FORT WAYNE SENATE AGENDA
MONDAY
March 16, 2020
12:00 P.M., KT G46

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of February 10

3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Toole

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
   a. IFC Representative – J. Nowak
   b. Deputy Presiding Officer – J. Toole

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – A. Nasr

6. Special business of the day

7. Unfinished business
   a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 19-19) – J. Toole

8. Committee reports requiring action
   a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 19-20) – V. Maloney
   b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-21) – H. Di
   c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-22) – H. Di
   d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 19-23) – S. Hanke
   e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 19-24) – S. Hanke

9. Question time
   a. (Senate Reference No. 19-35) – S. Buttes
   b. (Senate Reference No. 19-36) – L. Lin
   c. (Senate Reference No. 19-37) – J. Badia
   d. (Senate Reference No. 19-38) – A. Livschiz
   e. (Senate Reference No. 19-39) – A. Livschiz

10. New business

11. Committee reports “for information only”
    a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 19-32) – V. Maloney
    b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 19-33) – V. Maloney
    c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 19-34) – V. Maloney
    d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 19-40) – J. Toole

12. The general good and welfare of the University

13. Adjournment*

*The meeting will adjourn or recess by 1:15 p.m.

Attachments:
"Constitutional Amendment – Apportionment" (SD 19-19)
"Approval to Fill a Vacancy on the Curriculum Subcommittee" (SD 19-20)
"Approval of Filing in of a Vacancy in the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee" (SD 19-21)
"Procedures of Promotion to Include Clinical Faculty" (SD 19-22)
"Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee" (SD 19-23)
"Senate Document 19-24 and Procedures for Senate Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee" (SD 19-24)
"Question Time – re: Campus Master Plan and Campus Strategic Plan" (SR No. 19-35)
"Question Time – re: International Student Organization Funding" (SR No. 19-36)
"Question Time – re: Free Menstrual Products" (SR No. 19-37)
"Question Time – re: 2020 NSO Plans" (SR No. 19-38)
"Question Time – re: Summer Pay Policy" (SR No. 19-39)
"Department of Psychology Certificate in Death Education" (SR No. 19-32)
"School of Music Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Music Performance" (SR No. 19-33)
"Department of Human Services Concentrations in Human Services" (SR No. 19-34)
"Report on Designated Items" (SR No. 19-40)

Senate Document SD 19-19

To: Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate
From: PFW Senate Executive Committee
Re: Constitutional Amendment--Apportionment
Date: 29 January 2020

WHEREAS, all major units at Purdue University Fort Wayne should be afforded representation in the Senate, and;

WHEREAS, the authors of the Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue University Fort Wayne never countenanced a situation where a major unit would possess fewer than six Voting Faculty members, and;

WHEREAS, a major unit has, in fact, now dropped below that threshold;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate vote to amend the language of Section VII.A.4 of the Constitution to read as the following.

4. ***Apportionment***. Senate membership shall be apportioned among the major units according to the number of Voting Faculty comprising those units. One member shall be allocated to each unit for every six Voting Faculty in that unit**; all major units must be allotted at least one Senator**. The representative of the continuing lecturers does not count toward a major unit's apportionment.

Approved	**Opposed**	**Abstention**	**Absent**	**Non-Voting**
Ann Marshall				Craig Ortsey
Assem Nasr				
Jeffrey Nowak				
Mark Ridgeway				
James Toole				
Nashwan Younis				

Senate Document SD 19-20

MEMORANDUM

TO: James Toole, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Vincent Maloney, Chair, Curriculum Review Subcommittee

DATE: 1/28/20

SUBJ: Approval to fill a vacancy on the Curriculum Subcommittee

---

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate (5.1.5.1) provide that, "Senate subcommittees shall have the power to fill subcommittee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting"; and

WHEREAS, There is a vacancy on the Curriculum Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, The Curriculum Subcommittee voted on 1/22/20 to appoint Shannon Johnson to fill the available vacancy for the 2019–2020 academic year;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Curriculum Subcommittee requests that the Senate approve this appointment.

Approved	**Opposed**	**Abstention**	**Absent**	**Non-Voting**
Clare Cholewa				
Seth Green				
Teresa Hogg				
Carol Lawton				
Sarah LeBlanc				
Haowen Luo				
Vincent Maloney				
				Terri Swim
Jin Soung Yoo				

Senate Document SD 19-21

MEMORANDUM

TO:	James Toole, Chair
	Executive Committee
FROM:	Hui Di, Chair
	Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
DATE:	February 6, 2020
SUBJECT:	Approval of filling in of a vacancy in the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.4.1.) that "Senate committees shall have the power to fill committee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting and to the guidelines established in sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.4."; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.2.) that "No one may serve on more than four Senate committees and/or subcommittees in a given academic year"; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.4.) that "Senators must comprise at least 2/3 of the voting membership of any committee";

WHEREAS, There are two vacancies on the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee; and

WHEREAS, Mark Jordan (Biology) and Michelle Parker (Polytech) are Senators and are not already serving on more than three Senate committees and/or subcommittees in the current academic year;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee requests that the Senate approve this appointment.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Hui Di, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 20, 2020

SUBJ: Procedures of promotion to include Clinical faculty

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate approved procedures for promotion and tenure (SD 14-36); and

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate subsequently approved guidelines for promotion of Clinical faculty (SD 18-15);

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate has not formally approved separate procedures for Clinical faculty;

WHEREAS, the current expectation is that Clinical will follow the procedures set forth in SD 14-36;

WHEREAS, SD 14-36 does not allow for Clinical faculty to vote in the promotion of Clinical faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt the following revisions to SD 14-36 to allow Clinical faculty to vote in the promotion of Clinical faculty;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt the following revisions to SD 14-36 to allow all instructional faculty to read and provide feedback on promotion and/or tenure cases;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt the following revisions to SD 14-36 to change IPFW to PFW or Purdue Fort Wayne.

Approved	**Opposed**	**Abstention**	**Absent**	**Non-Voting**
Dong Chen				Marcia Dixson
Karol Dehr				
Hui Di				
Mark Jordan				
Andres Montenegro				
Michelle Parker				

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE AND THIRD YEAR REVIEW

Purdue Fort Wayne and its autonomous academic units shall establish, within the timeframes and by means of guiding principles and criteria established in other documents, procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure according to the following procedures. Autonomous academic units shall consist of those units subject to the powers of the Faculty detailed in Section VI of the Constitution of the Faculty; other units may, at their option, adhere to these guidelines and procedures.

The procedures for evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure ensure fair and consistent treatment of candidates. The procedures include multiple levels of review with clear expectations for each level. When considered in its entirety, the procedures create a coherent whole that includes a system of checks and balances. While there are variations between academic units, all procedures are based on these principles. If a department/program (department) or college/school/division (college) cannot comply with specific procedures in this document, they are expected to explain why they cannot and utilize a procedure that conforms as closely as possible to the procedures in this document. The explanation and amended procedure shall be included in a separate document with recommendations regarding cases for promotion and tenure.

The procedures and guiding principles for evaluating faculty for promotion and/or tenure are discussed in separate documents (see SD 14-35 & SD 18-15 for guiding principles), but the two are interrelated. The procedures for evaluating faculty members are the method for implementing the guiding principles.

Amendments to this document shall trigger reviews of college and department procedure documents. It shall be the responsibility of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, in concert with the Senate Secretary, to notify colleges and departments of any amendments to this document and the need to review their procedure documents.

The appointment letter of a faculty member to more than one academic unit shall identify that department whose tenure/promotion process shall apply to the appointee.

1. Document Review and Approval
   - 1.1. Department documents
     - 1.1.1. Departments must include procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure in documents.
     - 1.1.2. Department procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in college and Senate documents.
     - 1.1.3. Department criteria must align with college guiding principles.
     - 1.1.4. Department procedures must be submitted to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for feedback and then reviewed and approved at the college level. The feedback from the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be forwarded to the college.
     - 1.1.5. Department criteria must include:

1.1.5.1. Criteria for quality of performance (e.g. competence, excellence) in all relevant areas (e.g. teaching, service, research/creative endeavor) for all levels (e.g. associate professor, full professor, librarian), except criteria for excellence in service to associate professor.

1.1.5.2. Rationale of the department for the criteria.

1.1.6. Department criteria must be reviewed and approved at the college level. The review by the college must focus on:

1.1.6.1. The completeness of the department criteria document.

1.1.6.2. The explanation of how the department criteria align with the guiding principles of the college. This explanation should reference credible evidence as to the appropriateness of the criteria for the discipline.

1.1.7. If a college rejects the criteria of a department, a thorough explanation of the rejection must be sent to the department.

1.1.8. If there is a disagreement between a department and college about criteria, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee will arbitrate the disagreement.

1.1.9. Upon passage of this document by the Senate, departments have one academic year to draft, approve, and seek review of department promotion and tenure documents.

1.2. College documents

1.2.1. Colleges must include procedures and guiding principles in documents. Colleges may choose to elect the campus guiding principles as the guiding principles of the college.

1.2.2. College procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in senate documents.

1.2.3. College procedures and guiding principles must be reviewed and approved at the campus level first by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and then by the Senate.

2. Decision Levels: Nominations for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels. The quality of the evidence presented in the case is best evaluated at the department level. Candidates may respond in writing to recommendations at all levels. Written responses must be submitted within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and proceed with the case.

2.1. The department committee

2.1.1. Establishing the department committee: The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the college. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

2.1.2. Composition of the department committee:

2.1.2.1. The majority of the departmental committee shall be persons possessing the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires.

2.1.2.2. If, by established departmental criteria, fewer than three persons are eligible to serve on the department committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the college the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department committee. From this list, the chief academic officer of the college shall

appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to between three and five.

2.1.2.3. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

2.1.2.4. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.

2.1.3. Primary Tasks: The department committee shall review the evidence presented in the case, compare the case to department criteria, and make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

2.1.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the department committee shall be based on the case and department criteria and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including commenting on the candidate's professional standing.

2.1.5. Other:

2.1.5.1. Any full-time lecturer, clinical, tenure track or tenured faculty member at PFW shall have the opportunity to read and provide feedback on cases in their home department until the department committee has made a recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion. Any document that is provided does not become part of the case and does not move forward with the case.

2.2. The chief academic officer of the department

2.2.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the department shall:

2.2.1.1. Review the case and compare the case to department criteria.

2.2.1.2. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.

2.2.1.3. Review the recommendation of the lower level.

2.2.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

2.2.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the department shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the case in light of department criteria, the process to this point, and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decision of the lower level.

2.3. The college committee

2.3.1. Establishing the college committee: The college committee composition and functions shall be established by the college faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the college, and approved by the Senate. This procedure shall be periodically published, simultaneously with the Bylaws of the Senate, as and when the Bylaws of the Senate are distributed.

2.3.2. Composition of the college committee

2.3.2.1. There is no requirement that the majority of the college committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.

2.3.2.2. Members of the college committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the college committee.

2.3.2.3. Members of the college committee may serve at the department level, but not at the campus level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the college committee.

2.3.2.4. Members of the college committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be staggered and may not be longer than three years.

2.3.2.5. Members of the college committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

2.3.2.6. The chief academic officer of the college may not serve on the college committee or participate in the meetings.

2.3.3. Primary Tasks: The college committee shall:

2.3.3.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.

2.3.3.2. Review the recommendation of the lower levels.

2.3.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.

2.3.3.2.2. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.

2.3.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

2.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the college committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.

2.4. The chief academic officer of the college

2.4.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the college shall:

2.4.1.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.

2.4.1.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels. This review:

2.4.1.2.1. Shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.

2.4.1.2.2. May include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a decision from a lower level is judged to be contrary to the evidence.

2.4.1.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

2.4.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the college shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.

2.5. The Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee (a.k.a. the campus committee)

2.5.1. Establishing the campus committee

2.5.1.1. Members of this committee shall be selected to staggered, three-year terms, by the Chief Administrative Officer of PFW and the two Speakers of the Faculty.

2.5.1.2. The committee members will be selected from a panel of nominees composed of at least two representatives from the faculty of each college elected according to procedures adopted by the college faculty and incorporated into the documents which define the protocols of faculty governance within the college and a person with prior service on a college committee. The vote totals from the elections shall be included with the panel of nominees.

2.5.2. Composition of the campus committee

2.5.2.1. The campus committee shall consist of seven (7) members.

2.5.2.2. A minimum of five (5) academic units must be represented on the campus committee and no more than three (3) members of the campus committee may be from one academic unit.

2.5.2.3. A majority of the members of the campus committee must be at the rank of professor, or librarian.

2.5.2.4. Members of the campus committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the campus committee.

2.5.2.5. Members of the campus committee may serve at the department level, but not at the college level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the campus committee.

2.5.2.6. Members of the campus committee may not serve consecutive terms.

2.5.2.7. Members of the campus committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

2.5.2.8. The chief academic officer of PFW may not serve on the campus committee or participate in the meetings.

2.5.3. Primary Tasks: The campus committee shall:

2.5.3.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.

2.5.3.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels.

2.5.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.

2.5.3.2.2. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.

2.5.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

2.5.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the campus committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.

2.6. The chief academic officer of PFW

2.6.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of PFW shall:

2.6.1.1. Recognize the credibility of the decisions of lower levels.

2.6.1.2. Review split votes and/or inconsistencies in findings and recommendations at, and between, lower levels. When there is a split vote and/or inconsistency, the chief academic officer of PFW will focus the review on that part of the case dealing with the split vote and/or inconsistency.

2.6.1.3. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures.
2.6.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

2.6.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of PFW shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of recommendations from lower levels, the process to this point, and must clearly explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of the lower level(s).

2.7. The chief administrative officer of PFW shall forward recommendations to the President of Indiana University or to the President of Purdue University.

3. Case Process: Nominations for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels.

3.1. The candidate must identify the criteria document that should be used to judge the case. The department criteria document used must have been in effect at some point during the six years preceding the submission of the case.

3.2. All cases for promotion and/or tenure shall pass sequentially through the decision levels above.

3.3. No information, other than updates to items in the case, can be added to the case after the vote and recommendation from the department level. The intent is that each level will be reviewing the same case. Each decision level is responsible for determining if items submitted after a case has cleared the department committee should be included in the case or considered to be new evidence that should be excluded.

3.4. Each decision level forwards only a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments or supplemental information.

3.5. The administrator or committee chair at each level shall inform the candidate in writing of the vote tally or recommendation on the nomination, with a clear and complete statement of the reasons therefor, at the time the case is sent forward to the next level. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may submit a written response to the statement to the administrator or the committee chair within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and must proceed with the case. At the same time that the case is sent forward to the next level, the administrator or committee chair shall also send a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons, and the candidate's response, if any, to administrators and committee chairs at the lower level(s). Committee chairs shall distribute copies to committee members.

3.6. The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential, and only the chair may communicate a committee's decision to the candidate and to the next level. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No abstentions or proxies are allowed. Committee members must be present during deliberations in order to vote.

4. Individual Participation

4.1. Only tenured faculty may serve as voting members of promotion and tenure committees to Associate Professor and Professor

4.2. Clinical Associate Professors and Clincial Professors may serve as voting members for Clinical promotion cases.

4.3. No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for promotion or tenure is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own promotion or tenure nomination.

4.4. The department level excepted, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before college committees.

4.5. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (college or campus).

4.6. Voting members of committees and chief academic officers shall recuse themselves from considering cases of candidates with whom they share significant credit for research or creative endeavor or other work which is a major part of the candidate's case or if they have other conflicts of interest. The committee will decide if committee members who collaborate with the candidate need to recuse themselves. The next highest administrator will decide if a chief academic officer who collaborated with the candidate needs to recuse her/himself.

4.7. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.

4.8. Chief academic officers who have written a letter of recommendation as part of 2.2.2. will recuse themselves from discussion or vote on that candidate's case at a higher level.

REVIEW OF PROGRESS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY TO TENURE AND PROMOTION

It is in the best interest of PFW to see its faculty succeed. One way to judge success for probationary faculty is to evaluate progress toward tenure and promotion at the midway point. The diversity of colleges and departments at PFW makes it difficult to develop a single procedure for reviewing progress of probationary faculty to tenure and promotion.

5. Development of Review Procedure: Departments must develop a procedure for reviewing progress of probationary faculty toward tenure and/or promotion that adheres to the following principles.

5.1. The procedure must make use of annual reviews (discussing performance in the previous year) and annual reappointments (discussing progress toward promotion and tenure).

5.2. Departments/programs must have a thorough formative review process that provides specific details about where improvement is needed and must be based on department criteria. The formative review must occur half way through the third year.

5.3. The formative review must be voted on by the department promotion and tenure committee.

5.4. The chief academic officer of the department must comment on the case and the review from the committee.

5.5. The probationary faculty member must have opportunities to respond during the review.

5.6. If, at any point during the probationary period, a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending the reappointment of a probationary faculty, the input and vote of the promotion and tenure committee at the same level must be sought.

Department procedures for reviewing progress shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the college. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be consulted about any newly established review procedures and any changes to a review procedure. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

6. Senate Procedure to be used in the absence of a department or college procedure:

6.1. The required review of the progress of probationary faculty to tenure and/or promotion must make use of annual reviews (discussing performance in the previous year) and annual reappointments (discussing progress toward promotion and tenure).

6.2. This review must be formative and be based on department criteria.

6.3. This review must occur halfway through the third year.

6.4. This review must move forward with the reappointment documentation for that year.

6.5. This review must occur at the first two levels (department promotion and tenure committee and chief academic officer of the department referred to in 2.1 and 2.2 above) and result in a written recommendation from both levels.

6.6. This review must be voted on by the department promotion and tenure committee.

6.7. The chief academic officer of the department must comment on the case and the review from the committee.

6.8. The probationary faculty member must have opportunities to respond during the reviews.

6.9. If, at any point during the probationary period, a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending the reappointment of a probationary faculty, the input and vote of the promotion and tenure committee at the same level must be sought.

Senate Document SD 19-23

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Steven Hanke, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee

DATE: 2/20/2020

SUBJ: Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee

---

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue University Fort Wayne (PFW) grants the Voting Faculty the power "to make recommendations concerning … changes in academic organization"; and

WHEREAS, The Senate has lacked clear structures and policies to govern the modification or elimination of academic programs; and

WHEREAS, Senate Document SD 15-26 was written primarily to address circumstances of financial crisis or exigency and has not been easily adaptable to meet other circumstances; and

WHEREAS, Senate Document 17-3 proposed the creation of the Academic Organization Subcommittee and that committee has never been implemented and the timeline for establishing its procedures has lapsed.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the text of Section 5.3.3.2.3.4.2.2. of the By-Laws of the Senate for the responsibilities of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee be amended to read: "Upon a request from the Senate, an academic unit, or PFW's Chief Academic Officer, examine and report on existing academic programs and new or proposed courses. Such examinations shall be requested only when **one of the following circumstances occur. First,** significant questions of proper sponsorship or academic quality arise**. Second, there are administrative or faculty led initiatives to reorganize, merge, reduce or eliminate academic programs or units. Third, there is** a PFW-wide effort to ensure the periodic review of academic programs by a body functioning above the department level. **Procedures for carrying out these responsibilities can be found in Senate Document SD 20-XB**. Upon the completion of this examination, the Subcommittee shall"

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the text of Section 5.3.3.2.3.5.2.2.2. of the By-Laws of the Senate for the responsibilities of the Graduate Subcommittee be amended to read: "Upon a request from the Senate, an academic unit, a graduate school, or PFW's Chief Academic Officer, examine and report on **existing academic programs or courses.** Such examinations shall be requested only when **one of the following circumstances occur. First,** significant questions of proper sponsorship or academic quality arise. **Second, there are administrative or faculty led initiatives to reorganize, merge, reduce or eliminate academic programs or units that impact graduate-level programs. Third, there is a PFW-wide effort to ensure the periodic review of academic programs by a body functioning above the department level. Procedures for carrying out these responsibilities can be found in Senate Document SD 20-XB**. Upon the completion of this examination, the Subcommittee shall"

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That EPC shall prepare a Senate Document outlining the procedures to be followed by the Subcommittees; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the bylaws modifying the responsibility of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee and the Graduate Subcommittee shall become effective as soon as the procedures are approved by the Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the bylaws modifying the responsibility of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee and the Graduate Subcommittee shall be automatically updated to include the correct Senate Document number when the Subcommittees' procedures are approved by the Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That Senate Documents 17-3 and 15-26 shall be rescinded when the revised bylaws become effective, and references to SD 15-26 in the Bylaws shall be removed.

Approved	**Opposed**	**Abstention**	**Absent**	**Non-Voting**
Stacy Betz				Cheryl Hine
Zhuming Bi				Teri Swim
Steven Hanke				
Donna Holland				
Shannon Johnson				
Kate White				

Senate Document 19-24

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Steven A. Hanke, Chair of the Education Policy Subcommittee

DATE: 2/20/2020

SUBJ: Senate Document 19-25 and Procedures for Senate Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee

---

WHEREAS, Senate Document 19-24 replaces Senate Document 17-03 and Senate Document 15-26; and

WHEREAS, The procedures outlined in Senate Document 15-26 established "guidelines to be followed in making decisions about financial shortages, mergers of academic units, reassignments of faculty to new academic units, or the elimination of academic programs within academic units" do not adequately reflect IPFW's current situation; and

WHEREAS, Senate Document 19-24 noted that SD 15-26 "was written primarily to address circumstances of financial crisis or exigency and has not been easily adaptable to meet other circumstances"; and

WHEREAS, Senate Document 19-24 modified the charge of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, Bylaw 5.3.3.2.3.4.2 states that "The Curriculum Review Subcommittee shall under 5.3.3.2.3.4.2.2 "examine and report on existing academic programs…when one of the following circumstances occur…there are administrative or faculty led initiatives to reorganize, merge, reduce or eliminate academic programs or units."

WHEREAS, Bylaw 5.3.3.2.3.5.2. states that "The Graduate Subcommittee", under 5.3.3.2.3.5.2.2 "examine and report on existing academic programs or courses…when one of the following circumstances occur…there are administrative or faculty led initiatives to reorganize, merge, reduce or eliminate academic programs or units that impact graduate-level programs.";

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following procedures be adopted to replace those outlined in Senate Document 15-26.; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the following procedures delineate the roles and responsibilities for coordinating the work of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee and the Graduate Subcommittee with one or more Academic Units when considering a proposal for Program Reorganization, Merger, Reduction, and/or Elimination.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Stacy Betz				Cheryl Hine
Zhuming Bi				Teri Swim
Steven Hanke				
Donna Holland				
Shannon Johnson				
Kate White				

Guidelines for Program Reorganization, Merger, Reduction, and/or Elimination

I. Faculty Authority

A. The Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue University Fort Wayne (hereafter, PFW) endows the faculty with the powers to make recommendations concerning changes in academic organization (VI.A.2.a).

B. In the exercise of this power, decisions concerning reorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination of programs shall occur as a result of a review process in which the faculty has assumed a prominent role.

C. Reorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination of a program shall proceed according to procedures established by the Fort Wayne Senate (hereafter, Senate) and the faculty of each unit directly affected.

D. The procedures described below shall apply whenever a proposal for reorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination of programs is submitted, regardless of whether the proposal is initiated by faculty, a Chair/Director, a Dean, or Administrator.

II. Affirmative Action

A. These procedures shall be applied in a manner that is consistent with PFW's commitment to affirmative action.

III. Student Completion

A. Any proposal for reorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination that affects students pursuing a degree or certificate, or that requires course work in an affected program, should allow for those students to complete their degree or certificate program within a reasonable timeframe or to transfer to a comparable program without incurring any credit penalty.

IV. Procedures for Proposing a Program Reorganization, Merger, Reduction, and/or Elimination

A. The following procedures deal with the possibility of the reorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination of academic programs and become effective whenever either an academic unit or the administration makes or endorses such a proposal.

B. A faculty member, Chair/Director, Dean or a designee of an administrative officer may initiate a proposal for program reorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination of an academic program. The proposal shall contain the following information: 1) rationale for proposed changes, 2) explanation of the new structure for the impacted program/unit, including a comparison of the current and proposed structures; 3) impacts (both positive and negative) on students, 4) curricular impacts, 5) impacts on full-time and part-time faculty, 6) impacts on the unit (department, college), 7) impacts on other departments or programs (e.g., General Education), and 8) impact on accreditation, as appropriate.

C. The proposal shall be shared with and feedback will be solicited from the majority of full-time faculty members (i.e., tenure track, tenured, Continuing Lecturers, and Clinical faculty) in the unit, the Chair/Director, and Dean. If the proposal cuts across units or colleges, full-time faculty members, the Chair/Director, and Dean of all affected units shall be invited to provide feedback.

D. The proposal should then be revised, as necessary, based upon the feedback provided before submitting the final proposal to the Office of Academic Affairs.

E. The Office of Academic Affairs will review the proposal for completeness and adherence to the proposal criteria (IV.B) and send feedback to the proposal originator. If OAA determines the proposal was not in compliance, all necessary changes must be made before the proposal will be submitted for a 15-day remonstrance period. All full-time faculty members, the Chair/Director, and Dean of all appropriate units will receive the proposal through the remonstrance process.

F. At the expiration of the 15-day remonstrance period, the Senate Curriculum Review Subcommittee and the Senate Graduate Subcommittee, if the proposal impacts graduate programs, will consider the proposal. The Subcommittees will deliberate regarding the viability of the proposal (see IV.B), and whether lower levels followed basic standards of fairness and shared governance. The Subcommittees then will conduct a vote to accept, reject, or remand the proposal back to the unit. Each Subcommittee shall notify the unit in writing of its decision. Should a committee decide to deny or remand the request back to the unit, the committee shall provide its written reasons in detail. The unit may either revise the existing proposal, create a new proposal, or withdraw the request altogether. All new proposals must go through the process again, beginning with IV.A.

G. Should the Senate Curriculum Review Subcommittee or the Senate Graduate Subcommittee vote to endorse the proposal, the recommendation will be sent to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration and then be handled by the normal Senate processes. If there is a split vote for a program reviewed by both Subcommittees, the subcommittee approving the proposal will send it to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration. The Senate Executive Committee should contact the chair of the other subcommittee reviewing the proposal for a status update.

H. Should the Senate vote to endorse the proposal, the recommendation will go to the Office of Academic Affairs to be routed for approval by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA) and the Chancellor. Should the VCAA or Chancellor deny the request or remand it back to the unit, a written decision should provide reasons in detail. The unit may either revise the existing proposal, create a new proposal, or withdraw the request altogether. All new proposals must go through the process again, beginning with IV.A.

Senate Reference No. 19-35

Question Time

Could we receive an explanation of how the Campus Master Plan and the Campus Strategic Plan interface with each other? (I'm sorry I was unable to attend the open forums.) Below I list of series of questions that describe the kinds of information I'd like to have in the explanation:

1. Were there any discussions of potential difficulties in achieving the goals set out with one or the other given that it seems they were developed in separate and only tangentially related processes? For example, if it is the case that the website below is current reporting on the campus master plan (it is what comes up when I search "campus master plan" on pfw.edu), "high quality instructional spaces" and "provide for the educational needs of the community" are listed. How can those be decided without guidance by the strategic plan? https://www.pfw.edu/offices/physical/project-management/campus-master-plan.html
2. If this website is out-of-date, is there a current, public-facing website for the campus master plan like the one we have for the strategic plan? Does it also transparently explain the processes that were used to reach decisions as is the case with the strategic plan?
3. What outside entities were consulted during the development process of the Campus Master Plan? For example, the website below indicates that a previous master plan was developed by Johnson, Johnson and Roy. Is there a similar organization that has developed this master plan? How were decisions reached in choosing involved outside parties?
4. How has this process been coordinated with Purdue West Lafayette, the city, the county, the state and other related partners? Are they represented or do they have involvement with the process and/or its conclusions?
5. What has faculty input been for the ways the Campus Master Plan might facilitate or hinder decisions the faculty make about curriculum? Will there be opportunity in the future for changing and refining the campus master plan if it turns out faculty decisions about the curriculum are affected (positively or negatively) by plan activities?
6. Does the administration consider it would be beneficial for the faculty Senate to provide feedback on and/or endorsement of the Campus Master Plan (as with the strategic plan)? If so, why, and what would that process look like? If not, why not?

I am new to the Senate, so I apologize is these issues have been discussed in the past. If I should refer to Senate or other documents, I would welcome those references so that I can understand the process that has been followed as well as the conclusions that have been reached.

S. Buttes

Senate Reference No. 19-36

Question Time

1 I am aware that some Universities in the US provide extra funding, in addition to regular funding, to international student organizations when they hold events to celebrate their major ethnic holidays. Will Student Affairs consider follow suit by doing the same to international student organizations on campus?

2 In light of the above question, what are Student Affairs' plans to better support international student organizations?

L. Lin

Senate Reference No. 19-37

Question Time

Purdue University recently announced that it would be supplying free menstrual products in public restrooms at the West Lafayette campus. Are there any discussions about extending this initiative to Purdue FW? If so, at what stage are those discussions?

J. Badia

Senate Reference No. 19-38

Question Time

Could we please have someone with decision-making power from the NSO planning committee come to senate and explain the status of current plans for NSO 2020? After the problematic changes that were done for NSO 2019, there was an attempt by concerned faculty to offer feedback on the NSO structure with the hope that those changes would be listened to. So far, it does not appear that any of that input is being taken seriously or listened to in any way. For example, there were concerns expressed with the proposed new changes for the schedule of dates for NSO 2020, and while we were asked for feedback and told that those dates were still in draft form, ultimately, those dates became the actual schedule. And while we are being told that the "day of" schedule for the NSO visits has not been finalized, once again, many of us are concerned that the schedules will be finalized without taking concerns into account. In particular, there has been no reasonable explanation offered for why registration has been taken away from departments. (Why it is better for the student to be registered in a giant room in groups rather than in a one-on-one setting with their departmental advisor?) There is also no explanation offered for why “advising” and “registration” have been separated into two different activities and in the case of overnight visits, activities on two different days. Any clarity on this matter, before the 2020 NSO schedule is finalized would be greatly appreciated.

A. Livschiz

Senate Reference No. 19-39

Question Time

New summer pay policy unveiled for Summer 2020 creates a faculty-specific minimum enrollment and requires that for a class to not be cancelled, it has to make 200% of the faculty member's salary. There are (at least) two general concerns:

--why is the university willing to turn down an opportunity to generate thousands of dollars in revenue (for the hypothetical cases where the class would make between 125-199%, that's still potentially thousands of dollars of revenue). For f2f classes, these are buildings that are already being air-conditioned and provided with lights, whether or not classes are taught there. For online classes, IT support would continue to be paid over the summer and fees to Blackboard would continue to be paid. Can you explain the logic of this?

--It's clear that the goal of the policy is to discourage the higher-paid (tenured or tenure-track) faculty teaching summer classes, while having lower paid contingent faculty offer them instead. Has any thought been given to the impact that this policy is going to have on students? So much has been made about cutting back on course releases and making sure that full time faculty teach more, so we as an institution do not rely on LTLs. But we want LTLs to teach in the summer? What about students who need to take summer classes? Why don't they deserve the opportunity to take classes from full time faculty? And since not all classes can be covered by LTLs, this policy will either result in a reduction of the diversity of courses being offered OR proliferation of exceptions being made. (The latter would lead to greater faculty wage inequity.) Focusing on student impact, there are categories of students who rely on summer classes. For example, 21st century scholars (i.e. a subset of first gen students) need to complete 30 credits each academic year. So if they can only handle 12 credits a semester, they will need summer classes. Reduction of options for summer classes unfairly disadvantages this category of students, and possibly others as well.

Can we have an explanation of why the university is moving forward with a policy that will have such detrimental consequences for students?

A. Livschiz

Senate Reference No. 19-40

To: The Senate

From: The Executive Committee
Fort Wayne Senate

Date: March 4, 2020

Subj: Report on Designated Items

Below is an item that Executive Committee has charged another committee with acting upon. The Committee is distributing this for information only.

- EPC—Consideration of the implications of affirming the Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities developed at Purdue University West Lafayette