and to think of ways to improve faculty instruction in critical thinking.

President-Elect Mung Chiang also briefly addressed the Senate, stating how deeply humbled, honored, and excited he had been by the listening sessions he has attended with the Purdue community, and that he looked forward to working with the Senate beginning in January.

6. For Question Time, President Daniels noted that, in response to a pre-submitted question from the Senate, it had been recommended to Purdue Global Chancellor Frank Dooley and Provost Jon Harbor that the civics literacy requirement be applied to Purdue Global students. He stated that other answers to pre-submitted questions would be posted once the answers had been prepared.
7. Chair Brady recognized that this was the final Senate meeting to be attended by the two individuals who had provided the most stable leadership team in the entire B1G. She formally thanked President Daniels on behalf of the Senate, and all the Senates of the past ten years, for his service to the University; she hoped he would enjoy the celebrations of “MitchFest.” She also thanked President-Elect Chiang, and said the Senate was looking forward to working with him in the new year. She thanked Provost Jay Akridge for his years of service to the faculty, staff, and students in Purdue, and his faithful engagement with the many diverse voices in our community.

She reminded all those present that an open internal search to name the next Provost was ongoing, and called for nominations of qualified individuals to be sent to her or to Amy Boyle. The last listening session for faculty and staff re: the Provost Search was scheduled for Tuesday 22 November 2022.

8. Professor Elizabeth A. Richards presented the Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Committees [[Appendix B](#)] on behalf of the Steering Committee. Senator David Sanders, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, thanked the Office of the Provost for changing the requirement that faculty mentors of undergraduates undergo [Gramm Leach Bliley Act \(GLBA\) certification](#), which he estimated would save the faculty a collective 1000 hours of work per year. Yuan Yao, Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee, announced that the URPC was taking up a motion suggested by the Educational Policy Committee regarding classroom lighting enhancement, and was requesting remediation of the poor lighting in many large examination rooms. The Co-chairs of the Budget Interpretation and Evaluation Review Committee were working on this issue, and Professor Yingjie Chen, Co-chair of the BIER, stated that the issue had been brought to the attention of Vice Provost Cherise Hall. Provost Akridge agreed that the matter was on the radar, and that the Provost’s Office was working on solutions.
9. Steering Chair Richards introduced for action [Senate Document 22-09](#) Reapportionment of the University Senate. The Document being moved and seconded, discussion began. Professor Richards explained that this Document comes from Steering at this time every year, and follows a standard process by which we look at the current number of faculty members and use that to determine the numbers of Senators that units are allocated for the next academic year. Senator Alice Pawley asked whether there had been any discussion about adding a Senator from Purdue Global. The Secretary of Faculties clarified that Purdue Global is not a regional campus, but rather an affiliated but separate system with its own Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Therefore, the analogy to regional campuses, which are provided for in Bylaw 2.00b(4), does not hold, and the addition of Global Senators would require a formal Bylaw change. Immediate Past Chair Steve Beaudoin

reminded the Senate that one of the suggestions he had made was that we may not need to have this many [104] Senators, and that it might be worthwhile to consider a leaner, more effective Senate made up of individuals more committed to the institution. Chair Brady suggested it was a timely moment for the Faculty Affairs Committee to look into this issue, considering the influx of new faculty members coming to Engineering and Purdue PPI from the dissolution of IUPUI. Senate Advisor Laurie Hitze inquired whether it would be possible to add Senators representing MaPSAC and CSSAC. Chair Brady suggested that Faculty Affairs also take up this suggestion for consideration. Faculty Affairs Chair Eric Waltenburg agreed that the FAC would be happy to consider these questions but requested that it be sent in clear written form. Professor Richards stated that this would be added to the Steering Agenda, and that Steering would then communicate with the FAC directly. There being no further discussion, the question was put and the reapportionment was adopted by general consent.

10. Professor Sanders presented for action [Senate Document 22-05](#) Endorsement of the Authorship of Scholarly Works Standard. He reminded the Senate that the Document had been presented to the Senate in September, but that action had not been taken in October because he and Dean Mohler, the RIO, had not been available for that meeting. He also noted that the Document's reference section had been modified in response to Senate feedback. The Document being moved and seconded, discussion began. Purdue Graduate Student Government President Alex Seto announced that the PGSG had already voted to endorse the proposed Authorship Standard. Professor Pawley also noted that her colleagues in Engineering were very supportive of the proposed standard. There being no further discussion, the question was put. The motion carried, with 65 votes in favor, five opposed, and four abstaining. Chair Brady thanked the Senate and Professor Sanders and Dean Mohler, noting that our colleagues at Purdue Fort Wayne and Purdue Northwest were interested in adopting something similar. Provost Akridge echoed her thanks, and reiterated the importance of having an approved authorship standard for adjudicating disputes, and more importantly for, hopefully, preventing them in the first place.
11. Professor Alice Pawley introduced for action [Senate Document 22-08](#) Addressing the Negative Impact of Indiana Senate Bill 1 on Purdue Students, Staff, and Faculty on behalf of the Document's co-sponsors. [\[Appendix C\]](#) The proposal was moved and seconded and discussion began. Professor Pawley noted two changes to the status of SB-1: that the Indiana Supreme Court had taken jurisdiction over the case alleging the law violates the Indiana state constitution and upheld the injunction against it going into effect, and that the deadline to submit supporting documents had been moved from October to January. A second legal challenge was brought by the ACLU, alleging that the law violates Indiana's RFRA. She stated that conversations with Purdue faculty had made clear that there was confusion over the assumption that the term "abortion" meant only elective abortion, when in fact there is no clinical difference between abortion care and miscarriage care; both use the same procedures and medication. The term used in 22-08 was therefore "termination," which is preferred by subject-matter experts for its clarity. Because the legal landscape for pregnancy termination was so unclear at the moment, most of

Purdue's B1G and Midwestern peers were not yet taking action in this arena. However, IU, Ball State, Purdue Fort Wayne, and Purdue Northwest were all working to bring legislation to their Senates/Councils. IU had also made a statement in support of Dr. Caitlin Bernard, one of their faculty members. In response to questions about Ascension Health, which was to service the proposed West Lafayette microhospital, Professor Pawley had been told that Ascension follows the [Directives for Catholic Health Care Services](#) – as does St. Elizabeth's – but that providers could refer patients to other providers for their care. In addition, per Benefits Director Candace Shaffer, Ascension would be able to provide Plan B to victims of sexual assault (it is also available in College of Pharmacy vending machines). Chair of the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Professor Mireille Boutin had explained that Plan B is only one of four types of emergency contraception, and is a less effective choice for people who weigh more than 165 pounds; the Document proposed now recognized this issue. Also, a group of faculty in the Department of Mathematics made recommendations recognizing the probability that with SB-1, people were likely to have more children. Finally, while most of the proposals in the Document would need to be implemented in collaboration with the administration, Professor Pawley stated that the Senate could act directly to expand the Medical Excused Absence Policy (MEAPs) to include reproductive healthcare including pregnancy termination in or out of state.

Professor Richards voiced support for the Document based on her expertise as a faculty member teaching public health, a former healthcare provider, and a parent and person of childbearing age. Professor Dennis Saviano also voiced support for the opportunity to improve the quality of care for women on campus and in the Purdue community.

There being no further discussion, the question was put. The motion carried, with 61 votes in favor, nine opposed, and four abstaining.

12. Professor Pawley presented for discussion [Senate Document 22-10](#) The University Senate's Right to Direct Communication with the Faculty. [[Appendix D](#)] Professor Pawley stated that after the Senate passed a number of changes to the academic regulations in the previous year, the question arose in the Educational Policy Committee of whose responsibility it would be to inform faculty of these changes. The Office for the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning stated that their plan was to orient faculty on the changes just prior to the start of the new semester, but some members of the EPC would have preferred to have this happen sooner. The resulting discussion had raised the question of whether the Senate could independently email the faculty about important legislation or other matters. The proposal was to give the Senate Chair, Secretary of Faculties, and Sergeant-at-Arms direct access to faculty email listservs. Professor Pawley and the Document's two co-sponsors, Professors South and Vanaik, intended to work to secure FAC approval of the legislation before bringing it for a final vote in the Senate. She explained that the proposal was rooted in AAUP principles, which called for "free and unfettered access" to faculty and that faculty should be able to comment on governance issues without fear of retaliation. She stated that many other bodies on both the West Lafayette and regional

campuses were able to email their constituents directly without permission from a moderator, but the West Lafayette faculty email lists were moderated by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. While the current VPFA was supportive of the Senate Chair's requests to email faculty directly when needed, that might change with different personnel in the future. Moreover, Senate leadership would not subsume each Senator's right and responsibility to direct contact with their constituents. The purpose of the proposal was not advocating unfettered or unrestricted access, but rather stating the principle that the Senate should govern its own access, rather than having the administration do so.

Provost Akridge expressed understanding of the rationale, but added that, in five and a half years, his administration had never denied Senate leadership access to the lists when they asked for it; there was a highly effective working relationship between Senate leadership and administration with respect to communications. The listserv is moderated judiciously to avoid the overcrowding of already full inboxes, and most listservs, including MaPSAC and CSSAC, were also moderated for this reason.

Vice Provost Peter Hollenbeck pointed out that the listserv was actually maintained and governed by ITaP, but that moderating the listservs had been delegated to him, as was running point on complaints when people felt they were receiving too many email communications. Communication itself was in no way restricted—anyone could communicate with anyone—but access to IT assets like listservs was regulated as a matter of policy. He reiterated Provost Akridge's assertion that there had been nothing but support for the Senate leadership's usage requests.

Professor David Koltick questioned the proposal's assumption that Senate leadership would always speak with one voice—how could that be maintained? Were members of Senate leadership to be at odds over an issue, the listserv might become a debating tool unless there were some mechanism to avoid this. Professor Pawley responded that she was open to instating guidelines about the use of the listserv, but argued that those guidelines should be set by the Senate directly.

Professor Tony Vyn stated that he preferred the Senate take the approach of ensuring our 104 Senators were taking the opportunity to regularly communicate with their units about all Senate matters. He stated that we have unprecedented access now to Senate deliberations—anyone can follow the livestream, and all faculty are invited to give feedback, although not to vote. This initiative, if necessary, should only occur after first providing recommendations to Senators about their frequent communications with constituents. Professor Pawley stated she agreed that Senators should communicate with their units, but said that this did not always happen, and that the broader principle remained that determining how the Senate communicates with faculty should be the job of the Senate itself.

Professor Saviano thanked Professor Pawley, and stated that he didn't feel the Document intended to prevent the Provost's Office from regulating the listservs, but only to require that Senate requests to use the faculty listservs would be granted.

13. Dean Beth McNeil provided the Senate with a report on Purdue Libraries and Open Access Publishing. [\[Appendix E\]](#) Dean McNeil thanked the Senate for its invitation, and provided information in response to pre-submitted questions. The first was around open access. Advantages of using Purdue Libraries' open access services included retaining copyright, the ability to immediately or shortly share the results globally, accelerating scientific discovery, and increased visibility and discoverability. Open access could also be necessary to meet certain federal funding requirements, and open publications could serve as online educational resources (OERs) as well. She explained Purdue Libraries supports OA with the Purdue Libraries Publishing Partnerships, meaning free publication in a number of major journals; Purdue ePubs; and through support of OA fees via the Open Access Publishing Support Fund, as well as negotiated publisher discounts. Professor Richards asked where she could find out which Wiley journals could be published in for free. Dean McNeil said that this information could be accessed by going to the Library website and searching for open access in the LibGuides. However, in the case of Wiley, moving forward, publication in all of their journals would be free. Wiley believes that by 2025, they will be a fully open access publisher. Professor Pawley asked whether there was still any value in using the CIC rider to request open access with respect to journals not covered by the new open access agreements. Dean McNeil agreed that some publishers were not ready yet for open access, and said she would follow up with the B1G libraries group to see whether there were any update on her question. Another question was asked about open access funds and when they renewed. Dean McNeil replied that the fund was \$50K, and renewed on a fiscal-year basis.

Provost Akridge asked for a quick set of comments on the Library Master Plan and scheduled book move. The dean explained that the Board of Trustees had approved funding that would allow Libraries to move some of their print materials to the 2550 Building (the State Farm building), about three miles from campus. This would allow for better preservation of materials, as the current long-term repository under Hicks was not an ideal environment for preservation. Materials would also be moved from the Lynn-Hall repository, freeing that space for Veterinary Medicine needs, and from HSSE and the Mathematics Library in order to create more space for students. Materials in high use or available as print-only would not be moved. Access to the new long-term repository would be made as easy as possible, including twice-daily deliveries of requested materials. Professor Geraldine Friedman expressed concerns from her colleagues that these changes would have a negative impact on browsing, which would be problematic for doing research and for teaching students how to do research. In addition, she wished to know how usage was determined. Dean McNeil agreed that checking out was not the only measure of a text's usage, and said that materials left on carts were also noted, as well as the date of publication and of the library's acquisition. She underscored the importance of good communication between faculty and their liaison librarians. She also expressed willingness to attend faculty meetings to address the book move.

She turned to the question of library hours, noting that HSSE closes at 5pm on Fridays and is only open 1-5pm on Saturdays, but that other days it remains open until midnight. Other libraries, such as WALC, are open 24/7. Hours would normally

changed due only to usage data and security concerns. Expanded hours are offered during exam periods where possible, but this can create staffing issues, particularly for the smaller libraries.

A final question from Professor Abdelfattah Nour asked about vacancies in the library; it was reported that Libraries expected two more hires to join in August, and that staff needs were an ongoing issue still being addressed.

14. Under New Business, Professor Sanders called for the Senate suspend the rules and take action on [Senate Document 22-14](#) Resolution Calling for the Maintenance of a Bureau of Motor Vehicles License Branch in West Lafayette in response to the plans of the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles to close their West Lafayette license branch and partially replace it with a kiosk. The proposal being moved and seconded, discussion began. Professor Richards noted that the closing of the branch would present a huge additional hurdle for members of the community's international population, who needed to conduct business with the BMV in person. Vice Chair Brian Leung noted that while he was from the Lafayette side of the river, that population found the arguments made in favor of keeping the West Lafayette branch open to be compelling. There being no further discussion, the question was put, and the motion carried with a vote of 64 votes in favor, four opposed, and three abstentions. [The response of the BMV is listed as [Appendix F](#)]

Senator Deborah Nichols moved that the Senate suspend the rules and adopt [Senate Document 22-11](#) University Senate Commendation for Jay Akridge in Recognition of His Distinguished Service to the Community. The motion seconded by several people simultaneously, discussion began. Chair Brady read the text of the Document to the Senate:

WHEREAS: Jay Akridge has been a valued and respected member of the Purdue Community for more than forty years.

WHEREAS: Jay Akridge has served the University Senate and Purdue community as a whole as Purdue's Provost, Chief Academic Officer, and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Diversity since July 2017, the longest tenure of any currently serving Provost in the Big Ten.

WHEREAS: In these years, Jay Akridge has shown unflinching dedication to the faculty, staff, and students at Purdue, and has been a crucial participant in and advocate for shared governance in our community.

WHEREAS: Jay Akridge is today attending his final Senate meeting as Provost. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The University Senate formally recognizes and salutes Jay Akridge for his unprecedented excellence, his good humor and fellowship, and his lasting contributions to Purdue University. The Senate recognizes that he will be missed.

Immediate Past Chair Beaudoin stated that he could not imagine how Purdue would have made it through the years of the pandemic without Provost Akridge's leadership. Professor Saviano said that it was an incredible accomplishment for Provost Akridge to have managed Purdue and its faculty and its resources over the

last few years, and to have helped them to accomplish so much given the challenges faced. He stated that the motion was well-observed and appropriate. Professor Pawley thanked Provost Akridge for always taking questions from the AAUP seriously and responding to them promptly and thoughtfully. Vice Chair Leung reported that in fifteen years of university administration, he had never had a better mentor than Provost Akridge, and that his ability to focus on the humane in every situation was an important gift to carry forward. Professor Nour acknowledged Provost Akridge for embracing and celebrating diversity. Professor Juan Sesmero spoke about Provost Akridge's ability to minimize tensions and find common ground when working with the Senate in a way that showed both good intentions and keen intelligence. Vice Provost Hollenbeck told the Senate that as someone who got to see "the man behind the curtain" nearly every day, he could affirm that the man behind the curtain was exactly as humane and honorable as the man before it. Professor Brian Dilkes recalled meeting Provost Akridge, then an associate dean, in person when he interviewed at Purdue, and said it exemplified the total devotion to the job he continued to show. There being no further remarks, the motion was passed by unanimous consent.

Provost Akridge thanked the Senate, and echoed President Daniels in acknowledging the important relationships they had had with the Senate, its leaders, and within the important forum of the Advisory Committee. He stated that he looked forward to re-engaging the community from a faculty role. He was immediately nominated to run for Vice Chair of the Senate. It was unclear whether the nomination was accepted.

15. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:26pm with many wishes for a smooth end of the semester and happy holiday season.



Fall Applications Year to Date

	Resident	Non-Resident	International	Total
	Flat	14.5%	5.3%	10.1%
As of 11/21	10,391	35,960 ↑	6,707 ↑	53,058 ↑
Projected Final				70,000 ↑

Child Care Task Force, 2013

Ad Hoc Panel to Evaluate Security Feedback (Hart Report), 2014

ABA Therapy (Autism) insurance coverage, 2015

Student Growth Task Force, 2015

Purdue Smoking Policy, 2016

IT policy for non -academic uses of bandwidth in classrooms, 2018

Covid Response, 2020 -21

History

- Rooted in work of faculty through Student Intellectual Growth Task Force launched in 2013
- First test administered in 2014 to stratified random sample of freshmen
- With faculty feedback test evolved from CLA+ → ETS → California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST)
- Over 1,100 took pretest in 2021. Making progress on post-test participation rates

- Measures ability to make judgments about what to believe or how to respond to given information and scenarios
- Does not test content or knowledge areas. All information needed to answer the question correctly is presented in short scenario test questions
- 55 minutes to complete 40 engaging, scenario-based questions
- Overall, Purdue freshmen score at the Moderate level; seniors at the Strong level (100 point scale)

Skills Measured:

- Analysis
- Inference
- Explanation
- Deduction
- Interpretation
- Evaluation
- Induction
- Numeracy

Sample Question

Three graduate school friends, Anna, Barbara, and Carol, graduated successfully. Being in the same program, the three often worked as a team on group assignments. Anna earned the special recognition of “pass with distinction” when she graduated. Carol and Barbara, although receiving their degrees, did not earn this special honor. A fourth student in the same graduate program, Deirdre, often said that the graduate program was poorly designed and not difficult at all. Deirdre did not graduate, instead she was advised by the faculty to withdraw from the program because her work was below acceptable standards. Given this information only, it follows that

- A = Carol and Barbara deserved to receive “pass with distinction” like Anna.
- B = Barbara’s work in the program was superior to Carol’s.
- C = Barbara was jealous of the academic success her friend, Anna, enjoyed.
- D = Deirdre’s work in the program was below the quality of Carol’s work.
- E = Anna, being successful, will decide to enroll in another advanced graduate program

Sample Question

Using the phone at her desk, Sylvia in Corporate Sales consistently generates a very steady \$1500 per hour in gross revenue for her firm. After all of her firm's costs have been subtracted, Sylvia's sales amount to \$100 in bottom line (net) profits every 15 minutes. At 10:00 a.m. one day the desk phone Sylvia uses to make her sales calls breaks. Without the phone Sylvia cannot make any sales. Assume that Sylvia's regular schedule is to begin making sales calls at 8:00 a.m. Assume she works the phone for four hours, takes a one-hour lunch exactly at noon, and then returns promptly to her desk for four more hours of afternoon sales. Sylvia loves her work, and the broken phone is keeping her from it. If necessary, she will try to repair the phone herself. Which of the following options would be in the best interest of Sylvia's firm to remedy the broken phone problem?

A = Use Ed's Phone Repair Shop down the street. Ed can replace Sylvia's phone by 10:30 a.m. Ed will charge the firm \$500.

B = Assign Sylvia to a different project until her phone can be replaced with one from the firm's current inventory. Replacing the phone is handled by the night shift.

C = Authorize Sylvia to buy a new phone during her lunch hour for \$75 knowing she can plug it in and have it working within a few minutes after she gets back to her desk at 1:00 p.m.

D = Ask Sylvia to try to repair her phone herself. She will probably complete the repair by 2:00 p.m.; or maybe later.

Summary

- Purdue is committed to delivering “higher education at the highest proven value”.
- That requires continued use of the CCTST assessment
- No reason Purdue graduates should not be at the “Superior level”

Questions for the Senate

- How do we increase participation among seniors, as well as the seriousness with which they take the test?
- How can the institution make critical thinking objectives more explicit and deliberate?
- How can professional development opportunities improve faculty instruction of critical thinking abilities? (e.g. IMPACT, Transformation Education 2.0, etc.)

If the goal of civics requirement is to shore up democracy by fostering greater civic awareness, why is the largest enrolled entity of the Purdue system (Purdue Global) exempt from that requirement? When will Purdue University Global students be provided with the benefit of having the Civic Literacy graduation requirement?

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

Steering Committee

Libby Richards, erichards@purdue.edu

1. Soliciting reports and informational sessions in response to faculty and committee requests.
2. Coordinating items between committees and between the PSG/PGSG and Senate Standing Committees: includes a proposal to address the university's response to faculty members with respect to tragedies such as the murder of Varun Manish Chheda.

Advisory Committee

Colleen Brady, bradyc@purdue.edu

Nominating Committee

Robert Nowack, nowack@purdue.edu

1. The Nominating Committee continues to fill vacancies that occur in Standing and Faculty Committees.
2. Preparing committee membership survey for spring distribution.

Educational Policy Committee

Eric P. Kvam, kvam@purdue.edu

1. Proposal for a new Embedded Learning Outcome Focused on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
2. Academic Regulations Update for Academic Probation and Deficiency
3. Revising academic regulations to drop the WF and associated direct grades
4. Revising academic regulations for stylistic consistency

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee

Denise Whitford, dwhitford@purdue.edu

1. Deaf and Hard of Hearing Accessibility
2. Student Course Evaluations
3. Provost Recruitment
4. New Senator workshops
5. Embedded learning outcome focused on DEI; co-sponsored by the Educational Policy Committee (University Core Curriculum)

Faculty Affairs Committee

Eric N. Waltenburg, ewaltenb@purdue.edu

1. Document addressing Senator Rights and Responsibilities

Student Affairs Committee

David Sanders, retrovir@purdue.edu

1. Improved Responses to Reports of Sexual Misconduct
2. Protecting Student Privacy/Recording Accommodations

3. Purdue Student Senate Resolution 21-69 “Resolution in Support of Editable Gender-Inclusive Options Amongst Purdue Affiliated Websites”

University Resources Policy Committee

Yuan Yao, yao1@purdue.edu

1. Revising SD 21-31 on the investments of the endowment relating to fossil fuels and carbon negative renewable technologies.
2. Developing a Senate Document about Purdue being carbon neutral by 2030.
3. Developing a Senate Document about joining the Greater Lafayette Climate Action Plan.

SD 22-08

***NEGATIVE IMPACT OF INDIANA SB-1 ON
PURDUE STUDENTS, STAFF, AND FACULTY***

FOR VOTE - 11/21/22

Min Chen, Mathematics
Daniel Frank, Philosophy
Katie Jarriel, Honors College
Cara Kinnally, Languages and Cultures
Richard Mattes, Public Health
Shannon McMullen, Interdisciplinary Studies
Julio Ramirez, Electrical and Computer
Engineering

Alice Pawley, Engineering Education*
Alex Seto, President, Purdue Graduate Student
Government
Susan South, Psychological Sciences
Anish Vanaik, Honors College
Steve Yaninek, Entomology



Indiana Senate Bill 1

SB1 makes almost all forms of abortion in Indiana illegal

- Passed Indiana Senate July 30, 2022
- Passed Indiana House, August 5, 2022
- Signed by Governor Holcomb August 5, 2022
- Came into effect Sept 15, 2022
- Preliminary judicial injunction blocking enforcement imposed Sept 22, 2022
- **Indiana Supreme Court upholds lower court injunction Oct 13, 2022**
- Second preliminary injunction argued Oct 14, 2022.
 - **Judge told AG and ACLU to submit various documents by Oct 28. Deadline to submit was moved to Jan 3.**
- **Currently slated for oral argument at the Indiana Supreme Court for Jan 19, 2023.**

Definition of abortion

In SD 22-08, abortion is defined as termination of pregnancy for any reason.

In particular, the term includes abortion required to save the life of the pregnant person, such as in the case of ectopic pregnancies, as well as "elective" abortions not for other medical reasons.

Peer institutions whose Senates are passing something similar

Big 10 (alphabetical)

State	Abortion access	Senate move?
Illinois	Legal until 24-26 wks	No, but raising with SEC
IU	Legal until 21 wks – new law paused	Yes
Iowa	Legal until 21 wks	
Maryland	Legal until 24-26 wks	No, no need
Michigan	Legal until 24-26 wks	No, supportive pres, gov, Prop 3
Michigan St	Legal until 24-26 wks	
Minnesota	Legal until 24-26 wks	
Nebraska	Legal until 21 wks	
Northwestern	Legal until 24-26 wks	
Ohio State	Legal until 20 wks – new law paused	
Penn State	Legal until 23 wks	
Rutgers	Legal	
Wisconsin	Illegal	PROFS statement on Dobbs ruling

Indiana institutions whose Senates are passing something similar

- Ball State – bringing something for consideration in January
- DePauw University – not yet
- Earlham College – not yet
- Hanover College – not yet
- Indiana State University
- Indiana University- Bloomington, Kokomo, South Bend – Yes - increase in medical benefits, travel allowance; faculty task force
- Manchester University
- Marian University
- Purdue University – Fort Wayne – first focused on anti-fascism principles; second modeled on PWL
- Purdue University – Northwest – yes – re increase research, public discussion on the topic
- University of Evansville
- University of Notre Dame

Access to Plan B, abortion information through Catholic providers

From Candace Shaffer, Senior Director, Benefits, HR

- Ascension and Franciscan are both Catholic providers.
 - They abide by the “**Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services**, and therefore does not promote, approve, condone or recommend contraceptive practices.” However, “patients are informed of their options which would include accessing these procedures outside of Ascension, if applicable.”
- People seeking abortion or contraceptive care through Ascension and Franciscan (as a Healthsync provider) and who are denied can get such care through IU Health at Healthsync prices.
- People who have been sexually assaulted who are seeking Plan B through Ascension will be provided it.
 - However...

Access to various kinds of (non-abortive) emergency contraception

From FCB Committee Chair Mimi Boutin

- There are 4 kinds of emergency contraception.
 - Plan B - taken within 72 hrs, single dose, no prescription needed, \$40-50/dose, can get discounted or free in some places. Insurance can cover with prescription.
 - Ella - single dose, requires prescription, take within 5 days, better than Plan B for people over 165 lbs, but under 195 lbs > \$50 or more, for one dose.
 - Copper IUDs - inserted within 5 days, Cu almost 100% effective at preventing pregnancy, works as ongoing contraception, better than pills for people over 195 lbs.
 - Hormonal IUDs - inserted within 5 days, works as ongoing contraception, better than emergency contraception pills for people over 195 lbs. Can be covered by insurance, or would cost \$1000 or more.
- No age restriction on any of these.
- **Currently only Plan B confirmed at Ascension micro-hospital.**

<https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2022/07/08/1109875418/plan-b-emergency-contraception-effective>

Revised draft

- Revised point 5 (in distributed draft)
 - Added in recognition that with SB1, more people on campus will be having children. (Recommended by faculty group in Mathematics)
 - Need improved support of parents – childcare access and costs, lactation room access (both spaces and time), healthcare costs due to addition of dependents
- Revised point 4 (new):
 - Replace “Plan B” with “emergency contraception”

If this were to pass, what would happen?

This would still only represent the voice of the faculty.

Relevant Senate committees would then have specific standing from the Faculty to take up specific points with the administration to bring them about.

Own authority	Work with administration	
2. EPC: Revise academic regulations on MEAPS to cover care needed for abortion	1. Improve access to affordable/free contraception, improve healthcare benefits	Collaboration between Fac Comp & Benefits, Student Affairs, MAPSAC, CSSAC
	3. Improve communication at CHL, PUSH re abortion options.	
	4. Ensure continued access to Plan B through campus healthcare facilities including micro-hospital	
	5. Improve resources, benefits, leaves for parents, increase accountability when they are denied	Faculty Affairs
	6. Public statement re aggressive protection of academic freedom for faculty in nursing, pharmacy, etc.	
	7. Assess similar risks, raise awareness at PNW and PFW	Intercampus Faculty Council

*Please vote in favor.
Questions? Amendments?*

Min Chen, Mathematics
Daniel Frank, Philosophy
Katie Jarriel, Honors College
Cara Kinnally, Languages and Cultures
Richard Mattes, Public Health
Shannon McMullen, Interdisciplinary Studies
Julio Ramirez, Electrical and Computer
Engineering

Alice Pawley, Engineering Education*
Alex Seto, President, Purdue Graduate Student
Government
Susan South, Psychological Sciences
Anish Vanaik, Honors College
Steve Yaninek, Entomology

EXTRA SLIDES

If needed...

SB1 will have a detrimental effect on the Purdue community

We cite peer-reviewed research to support the argument that:

1. Reducing access to abortion disproportionately affects university students more than the general population.
2. Access to abortion care for vulnerable populations will decrease, and associated healthcare costs will increase.
3. That abortion care is eliminated in Indiana has consequences for other aspects of healthcare.
4. Students and faculty in healthcare-related areas at Purdue (such as in the School of Nursing and College of Pharmacy) need their academic freedoms affirmed and protected around topics relating to abortion.
5. SB1 will cause Purdue to have more difficulty recruiting, retaining, and helping succeed more diverse groups of students, staff, and faculty.
6. SB1 will limit Purdue's in-state industry partners, reducing opportunities for students, staff, faculty, and advancement of such collaborations.

What can the University Senate do?

From the University Senate bylaws:

“..subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees and in consultation with the President, [the University Senate] has the power and responsibility **to propose or to adopt policies, regulations, and procedures intended to achieve** the educational objectives of Purdue University and **the general welfare of those involved in these educational processes.**”

1. Make statements that express the will of the faculty;
2. Change the text of policies that we are in charge of (like the Academic Regulations).

What can the University Senate do?

From the University Senate bylaws:

“..subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees and in consultation with the President, [the University Senate] has the power and responsibility to propose or to adopt policies, regulations, and procedures intended to achieve the educational objectives of Purdue University and the general welfare of those involved in these educational processes.”

1. **Make statements that express the will of the faculty;**
2. Change the text of policies that we are in charge of (like the Academic Regulations).

Proposal

6 actions

1. Administration should increase access to free or affordable contraception on campus, and increase benefits to cover the increased cost of receiving healthcare out of state.
2. EPC should revise Academic Regulation on class attendance to be inclusive of students needing to receive reproductive care out of state, but without needing to divulge the need for such care (as records are not protected sufficiently).
3. HR and Student Life should ensure that CFHL and PUSH providers can comprehensively educate patients on reproductive care, and refer patients for abortion care out of state.

Proposal

6 actions

4. Administration should ensure Plan B (which is emergency contraception not related to abortion) is accessible at CFHL, PUSH, and Ascension-St Vincent micro-hospital when built.
5. Administration should publicly reassert its aggressive protection of academic freedom around topics related to reproductive healthcare.
6. Administration should review similar health risks for students, staff, and faculty at Purdue-Northwest and Purdue-Fort Wayne.

SD 22-10

***THE UNIVERSITY SENATE'S RIGHT TO DIRECT
COMMUNICATION WITH THE FACULTY***

FOR DISCUSSION - 11/21/22

Alice Pawley, Engineering Education*
Susan South, Psychological Sciences
Anish Vanaik, Honors College



Context

- The Senate passed important legislation expanding student rights and changing the calendar in the 2021-22 Senate year
 - MEAPS
 - Quiet Period
 - Winter Term

Context

- In EPC, discussion occurred around whose responsibility it was to let faculty know in good time to revise their course designs.
 - Office of VPTL were not going to communicate this until just before Fall term.
- Could Senate email faculty directly about legislation passed?
 - Miscommunication between VP for Faculty Affairs and co-sponsor implied VPFA would not support.
 - Opened door to exploring under what conditions Senate leadership could email faculty directly.
 - Document was introduced in FAC, but missed deadline for vote in October meeting. Next meeting is in December. Intend to work to secure FAC vote in favor.

Proposal

Statement of principle, and specific ask to IT

- University Senate Chair, Secretary of Faculties, Sergeant at Arms should have right to email faculty directly without needing prior approval by Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Rationale

AAUP statement on Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications:

"[S]enate officers and other faculty representatives engaged in institutional governance activities should have free and unfettered access to university-controlled lists of faculty members they represent, and all faculty members should be able to comment electronically on governance issues without restriction or fear of disciplinary action."

Rationale

- MAPSAC, CSSAC, PSG, PGSG can all email their constituents directly.
- Purdue-Fort Wayne and Purdue-Northwest faculty senate leadership can email their faculty directly.
- VPFA should not have potential to refuse to Senate leadership requests to email the West Lafayette faculty.
 - VPFA has been delegated responsibility to administratively oversee faculty listservs (VII.A.4, VII.B.8)
 - Repeated requests to Office of General Counsel (9/12, 9/19, 9/30, 10/7, 11/4) have not yielded evidence that proposal violates these policies.
 - While current VPFA is potentially supportive of certain access, this right should not be dependent on the opinion of the person occupying the position.

How does this affect senators communicating with their constituents?

- Senators still need to frequently communicate directly with their constituents.
- We imagine this right will be sparsely used in normal times.
- The Senate could internally sort out how often Senate leadership would email faculty directly.

Please send questions, revisions by January 3 to

apawley@purdue.edu

Vote anticipated January 22



LIBRARIES AND SCHOOL OF INFORMATION STUDIES

Report from Dean Beth McNeil

University Senate

11/21/2022

Topics:

Open access

Routledge

Library hours

Purdue e-pubs, PURR,

e-Archives

Other?

Open Access/Open Science/Open Scholarship

Open Access supports each of the basic mission areas of the land-grant mission of Purdue University: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement

- **Learning:** Open scholarship is available to all, and more likely to be used by educators. If teachers cannot access the works, they cannot teach those works.
- **Discovery:** Open scholarship is immediately available--without embargoes and reader fees, allowing more rapid scientific discovery and innovation.
- **Engagement:** Open scholarship is available to anyone, anywhere, free of reading charges. This allows greater opportunity for our partners to engage the results of our research, whether they be industry, government, military, non-profit, or commercial partners

Why publish Open Access?

Benefits

- Authors retain copyright of their works
- Immediately share research results with the world
- Accelerate scientific discovery
- More visibility and discoverability
- Higher citation counts
- Meet funder requirements
- Open works can be used as OERs:
 - Support teaching & learning
 - Promote equity in education, teaching and learning
 - Positively impact student retention and success



Three Ways Purdue Libraries Support OA:

1

Publishing Partnerships at Purdue

- Purdue Libraries Publishing Partnerships (publish OA in some journals for FREE)
 - PLOS
 - Cambridge University Press
 - Association for Computing Machinery
 - Wiley
 - Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development (JAFSCD)



PURDUE
UNIVERSITY®

Libraries and School
of Information Studies

2 Purdue Pubs

One Purdue Department

- Works in repository: 55
- 1,468 downloads in the last year
- 82 countries
- 216 institutions, including MIT, Wageningen Universiteit, Rice University





3:

Purdue Libraries Support OA Fees

- Open Access Publishing Support Fund:
<https://www.lib.purdue.edu/openaccess/fund>
- Publisher Discounts
<https://guides.lib.purdue.edu/c.php?g=1115699&p=8176447>

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS



Key features:

- Corresponding authors from Purdue University-West Lafayette can publish OA **without** fees.
- OA publishing is NOT mandatory--author's choice.
- Authors **MUST** opt-in to participate.
- Authors must use Purdue email when submitting manuscripts.
- Includes online access to Cambridge University Press journal content.

PLOS



Key features:

- Corresponding authors from Purdue University-West Lafayette, Purdue Fort Wayne and Purdue Northwest can publish OA **without** fees.
- Contributing authors whose corresponding author is not affiliated with another institution covered under this agreement receive discounted rates.
- Authors must use Purdue email when submitting manuscripts.
- Includes all PLOS journals

ASSOCIATION FOR COMPUTING MACHINERY



Key features:

- Corresponding authors from Purdue University-West Lafayette, Purdue Northwest, and Purdue Fort Wayne can publish OA **without** fees.
- OA publishing is NOT mandatory--author's choice.
- Authors **MUST** opt-in to participate.
- Authors must use Purdue email when submitting manuscripts.
- Includes online access to ACM Digital Library content.

WILEY

WILEY

BIG
ACADEMIC ALLIANCE

Key features:

- Corresponding authors from Purdue University-West Lafayette, Purdue Northwest, and Purdue Fort Wayne can publish OA **without** fees.
- OA publishing is NOT mandatory--author's choice.
- Authors **MUST** opt-in to participate.
- Authors must use Purdue email when submitting manuscripts.
- ~~One year addendum that allows a select number of OA tokens. When the tokens are used up, Purdue authors receive 10% discount.~~

2023 Update
coming soon

FYI: White House OSTP Memo

Ensuring Free, Immediate, and Equitable Access to Federally Funded Research

- Makes taxpayer-funded articles and data available immediately, at no cost to the public
- Makes taxpayer-funded research more useful and valuable
- Improves scientific research integrity
- Promotes equity in the publishing of and access to federally funded research
- Increases transparency in taxpayerfunded research
- Extends the scope and reach of current policy
- Provides ample time for policy updates to be implemented
- Libraries following closely following closely and happy to answer further questions
 - Nina Collins - e-Pubs, Reid Boehm– PURR, Nicole Kong– Assoc Dean for Research

Library Hours

	« Previous	Next »	Oct 16 Sunday	Oct 17 Monday	Oct 18 Tuesday	Oct 19 Wednesday	Oct 20 Thursday	Oct 21 Friday	Oct 22 Saturday
Archives and Special Collections			Closed	10am - 4:30pm; appointment recommended	10am - 4:30pm; appointment recommended	10am - 7:00pm; appointment recommended	10am - 4:30pm; appointment recommended	12:30pm - 4:30pm; appointment recommended	Closed
Aviation and Transportation Technology			Closed	8am - 5pm	8am - 5pm	8am - 5pm	8am - 5pm	8am - 5pm	Closed
Black Cultural Center Library			2pm - 9pm	8am - 9:30pm	8am - 9:30pm	8am - 9:30pm	8am - 9:30pm	8am - 6pm	Closed
Hicks Undergraduate Library			1pm - 12am; 24/7 with PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24/7 with PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24/7 with PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24/7 with PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24/7 with PUID swipe access	8am - 5pm; 24/7 with PUID swipe access	1pm - 5pm; 24/7 with PUID swipe access
Humanities, Social Sciences and Education Library			1pm - 12am	8am - 12am	8am - 12am	8am - 12am	8am - 12am	8am - 5pm	1pm - 5pm

Library Hours

[« Previous](#)
[Next »](#)

Oct 16
Sunday

Oct 17
Monday

Oct 18
Tuesday

Oct 19
Wednesday

Oct 20
Thursday

Oct 21
Friday

Oct 22
Saturday

Interlibrary Loan	Closed	8am – 5pm	8am – 5pm	8am – 5pm	8am – 5pm	8am – 5pm	Closed
Mathematical Sciences Library	1pm – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	1pm – 5pm
Roland G. Parrish Library of Management & Economics	1pm - 12am; 24 hour PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24 hour PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24 hour PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24 hour PUID swipe access	8am - 12am; 24 hour PUID swipe access	8am – 5pm	1pm – 5pm
Veterinary Medical Library	1pm – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 8pm	8am – 5pm	1pm – 5pm
Wilmeth Active Learning Center	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access	Open 24/7 with PUID swipe access
Library of Engineering and Science	11am – 2am	7am – 2am	7am – 2am	7am – 2am	7am – 2am	7am – 12am	11am – 12am
Ask-a-Librarian	3pm – 11pm	9am – 11pm	9am – 11pm	9am – 11pm	9am – 11pm	9am – 5pm	1pm – 5pm



INDIANA BUREAU OF MOTOR VEHICLES COMMUNICATIONS

Media Contacts:

[Melissa Hook](#) 317-232-2843

[Rich Lord](#) 317-233-4889

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Dec. 8, 2022

BMV Announces Relocation and a Collaborative Community Support Plan for Tippecanoe County

INDIANAPOLIS—The Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) announced today the Lafayette branch will relocate to 2200 Elmwood Avenue, Suite A6, Lafayette, IN 47907. It stays in the same strip mall as the current location. The branch will open in its new location on Tuesday, Dec. 20, 2022.



The new location provides added capacity to serve the community with double the number of testing stations and seven additional customer service stations. In addition, customers now have access to three in-wall BMV Connect kiosks. The branch will maintain the same operating schedule.

The final day at the former location will be Saturday, Dec. 17, 2022. The BMV branch located in West Lafayette will also have its final day of operation on Dec. 17, 2022.

“Our team has worked closely with Senator Spencer Deery and Purdue University officials over the past several weeks to ensure students and area residents have support and access to perform transactions,” explained BMV Commissioner Joe Hoage. “The

collaboration has resulted in a multifaceted plan that will adapt to meet the needs of the population being served and most specifically focus on the student population.”

Some highlights of the plan include:

- Additional training of branch associates to support the needs of foreign nationals. The training will occur in early 2023 and again in the summer as a refresher for associates who work in the university community.
- Special event on Purdue’s campus to benefit the international community with the BMV mobile branch. The mobile branch is staffed by BMV associates who can conduct the majority of BMV transactions from the convenience of campus.
- A BMV presence at student fairs and special events to provide education on required documentation.
- Additional promotion and continued availability of appointments to allow students and the local community to plan a trip to the agency with minimal inconvenience.
- The placement of a BMV Connect Kiosk in West Lafayette at a location to be determined.

"While nothing will fully take away the sting of the loss of a BMV branch, the BMV's leaders have met with me multiple times to consider the concerns I've heard from residents," Deery said. "We've explored ways the new branch can best meet the needs of Tippecanoe County, and I am encouraged by their responsiveness and obvious desire to maximize the new branch's impact. Residents should continue to communicate with the BMV to make sure our community's needs are met."

The BMV is grateful for the collaboration and looks forward to continued partnership with Tippecanoe County residents and officials.

For a complete list of branch locations and hours, to complete an online transaction, or to find a 24-hour BMV Connect kiosk near you visit [IN.gov/BMV](https://www.in.gov/BMV).

###

To: The University Senate
From: David Sanders
Subject: Authorship of Scholarly Works Standard
Reference: Purdue University Authorship of Scholarly Works Standard Document (attached)
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: An important component of research integrity is the definition of the responsibilities of authorship of scholarly works. It is essential that the criteria for authorship be clear and that the obligations imposed by being listed as an author be specified. Purdue University has not previously had an Authorship standard. Through this resolution, the Purdue University Senate invites Purdue University community participation in the refinement of the authorship standard and promotes awareness of its promulgation.

Proposal: Endorsement of the Authorship of Scholarly Works Standard

The University Senate endorses the proposed Authorship of Scholarly Works Standard and encourages widespread dissemination of its content.



Authorship of Scholarly Works (S-)

Standard: [University Policy Office will complete]

Responsible Executive: Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Diversity

Responsible Office: Research Integrity Office

Date Issued: [University Policy Office will complete]

Date Last Revised: N/A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contacts

Individuals and Entities Affected by this Standard

Statement of Standard

Responsibilities

Definitions (defined terms are capitalized throughout the document)

Related Documents, Forms and Tools

History and Updates

Appendix

CONTACTS

Clarification of Standard		
Title/Office	Telephone	Email/Webpage
Research Integrity Officer	765-496-3844	researchintegrity@purdue.edu

INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES AFFECTED BY THIS STANDARD

All Purdue Associates who make a scholarly contribution to research or the reporting of research in scholarly works.

STATEMENT OF STANDARD

Accuracy of authorship attribution is paramount to scholarly integrity and maintaining the public trust in the research and scholarship generated from Purdue University. Attribution of authorship is as critical to the integrity of the publication record as the reported methodology, interpretation or conclusions. Inaccurate identification of authors harms the participating scholars and the credibility of the research and the institution.

This standard affirms the university's commitment to research and scholarship integrity as represented by listed authors and associated acknowledgement sections. This standard and its requirements are rooted in, and informed by, Purdue's overarching [Statement of Integrity and Code of Conduct](#).

Suitable Authorship Practices

All Purdue Associates are required to list authors of scholarly works in accordance with authorship norms commonly accepted within a particular domain of scholarship and in accordance with the following:

1. List authors accurately and completely;
2. Do not list any gift authors, guest authors or ghost authors (see Unacceptable Authorship Practices below); and
3. Apportion credit fairly and accurately (through the order of authorship or other means).

This standard applies to all situations that include, or allegedly should include, a Purdue Associate as a co-author.

Authorship Defined

Many organizations, journals and conferences publish guidelines for author identification. In the absence of such a guideline, include authors based upon the following from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors:

- “Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.”

At Purdue University, substantial contribution to a work that deserves credit as an author requires both material participation and intellectual contribution. Credit for Co-author is expected when an individual both materially participates in a research project and provides intellectual contribution for which a resulting publication would suffer if it were lacking.

Acknowledgements may be used to denote contributions to the work that do not meet the criteria of authorship, such as supporting the study, general mentoring, acting as study coordinator and other related auxiliary activities. Authors should verify that all individuals noted in an acknowledgements section have been granted permission to be listed.

Author Order

The meaning of author order may vary by discipline or publication. Purdue Associates are encouraged to follow discipline or source conventions in the ordering of authors. Typically, the order of authorship conveys level of contribution. If there is equal involvement, authors are often ordered alphabetically by surname.

Where there is no prevailing convention and authorship is unequal, Purdue Associates should strive for correct representation based on contribution to the work. It is encouraged that Purdue Associates discuss and agree upon authorship and author order at the outset of a project.

Unacceptable Authorship Practices

Purdue Associates are required to avoid any manipulation of author identification to mislead the reader. In particular, the following practices are unacceptable:

1. Gift authorship – co-authorship given as reward or repayment to someone who did not contribute significantly to a work; “quid pro quo” authorship.
2. Guest authorship – co-authorship given due to reputation or influence to increase the potential for acceptance of the publication, when the co-author did not contribute significantly to the work; “honorary” authorship.
3. Ghost authorship – concealment of an author’s hand in the research or report of research.

Resolution of Authorship Disputes

A Purdue Associate who experiences an inaccurate or omitted authorship identification is encouraged to seek satisfactory resolution from the lead author or Corresponding author. If attempts to resolve the issue fail, the associate may report the concern in writing to the Research Integrity Officer.

The Research Integrity Officer and/or a tenured faculty member of their choosing, with no conflict of interest, will mediate among authors to obtain a voluntary resolution to the dispute. Choices of tenured faculty could be: disinterested faculty in the appropriate discipline, the chair of a unit graduate program, the associate dean of research, or others. If a voluntary resolution is not reached, the Research Integrity Officer will, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, refer the dispute to an appropriate academic head or dean who will create a faculty committee to advise the Office of the Provost on an appropriate resolution.

In the event that a credible allegation of plagiarism exists in addition to the authorship dispute, the allegation will be subject to review under the University’s policy on [Research Misconduct \(III.A.2\)](#).

This standard does not supersede intellectual property rights outlined in University [Policy I.A.1. Intellectual Property](#) and Standard S-19 Courseware and Online Modules.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Purdue Associates

- Understand this standard and use it as a guide for establishing authorship credit, author order and appropriate acknowledgement in all scholarly activities.
- Can identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work and should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.
- Report in good faith inaccurate, omitted or unacceptable authorship information as outlined in this standard.
- Abstain from the unacceptable practices of gift, guest and ghost authorship.
- Communicate this standard to other Purdue Associates in the course of research work and graduate advising at Purdue University.
- When requested, work with Purdue officials to resolve authorship disputes.

Dean/Associate Dean and School/Department Head/Chair

- Understand this standard and use it as a guide for helping faculty establish appropriate authorship credit, author order and acknowledgement when called upon to do so.
- Report in good faith inaccurate, omitted or unacceptable authorship information as outlined in this standard.
- Using this standard as a guide, assist in resolving authorship disputes.

Provost

- With guidance from the RIO, assign an academic head or dean to mediate and propose an authorship dispute resolution if faculty mediation fails to resolve the situation.
- When disputes involve external parties, work with the RIO to assign an appropriate individual to mediate and propose an authorship dispute resolution.

Research Integrity Officer

- Administer this standard.
- Receive reports of inaccurate, omitted or unacceptable authorship information as outlined in this standard and coordinate resolution of authorship disputes.

DEFINITIONS

All defined terms are capitalized throughout the document. Refer to the central [Policy Glossary](#) for additional defined terms.

Acknowledgment

Recognition of a participant whose involvement does not meet the discipline's recognized criteria for authorship.

Co-author

A participant whose contribution to a scholarly work meets the discipline's recognized criteria for authorship.

Corresponding Author

Sometimes also called primary author; a participant who takes primary responsibility for the submission and communication with the publisher and responds to any questions about the work during and after publication.

Principal Investigator

Principal Investigator is the primary individual responsible for the preparation, conduct, and administration of a research grant, cooperative agreement, training or public service project, contract, or other sponsored project in compliance with applicable laws and regulations and institutional policy governing the conduct of sponsored research.

Purdue Associate

See definition in the policy on [Research Misconduct \(III.A.2\)](#).

Research Misconduct

See definition in the policy on [Research Misconduct \(III.A.2\)](#).

RELATED DOCUMENTS, FORMS AND TOOLS

This standard is issued in support of the policy on [Research Misconduct \(III.A.2\)](#), as amended or superseded.

AAUP Policy Documents and Reports 11th Edition “Statement on Plagiarism”. pp. 147-148.

AAUP Policy Documents and Reports 11th Edition “Statement on Multiple Authors” pp. 267-268.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). (2022). *Roles and Responsibilities of Authors, Contributors, Reviewers, Editors, Publishers, and Owners*. Retrieved from <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/>.

Council of Science Editors. (2018). *White Paper on Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications*. Retrieved from <https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/>.

HISTORY AND UPDATES

[TBD]: This is the first standard to address this issue.

APPENDIX

There are no appendices to this standard.

To: The University Senate

From: Antonio Bobet, Civil Engineering
Min Chen, Mathematics
Daniel Frank, Philosophy
Katie Jarriel, Honors College
Cara Kinnally, Languages and Cultures
Richard Mattes, Public Health
Shannon McMullen, Interdisciplinary Studies
Alice Pawley, Engineering Education*
Alex Seto, President, Purdue Graduate Student Government
Susan South, Psychological Sciences
Anish Vanaik, Honors College
Steve Yaninek, Entomology

Subject: The negative impact of Indiana Senate Bill 1 on Purdue students, staff, and faculty. *Indicates Corresponding Senator

Reference: Indiana Senate Bill 1:
<http://iga.in.gov/legislative/2022ss1/bills/senate/1>

Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: In special session in June/July 2022, the Indiana Legislature passed SB-1 [1], eliminating almost all abortion care provided in the State of Indiana, endangering the health, safety, and lives of Hoosier citizens who can gestate and give birth, their families, and communities. Indiana currently has the 10th highest maternal mortality rate in the nation [2], and research indicates that states with more abortion restrictions have increases in the total maternal mortality rate [3]. The World Health Organization has stated that being able to obtain a safe abortion is a crucial part of health care. [4]

Since the passage of SB1 and signing by the governor into law, it has become increasingly clear the threat the bill's passage brings to the state's economy and to the health and wellbeing of the citizens of Indiana, including the students, staff, and faculty at Purdue University-West Lafayette campus.

Experts predict a number of deleterious effects of this bill, some of which have already begun to occur.

Reducing access to abortion disproportionately affects university students more than the general population.

University students as a population experience significant barriers to healthcare, including inexperience navigating the healthcare system, dependence on distant healthcare networks (e.g. in their hometown), avoiding seeking healthcare due to cost concerns, and the unregulated and variable care offered by campuses [5-6]. University students are also at high risk of sexual violence and sexual assault [7], so have a higher need for access to emergency contraception and abortion care for those students who would choose it.

Over half of all abortion patients in the US are in their twenties, and one-fifth of all abortion patients are active students seeking post-high school degrees.

Students often seek abortions to ensure they can complete their schooling successfully. Students who have a child while at university are less likely to graduate than those who do not, and students report that having a child would disrupt their educational goals [8]. Patients denied an abortion are less likely to have aspirational life plans for the coming year [8]. Patients who receive an abortion are six times more likely to have positive one-year plans are more likely to achieve them, compared to those denied an abortion [8]. These references are not limited to students as patients, but indicate particularly grievous impacts on students.

Restricted access to abortion requiring students to travel out of state increases out-of-pocket expenses, causes delay in receiving care, causes students to miss class, and limits students' options in finding an appointment that works with their schedule.

Access to abortion care for vulnerable populations will decrease, and associated healthcare costs will increase.

The groups most affected by restricted access to abortions, including women, people with low income, people of color, and transgender, nonbinary, and gender-expansive (TGE) people are groups who are already minoritized at Purdue [9-10].

The negative impacts of abortion restrictions fall disproportionately on people with low income and communities of color [11]. These occur within a broad context of healthcare disparities experienced by these groups on a systemic level [12].

Abortion restrictions also exacerbate structural barriers to abortion care faced by transgender, nonbinary, and gender-expansive (TGE) people. These existing barriers include policy

restrictions, healthcare refusals, discrimination, and misgendering [9].

Abortion denial compounds existing social and health inequities by creating economic hardship, e.g., increased household poverty, long-term loss of income, and increased debt. This insecurity lasts for years. [13]. Not being able to afford a child is one of the most common reasons for seeking an abortion [14].

The cost of healthcare for students who need to travel out of state for abortion care will increase [14]. When patients have to travel out of state to receive abortion care, a number of negative, compounding consequences occur: delays in care, negative mental health impacts as a result of the barriers to care, and considering self-induction. [15] In Indiana, patients who traveled out of state had abortions about three weeks later than those in-state [15], which further reduces access to abortions due to gestational age limits for care.

Candace Shaffer, Senior Director for Human Resources, confirmed to the University Senate on 9/12/22 that Purdue is not anticipating not changing any aspects of the existing healthcare plan in light of SB1 [16].

That abortion care is eliminated in Indiana has consequences for other aspects of health care.

Reports are already being published across the country how people who have health conditions whose treatment requires essential medication that can also be used to induce abortions are having difficulty accessing that medication. [17]

Treatment for miscarriage is clinically identical to abortion care. Restricting access to abortion creates a false distinction between abortion care and miscarriage care and can lead to healthcare providers being hesitant to provide time-sensitive care in circumstances where the line between miscarriage treatment and abortion is blurry. It also limits access to the medication mifepristone, which can be used in both abortion and miscarriage care. [18]

Students and faculty in healthcare-related areas at Purdue (such as in the School of Nursing and College of Pharmacy) need their academic freedoms affirmed and protected around topics relating to abortion.

Abortion training is, both, required for accreditation, and seen as one of the “best predictors of a physician’s providing the full range of miscarriage-management options.” [19-20]

Faculty at the University of Idaho are having their academic freedom of what to teach in the classrooms restricted by an abortion ban in Idaho. Instructors who express their own beliefs, informed by their expertise, about abortion in the classroom risk prosecution. In addition, the university is prevented from providing condoms for birth control purposes, and only for prevention of STDs. [21]

SB1 will cause Purdue to have more difficulty recruiting, retaining, and helping succeed more diverse groups of students, staff, and faculty.

Given the people who can get pregnant, and those groups who seek out abortions more frequently, that Indiana has eliminated abortion care statewide will have consequences for the recruitment of diverse students, staff, and faculty to Purdue, particularly from out of state. Without affordable options for contraception and abortion, students who might get pregnant will think twice about coming to Purdue. [22] Parents will think twice about sending their children to Purdue. Like employees at other businesses in Indiana [23-24], staff and faculty recruited from out of state, whether they themselves are capable of getting pregnant, or have partners who can, or have children who can, will think twice about coming to Purdue.

SB1 will limit Purdue’s in-state industry partners, reducing opportunities for students, staff, faculty, and advancement of such collaborations.

Eli Lilly and Co., one the largest employers in Indiana and a strategic research partner of Purdue, announced that it is looking to expand outside Indiana as a result of SB1 [23]. Indiana businesses have expressed that SB1 will impede their ability to attract and retain top talent [24].

Proposal:

From the University Senate bylaws [25]: “...subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees and in consultation with the President, [the University Senate] has the power and responsibility to propose or to adopt policies, regulations, and procedures intended to achieve the educational objectives of Purdue University and the general welfare of those involved in these educational processes.”

The University Senate is the representative body of the Faculty at Purdue-West Lafayette, and speaks with the voice of this Faculty. Here, this document is offered in the spirit of commenting about the general welfare of those at Purdue involved in these educational processes.

The University Senate expresses its gravest concern about how SB1 will affect the recruitment, retention, and success of a diverse array of students, staff, and faculty. It makes the following requests:

1. The Senate requests the administration to find sustainable ways to improve access to affordable or free contraception for students, staff, and faculty, and increase benefits to cover anticipated increased costs for receiving reproductive healthcare out of state.
2. The Senate requests the Educational Policy Committee to revise Academic Regulation [26] on class attendance and parental leave (A.7) or on medical excused absences (A.8) to include travel needed for abortion care or time at home needed for a medication abortion. The Senate cautions that policy revisions should focus on the time needed for recovery, or on including the type of facilities that can provide said care, rather than the specific reasons for the need for care.
3. The Senate requests Human Resources and the Vice Provost for Student Life ensure that the Center for Healthy Living and PUSH provide a standard of care that ensures patients know up-to-date information about abortion services and providers, and they are part of the mix of services medical providers can prescribe.
4. The Senate requests for the administration to ensure a commitment for providing access to emergency birth control through PUSH, the Center for Healthy Living, and the forthcoming micro-hospital serviced by Ascension-St Vincent Hospital, a faith-based health-care provider, in the Discovery Park District. [27]
5. The Senate requests the administration make a public statement as part of its aggressive protection of academic freedom, asserting the right of healthcare faculty and students to teach and study the material judged worthy given their professional standing and by the standards of their field.
6. The Senate strongly requests the administration to assess the health risks for students, staff, and faculty at the Purdue-Northwest and Purdue-Fort Wayne campuses in terms of access

to contraception and healthcare providers who will provide a standard of care that ensures patients know up-to-date information about abortion services and providers, and they are part of the mix of services medical providers can prescribe.

The Senate acknowledges and appreciates the Purdue-Fort Wayne Senate's SD 22-1 [28] and urges faculty at Purdue-West Lafayette to become familiar with and adopt the principles referred therein.

While there is currently an injunction against SB1 [29] that has temporarily suspended its implementation, we do not trust that this ban will be overturned and not come back. We stand together, irrespective of how we personally feel about abortion, to push back on the increased healthcare costs that our community members face and that we all bear because of SB1, and to protect the academic freedom of our students, staff, and faculty.

Works cited

1. Indiana Senate Bill 1: <http://iga.in.gov/legislative/2022ss1/bills/senate/1>
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), National Vital Statistics System, "Maternal deaths and mortality rates: Each state, the District of Columbia, United States, 2018-2020
3. Dovile Vilda, Maeve E. Wallace, Clare Daniel, Melissa Goldin Evans, Charles Stoecker, Katherine P. Theall, "State Abortion Policies and Maternal Death in the United States, 2015–2018", *American Journal of Public Health* 111, no. 9 (September 1, 2021): pp. 1696-1704. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306396>
4. Caron R Kim, Antonella Lavelanet, Bela Ganatra. Enabling access to quality abortion care: WHO's Abortion Care guideline. *The Lancet Global Health*, Volume 10, Issue 4, 2022, Pages e467-e468, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(21\)00552-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00552-0).
5. "At college health centers, students battle misdiagnoses and inaccessible care" by Jenn Abelson, Nicole Dungca, Meryl Kornfield and Andrew Ba Tran. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/2020/07/13/college-health-centers-problems/>
6. Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, "Campus Sexual Violence: Statistics". <https://www.rainn.org/statistics/campus-sexual-violence#:~:text=Among%20graduate%20and%20professional%20students,force%2C%20violence%2C%20or%20incapacitation.&text=Among%20undergraduat%20students%2C%2026.4%25%20of,force%2C%20violence%2C%20or%20inca pacitation>.
7. Upadhyay, U.D., Alice F. Cartwright and Nicole E. Johns, "Access to Medication Abortion Among California's Public University Students", *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Volume 63, Issue 2, 2018, Pages 249-252.
8. Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health, "Introduction to the Turnaway Study", <https://www.ansirh.org/sites/default/files/2022-07/turnawaystudyannotatedbibliography063022.pdf>

9. Moseson H, Fix L, Gerdtz C, et al. Abortion attempts without clinical supervision among transgender, nonbinary and gender-expansive people in the United States *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health* 2022;48:e22-e30.
10. Hodson K, Meads C, Bewley S. Lesbian and bisexual women's likelihood of becoming pregnant: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJOG*. 2017 Feb;124(3):393-402. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.14449. Epub 2016 Dec 15. PMID: 27981741; PMCID: PMC5299536.
11. Christine Dehlendorf, Lisa H. Harris, and Tracy A. Weitz, (2013) “[Disparities in Abortion Rates: A Public Health Approach](https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301339)” *American Journal of Public Health* 103, 1772_1779, <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301339>
12. Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH) (March 2020), “Factsheet: The harms of denying a woman a wanted abortion: findings from the Turnaway Study” University of California, San Francisco Medical Center, Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health. https://www.ansirh.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/the_harms_of_denying_a_woman_a_wanted_abortion_4-16-2020.pdf
13. Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH) (March 2020) “Introduction to the Turnaway Study,” University of California, San Francisco Medical Center, Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health. <https://www.ansirh.org/sites/default/files/2022-07/turnawaystudyannotatedbibliography063022.pdf>
14. Jerman, Frohwirth, Kavanaugh, Blades (2017) “Barriers to abortion care and their consequences for patients traveling for services: qualitative findings from two states.” *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 49 (2), 95-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12024>
15. Hoosier Abortion Access Study, Key Insights, <https://bit.ly/Hoosiers-key-insights>
16. University Senate – Meeting minutes (draft) for September 12, 2022
17. “Republican abortion bans restrict women’s access to other essential medicine,” by Maya Yang, *Guardian*, Sept 26, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/sep/26/us-abortion-bans-restrict-access-essential-medications>
18. Lynn M. Paltrow, Lisa H. Harris & Mary Faith Marshall (2022) Beyond Abortion: The Consequences of Overturning Roe, *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 22:8, 3-15, DOI: 10.1080/15265161.2022.2075965
19. Traub, A.M., K. Mermin-Bunnell, P.Pareek, S. Williams, N.B. Connell, J.F. Kawwass, et al. (2022) “The implications of overturning *Roe v. Wade* on medical education and future physicians”, *The Lancet Regional Health - Americas*, vol. 14: 100334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2022.100334>
20. Harris, L. H. (2022) “Navigating Loss of Abortion Services - A Large Academic Medical Center Prepares for the Overturn of *Roe v. Wade*” *N Engl J Med* 386:2061-2064. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2206246
21. Gluckman, Nell. (Sept 26, 2022) “It’s making us accomplices’: A university tells faculty to ‘remain neutral’ on abortion discussions in class.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/its-making-us-accomplices-a-university-tells-faculty-to-remain-neutral-on-abortion-in-class>

22. Bryant, Jessica. (August 9, 2022) “64% of Current Students desire to work in a state with Legal Abortion Access”
<https://www.bestcolleges.com/research/students-desire-to-work-where-abortion-is-legal/>
23. Russell, John. (August 6, 2022) In wake of new abortion ban, Lilly says it will look outside Indiana for expansion projects. *Indianapolis Business Journal*.
<https://www.ibj.com/articles/in-wake-of-new-abortion-ban-lilly-will-look-outside-indiana-for-expansion-projects>
24. Kelley, Lora. (August 6, 2022) Major Indiana Employers Criticize State’s New Abortion Law. *The New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/06/business/indiana-companies-abortion.html>
25. University Senate Bylaws <https://www.purdue.edu/senate/about/bylaws.php>
26. Academic Regulations on attendance,
<https://catalog.purdue.edu/content.php?catoid=15&navoid=18634#a-attendance>
27. “Ascension St. Vincent neighborhood hospital coming to Purdue University campus” *Purdue Today*, May 6, 2022.
<https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/releases/2022/Q2/ascension-st.-vincent-neighborhood-hospital-coming-to-purdue-university-campus.html>
28. Purdue Fort-Wayne Senate Document SD 22-1
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XEJkTjFwBeKmyAv7IRshK3knX8idUonB/view?usp=sharing>
29. Rudavsky, Shari, and Kaitlin Lange (September 22, 2022) “Judge blocks Indiana’s new abortion law – for now.”
<https://www.indystar.com/story/news/health/2022/09/22/indiana-abortion-law-blocked-special-judge-in-aclu-planned-parenthood-lawsuit/69511130007/>

To: The University Senate
From: University Senate Steering Committee
Subject: Reapportionment of the University Senate
Reference: University Senate Document 90-5; University Senate Document 90-6; University Senate Document 21-15; University Code D 3.00; Bylaws of the University Senate, Items 2.00 and 2.01
Disposition: University Senate for Approval and Faculty Units

Proposal: Reapportionment of the Senate for AY 2023-2024 as indicated below.

Proposed Action: Section D 3.00 of the University Code and the Bylaws of the University Senate provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred four members. Ten of these are specified in the items 1 through 10 below. The other slots will be apportioned among the West Lafayette faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two Senators.

There are 2328 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette campus. When this number is divided by ninety-four the result is 24.77.

Therefore, to qualify for two Senators, a faculty unit should have at least 50 voting faculty members. However, since no faculty unit can have fewer than two Senators, the Libraries unit with 33 faculty members qualifies for two Senators, as does the Honors unit with 18 faculty members.

The remaining units have a total of 2,277 voting faculty members with ninety Senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The apportionment of Senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 25.3. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 11.55; Education, 2.84; Engineering, 18.1; Health & Human Sciences, 10.63; Liberal Arts, 11.34; Management, 5.38; Pharmacy, 3.20; Science, 14.39; Purdue Polytechnic Institute, 8.26; Veterinary Medicine, 4.31.

In order to achieve the desired 90 Senators, the College of Science remainder was closest to being above 0.50 and thus was assigned a value of 15 Senators. The remaining units were rounded to the nearest integer.

Areas Represented	No. Voting Faculty Members 15 Nov. 2021	Number of Senators 2022-23	No. Voting Faculty Members 21 November 2022	Number of Senators 2023-24
1. President		1		1
2. Chief Academic Officer		1		1
3. Chief Fiscal Officer		1		1
4. Chair of the Senate		1		1
5. Vice-Chair of the Senate		1		1
6. Purdue Northwest		1		1
7. Purdue Fort Wayne		1		1
8. IUPUI		1		1
9. Undergraduate Student		1		1
10. Graduate Student		1		1
11. Faculty Units				
<i>Agriculture</i>	283	12	292	12
<i>Education</i>	68	3	72	3
<i>Engineering</i>	425	18	458	18
<i>Health & Human Sciences</i>	251	10	269	11
<i>Honors</i>	13	2	18	2
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	254	11	287	11
<i>Libraries</i>	29	2	33	2
<i>Management</i>	126	5	136	5
<i>Pharmacy</i>	76	3	81	3
<i>Science</i>	341	14	364	15
<i>Purdue Polytechnic</i>	164	7	209	8
<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	109	5	109	4
TOTAL:	2139	102	2328	104

To: The University Senate
From: Alice Pawley, Engineering Education
Susan South, Psychological Science
Anish Vanaik, Honors College
Subject: The University Senate’s right to direct communication with the Faculty
Reference: See Works Cited
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption
Rationale: The University Senate is the governing body of the faculty of Purdue University on the West Lafayette campus. [1]

The Office of the Provost currently maintains electronic mailing lists of all faculty organized by classification, accessed through information from the Office of Human Resources. The Office is delegated this authority through policies VII.A.4 and VII.B.8. [2-3]

For the University Senate leadership to email the Faculty directly, it must send a request to the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, with the justification of how the information is “official University business of broad interest.” [4] The VPFA must provide advance approval for the Senate leadership to email the faculty directly.

The AAUP Report on Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications [5] states:

“[S]enate officers and other faculty representatives engaged in institutional governance activities should have free and unfettered access to university-controlled lists of faculty members they represent, and all faculty members should be able to comment electronically on governance issues without restriction or fear of disciplinary action.”

Purdue Student Government (PSG) and Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG), MaPSAC leadership, and CSSAC leadership currently enjoy the right to directly email their constituents without mediation by administration. Additionally, the Senate leadership at Purdue-Northwest and Purdue-Fort Wayne have the power to email their faculties without asking permission from the administration.

The University Senate chair is the elected representative of the Senate, which itself represents the faculty at Purdue-West Lafayette; the chair serves a one-year term. The Secretary of the Faculties is a faculty member who serves the Senate across multiple academic years, thereby providing organizational continuity and consistency. The Sergeant-at-Arms, is a staff person assigned by the Office of the Provost to support the work of the Senate. These are Senate officers entrusted with ensuring the business of the Senate is carried on expeditiously, and that the will of the Senate is clearly expressed to various constituencies.

In pursuit of this charge, they might have need to communicate with the faculty body at large from time to time.

Proposal: The University Senate asserts that the University Senate Chair, Secretary of the Faculties, and Sergeant-at-Arms should have the right to email the Faculty directly on the Senate's behalf, without needing advance approval by the University administration.

Works cited:

1. University Senate Bylaws, <https://www.purdue.edu/senate/about/bylaws.php>
2. VII.A.4, "Acceptable Use of IT Resources and Assets" - <https://www.purdue.edu/policies/information-technology/via4.html>
3. VII.B.8. "Information Security and Privacy" - <https://www.purdue.edu/policies/information-technology/viib8.html>
4. University Senate minutes from January 27, 2020 on listserv use, summarizing remarks from Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: <https://www.purdue.edu/senate/documents/meetings/Jan-27-2020-Minutes-Complete.pdf>
5. AAUP report on Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications - <https://www.aaup.org/report/academic-freedom-and-electronic-communications-2014>

To: The University Senate

From: Stephen P. Beaudoin, Senate Immediate Past Chair
Colleen Brady, Senate Chair
Tom Brush, Senator
Matthew Conaway, Senator
Todor Cooklev, Senator
Jennifer Freeman, Senator
Keith Gehres, Registrar
Neil Knobloch, Senator
Eric Kvam, Educational Policy Chair
Brian Leung, Senate Vice Chair
Julie Liu, Senator
Shannon McMullin, Senator
Deborah Nichols, Senator and Past Senate Chair
Robert Nowack, Nominating Chair
Alice Pawley, Senator
Erik Otárola-Castillo, Senator
Elizabeth Richards, Steering Chair
David Sanders, Student Affairs Chair
Steven Scott, Senator
John W. Sheffield, Senator
Thomas Siegmund, Senator
Howard Sypher, Senator
Eric Waltenberg, Faculty Affairs Chair
Kipling Williams, Senator

Subject: University Senate Commendation for Jay Akridge in Recognition of His Distinguished Service to the Community

Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: WHEREAS: Jay Akridge has been a valued and respected member of the Purdue Community for more than forty years.

WHEREAS: Jay Akridge has served the University Senate and Purdue community as a whole as Purdue's Provost, Chief Academic Officer, and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Diversity since July 2017, the longest tenure of any currently serving Provost in the Big Ten.

WHEREAS: In these years, Jay Akridge has shown unflagging dedication to the faculty, staff, and students at Purdue, and has been a crucial participant in and advocate for shared governance in our community.

WHEREAS: Jay Akridge is today attending his final Senate meeting as Provost.

Proposal: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The University Senate formally recognizes and salutes Jay Akridge for his unprecedented excellence, his good humor and fellowship, and his lasting contributions to Purdue University. The Senate recognizes that he will be missed.

Endorsements from past and present shared governance leaders:

Frederick C. Berry, Past Nominating Chair
Natalie Carroll, Past Chair of the Senate
Joseph Camp, Past Secretary of Faculties
Cheryl Cooky, Past Chair of the Senate
Stephanie Dykhuizen, Past Seargeant-at-Arms
Nathan Engelberth, Past PACADA Chair and Advisor to EPC
Alexander Francis, Past Faculty Affairs Chair
Andy Freed, Past Educational Policy Chair
Se'Andra Johnson, Sergeant-at-Arms
Signe E. Kastberg, Past Faculty Affairs Chair
Manushag N. Powell, Secretary of Faculties
Linda Prokopy, Past Faculty Affairs Chair
Audrey Ruple, Past Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Chair

To: The University Senate
From: David Sanders
Subject: Resolution Calling for the Maintenance of a Bureau of Motor Vehicles License Branch in West Lafayette
Reference: [BMV Announces West Lafayette Branch Closure](#)
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion and Adoption

Rationale: The City of West Lafayette has grown from a population of 29,596 in 2010 to a population that exceeds the 44,595 people reported in the 2020 decennial census.

The City of West Lafayette is the most densely populated city in Indiana. The student population at Purdue University now exceeds 50,000 students.

The Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles opened its West Lafayette branch in the fall of 2002, noting that population growth in Greater Lafayette had warranted it.

The City's population features a large percentage of both Purdue University retirees and international students who could benefit from in-person contact with the state agency.

The State is now planning to close the West Lafayette branch of the Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

Public sentiment on the campus of Purdue University is opposed to this closure.

Proposal: BE IT RESOLVED, that the Purdue University Senate strongly encourages the State Bureau of Motor Vehicles to reverse its decision to close the West Lafayette branch; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the University Senate urges the President of Purdue University and the Board of Trustees to advocate on behalf of retention of the West Lafayette Bureau of Motor Vehicles branch; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the University Senate Chair or Vice-Chair will communicate this resolution to the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles and to our Lafayette-area representatives in the State Assembly and Senate.