

**To:** Purdue University Senate

**From:** Senator Lisa Bosman and  
Senator Lindsay Weinberg

**Subject:** American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Purdue Chapter Statement calling for a vote of no confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe in the University Senate.

**Reference:** Resolution for Standing Committees to Look into Issues, Concerns, and Allegations raised in the AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement and Report Back to the Steering Committee.

**Disposition:** University Senate for Discussion in the Steering Committee, Educational Policy Committee, Community Connection Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee, and University Resources Policy Committee.

**Rationale:** Recently, the Purdue Chapter of the AAUP passed a Chapter Statement calling for a vote of no confidence in Provost Patrick J. Wolfe in the University Senate, with subsequent coverage in *Based in Lafayette*, *Purdue Exponent*, and *Journal & Courier*. Given the breadth and significance of the concerns raised from across campus, it is crucial for Senators to have the opportunity to discuss, deliberate, and share questions regarding these concerns on behalf of their constituents.

**Proposal:** Purdue University Faculty Senate Standing Committees, and in particular, the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), Community Connection Committee (CCC), Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), Student Affairs Committee (SAC), and University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), look into the issues and concerns raised in the AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement calling for a vote of no confidence and report back to the Steering Committee before our next meeting on 9 March 2026.

**Resolution for Standing Committees to Look into Issues, Concerns, and Allegations raised in the AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement and Report Back to the Steering Committee.**

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding unilateral decisions to block faculty hires and refusal to sign offer letters for candidates who had accepted verbal offers (relevant to deliberations on the FAC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding the unilateral and non-transparent restructuring of the John Martinson Honors College, resulting in job losses for 15 of 17 faculty members, including the Provost's refusal to sign realignment offers for 7 JMHC faculty (relevant to deliberations on the FAC and EPC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding significant teaching shortages in several departments due to faculty turnover and hiring delays (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, EPC, and SAC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding a non-transparent Movable Dream Hires program alongside faculty hiring gaps in a broad range of areas (relevant to deliberations on the FAC and CCC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding a failure to complete a search process for a new Dean of Education (relevant to deliberations on the FAC and EPC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding broad overreach during tenure & promotion processes and failure to follow appropriate procedure for tenure and promotion cases, with several candidates allegedly pressured—without any reason explicitly cited—to remove their tenure cases from consideration the day before the Board of Trustees was scheduled to meet to review them (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, EPC, and CCC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding a failure to explain changes in direction to colleges (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, EPC, CCC, and SAC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding the expansion of HEA 1001 post-tenure review requirements to clinical faculty beyond the stated ambit of the law (relevant to deliberations on the FAC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding repeated cuts to book-producing disciplines in the humanities and reduction of tenured faculty who have the research time to write books, while promoting the use of Generative AI to turn faculty lecture notes into books (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, EPC, CCC, and SAC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding a failure to appeal the U.S. Department of Education's discontinuing of a \$34.9 million education grant for the Indiana Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR Up), the 6<sup>th</sup> largest federal grant in Purdue's history (relevant to deliberations on the SAC, CCC, and EPC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding the firing of staff involved in DEI and associated work across the campus over the summer, who had been explicitly told to

continue “business as usual,” which also reportedly involved firing 60 student ambassadors as well as full-time staff members, some of whom had no DEI-related responsibilities (relevant to deliberations on the CCC, SAC, and EPC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding fostering a climate of self-censorship that undermines the mission of the University (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, CCC, SAC, and EPC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding discrimination against prospective graduate students based on nationality (relevant to deliberations on the SAC, EPC, and FAC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns regarding a lack of leadership that directly impacts Purdue’s ability to meet its teaching, research, and service mission (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, EPC, CCC, SAC, and URPC);

**Whereas**, there are expressed concerns that a resignation is urgently needed in order to restore faith that the Purdue administration will treat its community with appropriate fairness and transparency and demonstrate a sense of duty to its alumni, faculty, staff, and students (relevant to deliberations on the FAC, EPC, CCC, SAC, and URPC);

**Be it resolved that**, the Educational Policy Committee, Community Connection Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee, and University Resources Policy Committee look into the issues, concerns, and allegations raised in the AAUP Purdue Chapter Statement and report back to the Steering Committee before our next meeting on 9 March 2026.

---

## Summary Report Regarding Senate Document 25-19

At the February 16, 2026 University Senate meeting, [Senate Document 25-19](#) was introduced in response to the AAUP Purdue’s [January Chapter Statement](#) calling for the immediate resignation of Provost Patrick J. Wolfe and a vote of no confidence.

As of March 20, 2026, the following information was received: reports from 6 University Senate Standing Committees; results from 2 college-level surveys open to faculty, staff, and administrators; feedback from 10 one-on-one meetings with faculty; and 9 emails from faculty and community members.

In addition to confirmations of the items listed in SD 25-19, other concerns were raised regarding the Provost’s handling of the [Vet School Dean search](#) and lack of follow up in communication from advisory meetings, senate meetings, and committee meetings.

Of 6 Standing Committees, 4 documented relevant concerns. Of the 6, 1 requested more time, 1 requested more detailed information regarding some of the claims, and 1

suggested that the President establish a deliberative evidentiary process to further investigate.

In an effort to support due process and due diligence, the Provost was contacted on March 12 to provide a response to SD 25-19. No response was received as of March 20, 2026.

## **Major Areas of Concern Based on Information Received**

### **1. Delayed and Adverse Decision-Making**

- Findings: there is a pattern in which major academic and administrative issues under the Provost's purview remain unresolved until external pressure requires action. This approach has resulted in delayed decision-making, limited transparency, and outcomes that disproportionately and adversely affect faculty and academic programs.

### **2. Lack of Information Transparency**

- Findings: the Provost's communication related to deviations from policy, personnel matters, and institutional initiatives appears to be tightly controlled. There are concerns about restricted communication channels and limited transparency surrounding the Provost's decisions, which have had adverse consequences for colleges, students, and faculty livelihoods.

### **3. Disconnected Institutional Understanding of Faculty**

- Findings: there is a reported disconnect between the Provost's leadership and Purdue's institutional culture, faculty responsibilities, and academic mission. There are concerns that leadership decisions do not adequately reflect sufficient engagement with the day-to-day realities faced by Purdue faculty, including teaching responsibilities, graduate advising, research development, and program leadership. This leadership approach negatively influences morale, retention, and institutional trust.

### **4. Inadequate Conflict Resolution**

- Findings: opportunities for direct dialogue between faculty and the Provost have been limited, particularly in situations involving complaints, escalating conflicts, and grievances. There are concerns regarding lack of sufficient notice and due process, with adverse consequences for the fairness of tenure and promotion processes, faculty retention, faculty welfare, staff workloads, and college-level hiring. A lack of follow-through on protocol, timely communication, and constructive resolution processes results in a loss of institutional trust.

### **Examples Illustrating 1-4 Above:**

- Last-minute refusals to sign offer letters of candidates who were selected by search committees and extended good faith verbal offers, which harms Purdue's reputation, faculty recruitment efforts, and department-level planning.
- [Non-transparent](#) restructuring of the John Martinson Honors College, including lack of sufficient consultation with the University Senate, lack of transparency regarding the realignment process, lack of a coherent restructuring plan, and refusal to confirm 7/9 realignments after department and college-level approvals.
- Failure to appeal the U.S. Department of Education's discontinuing of a \$34.9 million education grant for [GEAR Up](#), despite having a 7-day appeal window, resulting in sudden layoffs and loss of educational support structures for thousands of Hoosier students. All other impacted institutions allegedly appealed except for Purdue.

### **Institutional Climate and Governance Implications:**

Collectively, the concerns raise broader issues about how the Provost's administrative practices have impacted Purdue's institutional climate. Effective decision-making processes, transparent communication practices, and collaborative leadership all play critical roles in sustaining a healthy academic environment.

For the University Senate, these issues ultimately determine whether the Provost's leadership approach supports Purdue's core values, including:

- shared governance between faculty and administration;
- transparent and accountable decision-making;
- respect for faculty roles and expertise in research, teaching, and service; and
- alignment between administrative leadership and the university's mission.

These considerations collectively form the basis for the Senate discussion regarding a vote of no confidence in the Provost's leadership.