

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Thirty-Seventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
January 8, 2017
12:00 P.M., KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 11
3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – A. Schwab
 - b. Indiana University – A. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Malanson
6. Special business of the day
 - a. Athletics
7. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-13) – L. Wright-Bower
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-14) – L. Wright-Bower
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-15) – L. Wright-Bower
 - d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-16) – L. Wright-Bower
 - e. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 17-17) – Z. Nazarov
8. Question Time
9. New business
10. Committee reports “for information only”
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: J. Malanson
Parliamentarian: W. Sirk
Sergeant-at-arms: G. Steffen
Secretary: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“Change to the Academic Calendar Formula as defined in SD 11-18, SD 16-42 and SD 16-45 and Change to the 2018-2019 academic calendar to reflect the change in the academic calendar formula if adopted” (SD 17-13)

“Change to the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar as defined in SD 16-43 to reflect the calendar formula revision if approved by the Senate” (SD 17-14)

“Amendment of the Academic Regulations” (SD 17-15)

“Academic Calendar for 2020-2021” (SD 17-16)

“Continuing Lecturers Policy” (SD 17-17)

Senate Members Present:

A. Argast, A. Bales, A. Benito, P. Bingi, B. Boatright, A. Boehm, B. Buldt, M. Cain, S. Carr, D. Chen, K. Dehr, Y. Deng, S. Ding, A. Downs, C. Drummond, R. Elsenbaumer, B. Fife, M. Gruys, G. Hickey, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, B. Kim, S. King, L. Kuznar, S. LaVere, J. Leatherman, E. Link, J. Marshall, L. McAllister, Z. Nazarov, E. Norman, K. Pollock, M., Qasim, B. Redman, P. Reese, N. Reimer, S. Rumsey, B. Salmon, G. Schmidt, A. Schwab, S. Stevenson, R. Sutter, A. Ushenko, R. Vandell, L. Vartanian, G. Wang, D. Weese, M. Wolf, L. Wright-Bower, N. Younis, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

S. Bischoff, J. Burg, D. Cochran, D. Holland, M. Jordan, A. Kreager, H. Luo, A. Macklin, D. Miller, P. Nachappa, J. Niser, J. Nowak, A. Obergfell, J. O’Connell, G. Petruska, B. Valliere, G. Wang

Guests Present:

R. Barrett, S. Betz, J. Clegg, M. Dixon, A. Fincannon, C. Gurgur, K. Hartley Hutton, C. Hine, B. Kingsbury, D. Maloney

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Malanson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of December 11: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:
 K. Pollock moved to accept the agenda.
 Agenda approved by voice vote.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University:

A. Schwab: While I appreciate Andy taking the head report over the last semester, I wanted to welcome you all back to the final semester of IPFW. I don’t know if it seemed this way to all of you, but it seemed like a very short break to me.

Over the break, the work on the transition, the efforts at recruitment and retention, and rebranding, continue. As you are likely aware, the logo for Purdue Fort Wayne was unveiled late last week. I want to alert you of one activity associated with the transition, which is meant to help you and the members of your departments and colleges as we transition out of the IU library system: an offer to buy books. The staff at Helmke Library is in a position to add books to its shelves without the need for a special grant application. I found this hard to believe, so last week I sent a request to the library for two books I use in my classes every semester. It is a complicated process. I went to them and said “here are two books I use in my class every semester and I think we should have them.” I was told they are bring ordered.

I continue to be concerned about the addition of NewU to the Purdue brand. The plans for bridging, or not, the curriculum of NewU to the rest of the Purdue system and its plans to address the lack of meaningful faculty governance within NewU remain vague. These are things about which I am worried. And yet, most significant for regional campuses, the assurances that NewU will not take a bite out of our enrollments are limited to the current targets of NewU’s products. These are targets that could change in the future, and the difficulties encountered by our students trying to take advantage of NewU’s offerings. Their difficulties may be attenuated in the future. Most of all though, I worry that the acquisition of NewU is a bellwether for the direction of administrative governance in the Purdue system in the future. I tell you all this not because I know there is something you can do about it, but I figured if I am worried about it then I tell you so you can worry about it as well. Finally, I hope your semester goes better than you expect, and that this winter of our frozen tundra will begin a glorious spring, where we will continue efforts to educate our students.

b. Indiana University:

A. Downs: I want to thank Abe for taking all of the heavy lifting this spring and coming up with all of the important comments. I do want to welcome everyone back. I hope that your winter recess was everything you hoped it could be and more. I also want to wish you good luck on the semester. Finally, I want to thank folks from Athletics for attending today’s discussion. I look forward to a good discussion about what it is we hope to get from Athletics.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Malanson: Welcome to our last six months as IPFW and what will be happening and changing on campus this semester, especially after HLC formally approves the realignment and our use of the Purdue University Fort Wayne name. Information has already started to come out regarding the transformation projects you received over winter break about all faculty and staff having new professional portraits taken. And you should expect to receive updates and information from a variety of sources in the coming

months. At any point, if you have questions about information that has been shared, or about information that has not yet been shared, please do not hesitate to reach out to Andy, Abe, and I. All of whom are serving office hours this semester to help improve communication between faculty and the faculty leaders. I sent an email out about that last week. Also, please don't hesitate to reach out to the email address transformation@ipfw.edu or to the other relevant people. It is going to be very easy for some of us to miss information that has been shared this semester given the flow that is likely to start any day now. So, if you have questions, if you worry you missed something, check the transformation website or reach out.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Athletics

A. Downs moved to postpone the discussion until after committee reports requiring action.

Motion to postpone passed on a voice vote.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-13) – L. Wright-Bower

L. Wright-Bower moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-13 (Change to the Academic Calendar Formula as defined in SD 11-18, SD 16-42 and SD 16-45 and Change to the 2018-2019 academic calendar to reflect the change in the academic calendar formula if adopted).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-14) – L. Wright-Bower

L. Wright-Bower moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-14 (Change to the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar as defined in SD 16-43 to reflect the calendar formula revision if approved by the Senate).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-15) – L. Wright-Bower

L. Wright-Bower moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-15 (Amendment of the Academic Regulations).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-16) – L. Wright-Bower

L. Wright-Bower moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-16 (Academic Calendar for 2020-2021).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

- e. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 17-17) – Z. Nazarov

Z. Nazarov moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-17 (Continuing Lecturers Policy).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

6. Special business of the day:

- a. Athletics

J. Malanson: Today's discussion on athletics will focus on two questions: (1) What are IPFW's goals for participating in NCAA Division I Athletics? (2) How should IPFW measure its success in achieving these goals?

The focus of today's discussion is not whether we should have Division I Athletics. The Athletics Working Group recommended that we maintain Division I status, and every indication from the administration has been that it is their intention for IPFW to remain in Division I. So, if IPFW is going to have a Division I program then what should the university's goals for that program be? What benefits should IPFW be seeing from its participation? How can we derive the greatest benefit from the investment that is being made?

The focus of today's discussion is also not our current spending on Division I Athletics. Given IPFW's financial situation over the past few years, and the ongoing financial uncertainty we face as a result of enrollment declines and realignment, our Athletics spending remains an issue of critical concern. With that being said, what we hope to achieve through participating in Division I Athletics, and what we spend by participating in Division I Athletics, are two distinct questions. The latter of which is not our purpose today.

Finally, I believe it is important for all of us to remember that in the AAUP's principles of shared governance and in our own statements on shared governance documents that Athletics is not an area where faculty have exclusive, or even primary, authority or expertise. Faculty rightly have input and there are shared governance structures and powers in place to ensure that. The administration should care about the faculty's concerns and goals in determining IPFW's budgetary priorities and the roll that Athletics will play on this campus. But, it is ultimately the administration's decision.

The purpose of today's discussion is to both help URPC and SAC in the process of making some recommendations regarding measures of success, as called for in Senate Document 17-2. And to provide guidance to the administration in laying out the goals of ongoing participation in Division I Athletics, and the measures that we will use to access progress toward accomplishing those goals. By assigning this work to URPC and SAC, and by engaging in this discussion the Senate is making clear its expectation that goals and measures for Athletics will be established. Roberts Rules remain in effect for this discussion, so all comments and questions should be directed to me and I will be quick to redirect us if we stray too far afield from these two questions. I also say thank you to Kelly and to Jens for being here to participate in today's discussion.

G. Schmidt: For the measures in terms of goals of success, if they are reaching the goals, what are the responses to that relating to funding? If goals are not being reached, what happens after that? I guess that might come out of some of those metrics. What do the metrics lead to?

J. Malanson: That has to be part of the ongoing conversation. I mean I don't want to say to the administration to do x, y, and z. It has to be part of the ongoing conversation. But, certainly what we do with the measures matters.

M. Cain: So, looking at a survey that COAS students did, and looking at the mismatch between what the student-athletes' perceptions of engagement are with the students' engagement, I would think that that would be a good starting point to talk about what the goals should be. I mean I have a kind of personal sense that among my students, and even with myself, there is not a high level of interest in the Athletic program in terms of going to support the teams and so forth. So, given that the students seem to be less engaged with the program as a whole than the athletes are themselves shouldn't that be a goal to get people interested. I mean as I say that I am little skeptical about how successful a goal that might be given how busy our students are. I mean just knowing from other kinds of activities that I invite them to come to. Really good activities. We have a visiting writers program in our department and so forth. It is like pulling teeth. We have to go individually to students one by one and say "hey, this would be a good thing for you to go to." And even then it is really difficult. So, anyway, that is just a thought to throw out right now.

J. Malanson: One of the Working Group's recommendations was figuring out ways of increasing student-faculty-staff-community engagement with that type of thing.

B. Redman: Well, I was on the Working Group so that was kind of where I was going to go to. At the end of our meetings we came to the idea that Athletics, Division I or whatever division, that making sure that Athletics played a part in the development of campus ethos and campus community life. We also repeatedly talked about if donors express interest in us having Division I Athletics then we should test whether donors are really regularly committed to writing checks as well. How much does it really result in funds being raised?

L. Vartanian: Although, obviously every institution is unique in many ways, I guess I would ask the question, how do other institutions approach these two questions? Peer comparisons, sometimes I think are very useful, and other times I think are ridiculous. But, this is a place where discussion of peer institutions' priorities and how they approach these two questions might be useful. I don't know how to start to answer two questions that presume people have the participation no matter what because that seems to me somewhat of a preposterous premise. Nevertheless, that is the one that has been set up. So, has there been any attempt by any groups to look at how other institutions like, or not like, us have approached these two questions.

J. Malanson: Bev, did the Working Group look at that at all?

B. Redman: We didn't really do peer comparisons. But, we looked at the records of attendance, and we determined that it is going to be important to get bodies in the seats and it is kind of the same situation I go through with theatre all the time. How do I build an audience? How do I keep the audience that I have? So, what are we doing in regard to audience building? Do we need to develop some additional practices?

A. Ushenko: Well, this has an elliptical relevance to point one, I think. What is striking to me in these discussions, for example when the writing program was mentioned, I don't think anyone is thinking that if we can't get students there then maybe there is no value to the writing program. Or, are alumni and donors giving money? And if they are not then maybe the writers' program isn't okay to go. I guess what I am getting at is that everybody is talking like athletics has no value except in getting money and high profile good things for IPFW. Is this what everybody feels? That if Athletics, unlike the writing program or something, isn't bringing money to all of us, isn't as valuable? Is that the assumption?

J. Malanson: Actually, that is the whole point of having the conversation. So, we can start having a conversation about the ways in which Athletics is valuable to the campus. I mean let's start to have some ideas about what it is we are expecting.

D. Kaiser: So, a couple of things. One thing, it is hard for me to believe that other institutions don't consider what Athletics brings monetarily to the university. It does seem to me that that should be one way of measuring success. How much are you getting out of this for what you are spending on it? How does that compare to other institutions? Another thing I suppose is, does this somehow affect our enrollment or retention? I could see that as a potential way of thinking about success. But, I think fundamentally, the question is, what are we getting out of it monetarily?

J. Malanson: I am not saying we shouldn't talk about cost. I am saying we should have a more formed conversation than just what we spend on it in order to see what we get out of it.

P. Reese: I would like to say that some of my best students have been student-athletes. And I think we have to consider what those students have as leaders, as being organized. I have never had a student who is an athlete that wasn't really top notch. And I think that has to do with participation in Athletics. And I think it is too shallow to look at this as "what do we get out of it?"

S. Carr: Two quick things. I wanted to sort of double on what Mary Ann said. I wonder if there is a more nuanced version of question one that would ask "what are IPFW's goals for participating in NCAA Division I Athletics in relation to the institutions other goals?" I think part of the potential pitfall here is that we are talking about athletics, and the benefits or drawbacks of Athletics, in isolation. And I think we really have to consider what those goals are. What they cost in relation to other things. There are a lot of resources dedicated to ensuring that Athletics maintains NCAA eligibility and other areas of the university might not see those kind of things. My second point is that I wonder if the issue of staying Division I or not is a bit of a red herring and that there is another issue which I don't see on there that I think might in fact have more relevance to our discussion about goals and resources. I would actually like to hear a more detailed explanation about what are IPFW's goals for participating in the Summit League as opposed to the other athletic leagues that were mentioned in the report that you distributed. By the way, thank you to whoever approved this report. It was very useful to have this.

J. Malanson: Kelly or Jens, do you want to say anything about the Summit League? It is fine if you don't want to.

K. Hartley Hutton: Well, I didn't see that report that is being referred to.

J. Malanson: This is the Alden Report from 2015.

K. Hartley Hutton: Okay. Great. Our goals in respect to the Summit League are that we want to be competitive. And with that, academically, athletically, and in every way compete in the Summit League to best represent this institution, the city of Fort Wayne, and the region.

S. Carr: So, if I could? I guess my question would be "are those goals less desirable for the institution?" Or, would those goals somehow be diminished if IPFW did move to a different league?

K. Hartley Hutton: No. The other leagues mentioned, in some ways, particularly this geographic region, where we recruit students, has much better name recognition and history. And probably a lot of people in the room would argue that maybe that is a better league competitively. But, I don't really follow that closely. What we know is the name recognition because we see them on television and in the news. And they are a lot like us in many ways academically too.

J. Clegg: Just to put some context on this conversation. As the Athletic director, Kelly has to tip toe carefully around the question you are asking because we are part of that league. And that is where we participate and do everything. If you talk in the broader community, there are other leagues that are, of course, attractive to us and that we would be interested in because of size. That is a topic that she can't talk about as part of her position. I can talk about anything I want, but she can't talk about that. I will tell you that that is an issue that is absolutely being considered. It is always being considered. If the right opportunity came along that was better for us then of course we would consider that. But, that is something that can't be done from her side of things or even from Faculty Senate. The only person that could engage in those conversations is the chancellor. That is his purview. But, is it under consideration? Absolutely. It always is. It is something that is thought about.

K. Hartley Hutton: And my job then is to prepare us, or position us, so that the chancellor can make the best decision for this institution. That is clearly my job, and not to make that decision.

J. Malanson: The mechanics of switching leagues is time intensive and costly. And they have to want us and we have to want them. We can't just say that we want to go wherever.

S. Stevenson: I have been following this question for a number of years. And what I have seen from other universities is the quest for spikes in enrollment based on the success or exposure of the Athletic program. Other universities say "we get some exposure we wanted to gain." They see spikes in admissions. So, is that what are goal is for question number one? Is it to have another avenue to receiving applications?

B. Redman: That was often a question that we grappled with during the discussions in the Working Group. I would say I don't know how others felt. By the end of all of the discussions it was one of my biggest frustrations because there was consistently from our guests this sense that, of course, it is tons and tons of advertising. We get our brand out all the time, again and again. But, if we could find more tangible ways of measuring what is sometimes seen as immeasurable: the degree to which students come here because they have been exposed to Athletics, and they have gotten on the bandwagon. I think that would be useful to try to measure that in the coming years.

L. Wright-Bower: I want to support what Pam Reese had to say. I have been dealing with athletes for over twenty years and they are outstanding students. But, there is a bigger question than the fact that some of our students don't attend Athletic events. Well, they are not coming to music events, and they are not coming to art shows or the theatre. But, the athletic program is the only program that I have run in to where the students are encouraged to go to other kinds of events on campus and they earn some kind of points for that. And Coach Coffman and I are working on taking the basketball team to the opera. And I am so excited about that. We have been trying to schedule a date for quite some time, but things couldn't work out this spring. So, I think everybody ought to go to the opera before they leave campus.

J. Malanson: I just want to quickly connect that comment with your comment about connecting Athletics' goals to our institution's goals. One of the things we talk about a lot on campus is "how do we get students to engage more with the campus events?" So, this is a scenario where actually there is a lot of mutual interest.

R. Sutter: If I could just build on Linda's comment. One of the things that I am quite aware of is that the student athletes are also ambassadors to the community. They are constantly putting on, and basically running, events. Things like soccer for kids. They are constantly ambassadors for our campus, and that is certainly something to be commended. But, I am not exactly clear at this point how to turn those goals into metrics. I am sure that Athletics already has those.

K. Hartley Hutton: Which part?

R. Sutter: The goals and metrics on student success, academic success, and student-athlete participation.

K. Harley Hutton: Yes. We have a lot of ways to measure those things. Obviously, the academic pace is very easy. Grade point average. Graduation success rates. APR. There are a lot of measure for success. Community service. We have a competition to encourage this sort of collaboration that Linda is talking about with not just engaging on campus, but community events too. We measure those hours. So, we track everything. Last year it was three thousand seven hundred hours of community. In fact, we are trying to back it down a little bit because we feel like there is a fatigue right now on our students to try to be everything to everyone, and we really need them to focus a little bit more on academics and maybe internships and other things. Wellness initiatives. The third area, of course, is win-loss record. Right? Not frankly doing so great in that area in a lot of sports, but it is consistent with how they are funded in this league in which they are participating. And then the other piece, as far as measuring the visibility or the free advertising, we tried to do that a few years ago and that didn't go well to this group. So, I would really hesitate to put that sort of energy into that effort again.

J. Malanson: So, I see lots of hands. I just want to remind everyone of the general rule in here. People that haven't spoken yet get a chance to speak before people get a chance to speak a second time. So, I see those of you who have had your hands up for a while that have already spoken and I am not ignoring you. But, I am ignoring you.

N. Younis: I am going to talk about the successful Athletics programs. And I underline successful because these successful Athletic programs enhance the institution's profile, and increase the quantity and the quality of the students' applicant pool for the institution. This is well known. Now, in order to achieve this one, then we are going back to successful. The name of the game, and it is one goal that I suggest is, "win, baby, win." And that is how you achieve. The athletics director just mentioned the activities of the student-athletes, which is wonderful. Actually, all

of our students should do that: the engagement with the community. All of our students should do that. But, in order to generate the funds and in order to sell out, it is the name of the game. "Win, baby, win." For example, if you go to stadiums, and I am not comparing by no means. I know we don't have football. But, when you have a football school, on Saturdays they sell out 80,000. And 80,000 sell out in all these stadiums. And 20% usually, or 25%, are students. The rest are the alumni. They are bringing the community and people that travel. However, if that program is not winning that is when the coaches get fired. It is because they don't sell. The same thing with basketball. Arenas all around the nation. 17,000. Purdue-West Lafayette, I think has 17,000. A sell-out. These are sell-outs. Again, probably 20% are students. And it is how you connect the alumni and the community to come. But, they only come when their teams are winning.

G. Hickey: To Steve's first question, if I may? Because it was like you were reading my mind at that moment. Where does participation in Division I Athletics fit in with our strategic plan?

R. Sutter: I was just going to say, I am sure that Athletics has had to answer these in some way as part of USAP.

J. Malanson: I think part of what we are trying to engage in though is that Athletics, by and large, has existed as a silo on campus. And part of what I think the goal is of this conversation is to start thinking about "how do we integrate them into the life of the university?"

R. Sutter: My point is not that we shouldn't be having this discussion, but that part of the discussion should already have been picked up by Athletics in addressing these points.

B: Boatright: I have seen some of those reports on Athletics and the communication is very helpful. I would actually like to see more of that communication sent to the greater campus. We had a robust discussion in the library. We support Athletics totally in terms of the liberal arts idea of healthy mind, healthy body. That is the main goal. Although, certainly Division I limits, in some ways, the number of students that can participate in that way. But, we would like to see a way to measure the prolonging and impact value that Division I has on non-athletes. Certainly, the program is fantastic for our athletes. But, apart from their leadership initiative, what impact does that actually have on our students? One librarian said, "our goals for athletes should be to reduce the percentage of student fees being spent supporting the program, and develop metrics to evaluate the impact of Athletics on the university brand overall." Some of that was in the cost benefit report. I would like to see those numbers more regularly. Setting goals for the university to improve brand exposure through the Athletic program: we don't have the expertise to know what those number metrics look like. We also had several discussions about the difference between the student academic support systems available to athletes versus the lack of availability to non-athletes overall. There are a lot of concerns about that. But, one

goal could be to look at the successful models that they have and find ways to realign some of our budget and priorities to extend or build complimentary programs so that all of our students have equal success academically. We would like to hear from advancement about how our current Athletics program has impacted advancement, especially after that report from 2015.

A. Fincannon: I was on the committee with Bev. Part of our meetings surrounded advancement. So, we did a 20 year study on the impact of Athletics and fundraising, and it was roughly \$700,000 a year we are receiving directly because we have Athletics. And that is the direct hard benefit. There are many soft benefits as have already been said, such as alumni and support, and bringing them to campus.

B. Boatright: Is that donor money going to Athletics or to the university as a whole?

A. Fincannon: It is going directly to Athletics. \$700,000 a year.

J. Clegg: I would like to dispel one myth. It is this myth that student-athletes have all of these resources that other students don't. Technically that would be an NCAA violation. We can't give athletes resources that other students don't have. Every student on campus has the right to go see advisors, to free tutoring, to free mental health care. There is all kinds of services that students have, but they don't use them. That is not the fault of Athletics that students don't use those. Athletics forces, or mandates, that their students see advisors on a regular basis, go to tutoring, and do all these things. That is why it looks like they are much more successful. Students on campus have all these resources, but if they don't use them then that is not our fault. They are choosing not to use them.

B. Kim: These documents were very helpful for me in understanding Athletics at IPFW. From my interpretation, in general the IPFW community recognizes the value of the athletics program at IPFW. In order to further increase the contribution of athletic programs to PFW, I recommend comprehensive analysis that will study contributions and relations between allocated budgets vs. outcomes of having an athletics program at PFW, not IPFW. The study needs to get feedback from other major stakeholders, alumni, and community. The previous report mainly collected opinion within IPFW. I also recommend a study of which athletics programs will be more cost effective and appropriate to the PFW campus. We need to invest more resources to programs that will increase the visibility of PFW. This kind of info will be helpful to operate more manageable athletics programs at PFW.

A. Schwab: So, last semester I had a golfer in my Honors Ethics class and he had a regular complaint that you should know about, which is that the study tables that he is required to go to were only granulated down to thirty minute time increments. So, if he had fifteen minutes it wasn't worth it for him to go to the study table. And so this was his complaint. I raise that only to sort of push on the question of resources. I am not challenging the facts of the claim. But, one of the things that I would like to see, and this reflects my agreement with Pam. Right? Most of the athletes I have had in

my classes are very good students. And I don't know if they are getting additional resources, but there are strategies that are being employed by Athletics that are clearly producing higher than average GPAs and graduate rates than we are seeing elsewhere on campus. And so then the question becomes "are there practices that can be identified and then be expanded?" And maybe it is as simple as twisting arms. But, are there other strategies that we can use in order to take what Athletics is doing, and doing well, and expand it to our broader student population to make it so that it is actually benefitting the university as a whole? Because it is one of the things that I don't get an email about from every one of my students to find out what their grade is halfway through the semester. Right? It is only the student-athletes. So, that is not a resource in the sense of dollars. But, it is a resource in the sense of attention. And that is sort of where I would like to take that to the rest of the institution so that we can improve the institution as a whole given the successes that are there.

K. Dehr: Part of the campus culture is really changing the culture of the faculty. I looked at the statistics, and I think I took the survey back then, but half of the people when asked if we should continue as Division I said "I don't know." They didn't know enough about it. We have a lot of faculty, and I think I am one of them, that don't really know enough to support the program. So, I think it would be important to sell faculty more on the importance of Athletics. And I think that would be a harder sell than students.

M. Wolf: College Athletics is very important for me, my identity, and who I am. I would love to have this windfall that Butler or Florida Gulf Coast had. Win big is exactly what is up. But, my concern is the inexorable way we are heading, and that we are going to lose this overhead from Indiana. And I know I am crossing close to the line of what we are not talking about, but how do we survive? Secondly, when we are talking about these great student-athletes, I have had them as well. But, there are also great other students as well, such as the model UN students, and others. This is kind of directed at Jens that there really is a difference in institutional effort even if things are available. We need to be realistic about that. Right? And we realize that. But, I just don't want to see us make measures here and then have it all crash down because we are losing the overhead from the IU students. And we can't be twenty-third in the nation in institutional support for Athletics. So, our success has to be wound up in this.

J. Malanson: One of the things motivating having this discussion is so that when we have to have those conversations in the future we can have more informed conversations about the value of Athletics to this university. So, if we have to make any changes to the funding formula then we have now actually laid out "here are the goals, and here are the ways they are accomplishing them, and here are the ways that they are not accomplishing them." What is the university budget willing to do at that point in that context? Right now it is all just "I value this" in abstract ways. We are trying to create actual accountability in terms of how we discuss Athletics.

L. Vartanian: Two things. One is that I remember a time when we were not Division I Athletics. And related to that history is when we became Division I there was a very clear argument that made for why that would be a good thing to do and how accomplishing those good things would be measured. So, I am always puzzled when this topic comes up that we don't take that look back. Whereas the things that were laid out some fifteen years ago may no longer be where we are today, I think there is value in asking "how have we done compared to what we set out to do?" The second thing, related to a time when we were not Division I, has to do with the student-athletes. I agree 110% with the things that have been said about the value and characteristics of our student-athletes. But, I saw that before we became Division I. So, I have always had hard working and successful students long before we made this change. So, I don't know what it is that is special about Division I as opposed to say another division. But, the students were wonderful. So, I wouldn't expect that to change significantly with a change in the athletic competitiveness of the kids we serve.

J. Malanson: On the first question, about the terms of what we set out for in the beginning. Some of the things that Chancellor Wartell promised about Division I Athletics, he admitted a year or two later that we were not accomplishing that in terms of support. A senator by the name of Carl Drummond actually proposed creating a set of measures for our Division I program. The measures took three years for the committee to develop, but they were not meaningful in the way we are talking about here. They were "what is the student-athlete GPA?" and "what is the number of people going to the games?" It didn't help to compare or contextualize, and then that data wasn't even collected in a meaningful way or ongoing basis and then shared with the campus. And so we have tried to go back and look at some of this stuff, but it is not there in a meaningful way. It was not recorded in a way that we could utilize now. For example, when the Senate debated the move to Division I Athletics that debate lasted three meetings, and the Senate minutes of that consist of "meeting," "meeting," "meeting." We don't have the line by line discussion of it. That is lost for us. We don't have it. At least I haven't found it.

L. Wright-Bower: The big picture is something that might have an influence on our strategic plan, and that is about building community and getting people to go to each other's things. If you give students and faculty a bingo card to trade in for that cap that has the mastodon on it or the scarf or some of this stuff that is just given away. I mean I really wanted some of those things. I missed out on the soup mug and I feel really bad about that. I think we could get some competition going with the alumni, and giving some boost to that. But, I think there is value in having people that know what the benefit of having our campus activities and programs are. And we have a concert almost every weekend and during the week. There isn't a day of the week that we don't have a music event.

G. Schmidt: Mine is less optimistic than Linda's discussion. But, in URPC we looked at a number of numbers. We looked at the academic literature related to Division I athletics and if it helped enrollment. The academic literature does not find an effect of it helping significantly. Again, it depends on how you measure things. But, from what

we could see in the literature that was not supported. That is what is there. If we look at NCAA's reporting of how much programs profit versus cost there is something around 16 out of 320 programs that make a profit, in terms of money. So, that is pretty low. Now, the issue is if you are like "our program should make money" then that is a very hard thing to say that that is likely to happen. But, if the question is "what is the investment?" and "what do we get out of it?" then it is worthwhile. If we are going to subsidize Athletics \$3 million then the question is "are we getting out of it what is valuable for us?" And that is why I think the goals are really important because it is good to say "we are going to win the NCAA and our numbers are going to go up a huge amount" but that is not likely soon. We need to know what is going to happen now, and I think that is why these metrics are crucial because it is not going to be a windfall of cash anytime soon or likely. It is going to be these other goals and "are we reaching them?" and "is it worth it?" Which is true for any number of things on campus. But, that is to me where the conversation has to be.

L. Kuznar: I think this is correct. I think one of the things that did change when we went from DII to DI was that there was a quantum leap in the academic performance of the student-athletes in graduation rates, which is laudable. And it also helps our funding formula.

K. Hartley Hutton: That is very accurate. The grade point average went up significantly. The graduation rate went up, as well as retention. We didn't have to measure retention under the Division II model quite like we do now with the APR, which has real teeth in it in terms of participation. So, those are measurable and reflects that transition.

J. Clegg: They were good students before, but they are achieving more now than they were before in Division I.

K. Hartley Hutton: And retention is much better.

A. Ushenko: I am kind of missing something here. I am kind of hearing a vicious cycle happening. First of all, we are talking metrics and we are talking about what the Athletics are bringing to the university in terms of money for everyone. But, then you were saying that that is not the point and the point is that these people are not just dumb jocks but that they are wonderful people and students. And that we have to find ways of measuring what they are bringing to us outside of just crass financial gain. And what is happening is that in order to get anything for concrete metrics we instead are just going back to talking about what they can bring in. We should start to examine Athletics in the way that you would examine in other disciplines. Start with "why do we have Athletics?" and "what does it bring to the scholarly community?"

J. Malanson: That is the question of Gordon. I would actually disagree and say I haven't heard most people say anything about the cost of Athletics and the money they bring in. We have had lots of good conversation about pretty much everything except that.

S. Carr: I think the issue here is really one of scale and scalability. This is where I think I would disagree with Jens about how resources are allocated. The fact that you have 200 students who are getting concentrated benefits for whatever those support services are is very different from 7,000 or 8,000 students who maybe don't have access to what those athletes do. And I think the other elephant in the room here is that we have to look at the really excellent and terrific students who are not athletes and that many of them have jobs. It is not realistic to say they are in the immersive sort of environment that student-athletes are in. They come to campus, they take their classes, they leave, and they go to their job. That is the reality of our institution. So, rather than talking about taking resources away from Athletics, I think we would really do well to tailor our resources to the particular profile of students that we have and make that allocation of resources just as successful as the resources are that go to athletes who are in an immersive environment of basically being residential students.

B. Redman: Throughout the discussion I keep hearing ideas about various ways that Athletics can play a part in the entire IPFW community. And I think that rather than thinking about the goals for Athletics only, maybe it is time to develop a vision for community life and community ethos on this campus, and then think about how Athletics can be integrated into that overall vision that is sorely lacking.

8. Question Time: There were no questions for question time.
9. New business: There was no new business.
10. Committee reports "for information only": There were no committee reports "for information only."
11. The general good and welfare of the University:

R. Elsenbaumer: Thank you so much. First off, let me welcome you all back to the spring semester. I hope you have a great semester. I thought the discussion today was exceptional. Lots of good points were brought up, and I just wanted to comment that many of the things that you talked about we are engaged in. You will hear more about that later.

But, I wanted to take this opportunity today to tell you about something that I feel is very important. In the last sixteen days since I have been here on campus I have been learning a great deal and evaluating functions across campus, particularly as we prepare for this realignment. As we continue working towards the transition to Purdue-Fort Wayne it is clear to me, and hopefully it is clear to everyone in this room and beyond, that increasing enrollments and increasing our revenue are our immediate priorities. To this end, one key area of prioritization is to significantly enhance our external marketing and communications functions for this institution, as it does have a direct affect and significant impact on our recruiting efforts, and I firmly believe that. As such, the first

step in this process should be making marketing and communications its only division with a direct reporting line to the chancellor.

Early last spring, a professional advisor was hired to assess the university's marketing communications efforts and noted in his final report that it is a best practice in higher education to have a communications and marketing leader via a cabinet-level position and report directly to the chancellor or president of the institution. This person would be responsible for the university's overall brand building strategy and our institutional communications, including internal communications and media public relations. Additionally, the report highly recommended the university conduct a cost-benefit analysis of all university funds now expended for marketing communications related activities to optimize its impact on the university's marketing branded goals. In the short term, I am focused on hiring an experienced interim chief communications person who will focus on delivering an immediate communication marketing strategy, particularly as we work with SME, our brand marketing partner in establishing Purdue-Fort Wayne.

Until the interim chief communications director is named Kathryn Hopkins will continue to serve as the interim director of marketing communications, and Nicole Hahn, our public relations specialist, will split her time between the chancellor's office and marketing communications, providing additional support to the department. In the longer term, the chief communications director function will be elevated to a vice-chancellor position. Our Human Resources department will partner with Purdue University-West Lafayette's executive recruiting services to conduct a nationwide search. I will ask for your input during this recruitment process and plan to include your suggestions in various ways throughout the process. It is important to know that this change will be at the very least relatively neutral, with a clear intention of an overall significant cost savings as the division will undergo further review and evaluation with anticipation that coordinating marketing and communications efforts will allow for overall budgetary savings.

Finally, I wanted to offer my sincere appreciation to Angie Fincannon, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, for her many contributions to marketing communications since being hired. Angie will continue her outstanding leadership over the advancement division, which includes both the development and the alumni functions. As public funding for higher education dwindles nationally it is now more important than ever for her time and energy to be focused on raising money, developing community relations, and securing external resources for this institution.

I want to thank you, and please know that updates will be shared with the campus as we progress. Thank you. I wanted to make sure that you heard this first, before anyone else. Thank you.

N. Younis: Congratulations to the men's basketball team for going to Bloomington and spanking IU.

A. Downs: I just wanted to mention that one of the things we have noticed over the years is that Purdue gets bashed a lot in these meetings, and quite frankly deserves a lot of it.

But, as they have been going through all of these policies they have been reviewing, when they actually take the time to get input from us they actually have changed their minds quite a few times on things. So, if you are ever asked to provide input on one of these policies please do it because it actually can make a difference.

M. Wolf: I would just like to mention the model UN team. They did a great job at the national event. Dr. Toole does a great job.

12. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon
Secretary of the Faculty

Senate Document SD 17-13
Approved, 1/8/2018

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

From: Linda Wright-Bower, Chair Educational Policy Committee

Subject: Change to the Academic Calendar Formula as defined in SD 11-18, SD 16-42 and SD 16-45 and Change to the 2018-2019 academic calendar to reflect the change in the academic calendar formula if adopted

Date: November 29, 2017

Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

WHEREAS, the University formerly known as Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne will become two separate entities, and

WHEREAS, the majority of the IPFW units will be managed by Purdue University as of July 1, 2018, and

WHEREAS, degree programs previously supported as part of Indiana University will be realigned under the auspices of Purdue University as of July 1, 2018, and

WHEREAS, Academic Regulations for the newly created Purdue University Fort Wayne will need to be in concert with those of Purdue University West Lafayette, and

WHEREAS, a slight change in the academic calendar formula for the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus will provide uniform academic calendars for students attending Purdue University Fort Wayne and IUPUI health sciences programs in Fort Wayne, and

WHEREAS, a change in the fall break recess for the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus will provide a uniform recess for students attending Purdue University Fort Wayne and IUPUI Fort Wayne health sciences programs in Fort Wayne, and

WHEREAS, the IUPUI Registrar has agreed to coordinate the IUPUI Spring Break recess with the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus such that students attending IUPUI Fort Wayne classes will have the same recess, and

WHEREAS, the current IPFW Registrar has provided a table of fall break comparison dates beginning year 2018 through year 2027 as a reference document to support these resolutions,

RESOLVED, Senate Document SD 16-42 (Academic Calendar formula) be amended as enclosed, with bold language inserted and strike-out language removed.

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED, that the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar be changed to reflect this change in formula.

The academic calendar shall consist of two 16-week regular semesters (including a one-week final examination period), and one 15-week summer semester.

During the Fall and Spring semesters, the standard length of a three-credit-hour course shall be 150 minutes per week for fifteen weeks. The final examination period for courses shall be two hours.

FALL SEMESTER

1. The first day of classes of the fall semester shall be the Monday falling between August 20 and August 26, inclusive.
2. Labor Day shall be a holiday. Classes shall be suspended starting at 4:30 PM on the Friday preceding Labor Day and resume on the Tuesday following Labor Day.
3. There shall be a two-day suspension of regular classes consisting of the Monday and Tuesday after the ~~mid-point between the beginning of the semester and Thanksgiving~~ break 8th week of regular weekday classes of the fall semester.
4. Thanksgiving recess shall consist of Thanksgiving Day, the preceding Wednesday, and the following Friday and weekend.

SPRING SEMESTER

1. The first day of the spring semester may be the Monday following the end of the regular Fall Semester. Typically, weekday classes of the regular spring semester will begin the Monday falling between January 7 and January 13, inclusive.
2. The period of time between the regular fall and spring semesters will be called "Winter Intersession" for the purposes of communication to the public. All official university holidays during the intersession will be recognized and offices will be closed.
3. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, the third Monday in January, shall be a holiday. Classes will not meet.
4. There shall be a one-week spring recess after the 8th week of regular weekday classes of the spring semester.
5. Weekend College shall be suspended Easter weekend.

SUMMER SEMESTER

1. The first day of classes of summer semester may be the Monday following the end of the spring semester. Typically, weekday classes will meet in two 6-week summer sessions which will begin following a one-week break at the end of spring semester.
2. Memorial Day (Observed) and Friday evening, Saturday, and Sunday of Memorial Day weekend, shall be a holiday. Classes will not meet.

3. July 4 shall be a holiday. Classes will not meet on July 4 when it falls on a weekday. Classes will not meet on Friday, July 3, when July 4 falls on a Saturday. Classes will not meet on Monday, July 5, when July 4 falls on a Sunday. The Friday evening, Saturday, and Sunday including, or closest to, July 4 shall also be holidays when classes do not meet.

Table of Fall Break begin/end dates if calendar formula is adjusted by one week (Fall 2018 - Fall 2027):

Fall Term	Dates Current Formula	Dates Adjusted Formula
2018	Oct 8-9	Oct 15-16
2019	Oct 14-15	Oct 21-22
2020	Oct 12-13	Oct 19-20
2021	Oct 11-12	Oct 18-19
2022	Oct 10-11	Oct 17-18
2023	Oct 9-10	Oct 16-17
2024	Oct 14-15	Oct 21-22
2025	Oct 13-14	Oct 20-21
2026	Oct 12-13	Oct 19-20
2027	Oct 11-12	Oct 18-19

The fall semester includes seventeen weeks beginning with the first day of classes through the last day of final exams. With this proposed formula, students enrolled in eight-week classes that run the 1st half of the semester, will attend all but Monday designated for Labor Day observance. Students enrolled in classes that run the 2nd half of the semester will attend a full eight weeks of class time. These classes will begin Wednesday following Fall Break.

Senate Document SD 17-14
Approved, 1/8/2018

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

From: Linda Wright-Bower, Chair Educational Policy Committee

Subject: Change to the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar as defined in SD 16-43 to reflect the calendar formula revision if approved by the Senate (previous document).

Date: November 29, 2017

Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

WHEREAS, the University formerly known as Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne will become two separate entities, and

WHEREAS, the majority of the IPFW units will be managed by Purdue University as of July 1, 2018, and

WHEREAS, degree programs previously supported as part of Indiana University will be realigned under the auspices of Purdue University as of July 1, 2018, and

WHEREAS, a slight change in the academic calendar formula for the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus will provide uniform academic calendars for students attending Purdue University Fort Wayne and IUPUI health sciences programs in Fort Wayne, and

WHEREAS, the IUPUI Registrar has agreed to coordinate the IUPUI Spring Break recess with the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus such that students attending IUPUI Fort Wayne classes will have the same recess, and

WHEREAS, a change in the fall break recess for the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus will provide a uniform recess for students attending Purdue University Fort Wayne and IUPUI Fort Wayne health sciences programs in Fort Wayne, and

WHEREAS, the current IPFW Registrar has provided a revised 2018-2019 Academic Calendar as a reference document to support these resolutions,

RESOLVED, the change in the academic calendar formula, previously approved by this body, now requires an adjustment,

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED, that the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar be changed to reflect this change in formula

ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 2018-2019

Fall Semester, 2018

Monday	20 August	Classes Begin
Friday	31 August	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m. (Labor Day Recess)
Tuesday	4 September	Classes Resume
Mon.-Tues.	8-9 15-16 October	Fall Recess
Wednesday	10-17 October	Classes Resume
Tuesday	20 November	Thanksgiving Recess Begins After Last Class
Monday	26 November	Classes Resume
Mon.-Sun.	10-16 December	Final Exam Week/Last Week of Classes

Winter Inter-session, 2018-2019

Monday	17 December	Classes Begin
Mon-Tues.	24-25 December	Classes Suspended (Holiday Break)
Wednesday	26 December	Classes Resume
Monday	31 December	Classes Suspended (Presidents' Designated Holiday)
Tuesday	1 January	Classes Suspended (New Year's Holiday)
Wednesday	2 January	Classes Resume
Sunday	6 January	Last Day of Classes

Spring Semester, 2019

Monday	7 January	Classes Begin
Monday	21 January	Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday
Mon.-Sun.	11-17 4-10 March	Spring Recess
Monday	18-11 March	Classes Resume
Friday	19 April	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m.
Monday	22 April	Classes Resume
Mon.-Sun	29 April-5 May	Final Exam Week/ Last Week of Classes
Wednesday	8 May	Tentative Date of Commencement

Summer Semester, 2019

Monday	6 May	Summer Semester Begins
Monday	13 May	Summer Session I: Classes Begin
Friday	24 May	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m. (Memorial Day Recess)
Tuesday	28 May	Classes Resume
Friday	21 June	Summer Session I: Classes End at 4:30 p.m.
Monday	24 June	Summer Session II: Classes Begin
Thursday	4 July	Independence Day Holiday Observed
Friday	5 July	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m. (Independence Day Weekend Recess)
Monday	8 July	Classes Resume
Friday	2 August	Summer Session II: Classes End at 4:30 p.m.
Sunday	18-25 August	Summer Semester Ends

Senate Document SD 17-15
Approved, 1/8/2018

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

From: Linda Wright-Bower, Chair Educational Policy Committee

Subject: Amendment of the Academic Regulations (SD 16-45)

Date: November 29, 2017

Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

WHEREAS, the University formerly known as Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne will become two separate entities, and

WHEREAS, the majority of the IPFW units will be managed by Purdue University as of July 1, 2018, and

WHEREAS, degree programs previously supported as part of Indiana University will be realigned under the auspices of Purdue University as of July 1, 2018, and

WHEREAS, Academic Regulations for the newly created Purdue University Fort Wayne will need to be in concert with those of Purdue University West Lafayette, and

WHEREAS, a slight change in the academic calendar formula for the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus will provide uniform academic calendars for students attending Purdue University Fort Wayne and IUPUI health sciences programs in Fort Wayne, and

WHEREAS, the IUPUI Registrar has agreed to coordinate the IUPUI Spring Break recess with the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus such that students attending IUPUI Fort Wayne classes will have the same recess, and

WHEREAS, a change in the fall break recess for the Purdue University Fort Wayne campus will provide a uniform recess for students attending Purdue University Fort Wayne and IUPUI Fort Wayne health sciences programs in Fort Wayne, and

RESOLVED, Senate Document SD 16-45 (Academic Regulations) be amended as enclosed, with bold language inserted and strike-out language removed.

Purdue University Fort Wayne – Academic Regulations, Effective July 1, 2018

Academic Calendar Formula (SD 16-45) Adjustment in formula to align both Fort Wayne campuses

The academic calendar shall consist of two 16-week regular semesters (including a one-week final examination period), and one 15-week summer semester.

During the Fall and Spring semesters, the standard length of a three-credit-hour course shall be 150 minutes per week for fifteen weeks. The final examination period for courses shall be two hours.

FALL SEMESTER

1. The first day of classes of the fall semester shall be the Monday falling between August 20 and August 26, inclusive.
2. Labor Day shall be a holiday. Classes shall be suspended starting at 4:30 PM on the Friday preceding Labor Day and resume on the Tuesday following Labor Day.
3. There shall be a two-day suspension of regular classes consisting of the Monday and Tuesday after the ~~mid-point between the beginning of the semester and Thanksgiving break~~ 8th week of regular weekday classes of the fall semester.
4. Thanksgiving recess shall consist of Thanksgiving Day, the preceding Wednesday, and the following Friday and weekend.

SPRING SEMESTER

1. The first day of the spring semester may be the Monday following the end of the regular Fall Semester. Typically, weekday classes of the regular spring semester will begin the Monday falling between January 7 and January 13, inclusive.
2. The period of time between the regular fall and spring semesters will be called “Winter Intersession” for the purposes of communication to the public. All official university holidays during the intersession will be recognized and offices will be closed.
3. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, the third Monday in January, shall be a holiday. Classes will not meet.
4. There shall be a one-week spring recess after the 8th week of regular weekday classes of the spring semester.
5. Weekend College shall be suspended Easter weekend.

SUMMER SEMESTER

1. The first day of classes of summer semester may be the Monday following the end of the spring semester. Typically, weekday classes will meet in two 6-week summer sessions which will begin following a one-week break at the end of spring semester.
2. Memorial Day (Observed) and Friday evening, Saturday, and Sunday of Memorial Day weekend, shall be a holiday. Classes will not meet.

3. July 4 shall be a holiday. Classes will not meet on July 4 when it falls on a weekday. Classes will not meet on Friday, July 3, when July 4 falls on a Saturday. Classes will not meet on Monday, July 5, when July 4 falls on a Sunday. The Friday evening, Saturday, and Sunday including, or closest to, July 4 shall also be holidays when classes do not meet.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

From: Linda Wright-Bower, Chair Educational Policy Committee

Subject: Academic Calendar for 2020-2021

Date: November 29, 2017

Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

Whereas, the Educational Policy Committee has prepared and approved the academic calendar for 2020-2021,

Whereas, the Educational Policy Committee has approved the academic calendar for 2020-2021,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate approve the academic calendar for 2020-2021.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 2020-2021

Fall Semester, 2020

Monday	24 August	Classes Begin
Friday	4 September	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m. (Labor Day Recess)
Tuesday	8 September	Classes Resume
Mon.-Tues.	19-20 October	Fall Recess
Wednesday	21 October	Classes Resume
Tuesday	24 November	Thanksgiving Recess Begins After Last Class
Monday	30 November	Classes Resume
Mon.-Sun.	14-20 December	Final Exam Week/Last Week of Classes

Winter Inter-session, 2020-2021

Monday	21 December	Classes Begin
Thurs.-Fri.	24-25 December	Classes Suspended (Holiday Break)
Monday	28 December	Classes Resume
Thursday	31 December	Classes Suspended (Presidents' Designated Holiday)
Friday	1 January	Classes Suspended (New Year Holiday)
Monday	4 January	Classes Resume
Sunday	10 January	Last Day of Classes

Spring Semester, 2021

Monday	11 January	Classes Begin
Monday	18 January	Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday
Mon.-Sun.	8-14 March	Spring Recess
Monday	15 March	Classes Resume
Friday	2 April	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m.
Monday	5 April	Classes Resume
Mon.-Sun	3-9 May	Final Exam Week/ Last Week of Classes
Wednesday	12 May	Tentative Date of Commencement

Summer Semester, 2021

Monday	10 May	Summer Semester Begins
Monday	17 May	Summer Session I: Classes Begin
Friday	28 May	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m. (Memorial Day Recess)
Tuesday	1 June	Classes Resume
Friday	25 June	Summer Session I: Classes End at 4:30 p.m.
Monday	28 June	Summer Session II: Classes Begin
Friday	2 July	Classes Suspended at 4:30 p.m. (Independence Day Weekend Recess)
Monday	5 July	Independence Day Holiday Observed
Tuesday	6 July	Classes Resume
Friday	6 August	Summer Session II: Classes End at 4:30 p.m.
Sunday	22 August	Summer Semester Ends

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Zafar Nazarov, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: December 4, 2017

SUBJ: Continuing Lecturers Policy

WHEREAS, Purdue University has asked the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) of the Fort Wayne Senate to provide feedback on draft revisions of the policy on Continuing Lecturers (CLs) (see attached) and FAC did so vis-a-vis the Presiding Officer of the Fort Wayne Senate (i.e., see the responses from 9/28/16 and 3/21/17); and

WHEREAS, each time, FAC has expressed concern about the importance of balancing the preservation of tenure-track faculty lines with the specific instructional needs of the different campuses in the system, and has wondered how the three proposed caps (i.e., originally 10%, then 25%, then most recently, 15%—with the regional campuses able to set their own caps in accordance with their needs) have been arrived at, as no commentaries, explanations, or rationales have been offered; and

WHEREAS, although FAC would like to have an understanding of the rationale(s) underlying the previous and the latest revisions regarding the cap for CLs because we believe there is a delicate balance to be struck between meeting instructional needs and preserving tenure lines, we have reviewed the document and find it otherwise acceptable;

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate approve the proposed changes in the most recent draft of document VI.F.4.

Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers (VI.F.4)

Volume VI: Human Resources

Chapter F: Terms and Conditions of Employment

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

Responsible Office: Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Diversity

Date Issued: January 1, 1999

Date Last Revised: [University Policy Office will complete]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contacts

Statement of Policy

Reason for This Policy

Individuals and Entities Affected by This Policy

Exclusions

Responsibilities

Definitions (defined terms are capitalized throughout the document)

Related Documents, Forms and Tools

Website Address for This Policy

History and Updates

Appendix

CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Telephone	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs	765-494-2948	www.purdue.edu/provost/index.html
Fort Wayne Campus Questions	Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	260-481-6116	www.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/academic-affairs/
Northwest Campuses Questions	Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	219-989-4033	academics.pnw.edu/academic-affairs/staff/
West Lafayette Campus Questions	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs	765-494-2948	www.purdue.edu/provost/index.html

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Purdue University has established the Lecturer classification as a unique employment category to assist in meeting the academic mission of the University. Lecturers are professional instructional staff that supplement and support faculty expertise and capabilities in the instruction of students. Lecturers may be classified either as Continuing Lecturer or as Limited-term Lecturer.

The employment of Lecturers must be carefully monitored and managed to ensure that their employment:

- Enhances the education of students;
- Provides sound and fair employment opportunities for individuals; and
- Complies with the limits established by the University.

The number of Continuing Lecturers may not exceed 15 percent of the tenure/tenure-track and clinical/professional faculty on the West Lafayette campus. The Fort Wayne and Northwest campuses shall employ a combination of Continuing Lecturers and tenure/tenure-track and clinical/professional faculty that is appropriate to their instructional needs. An annual review of that combination shall be conducted by the Chief Academic officer of the Fort Wayne and Northwest campuses, and submitted to the Provost for consultation and review. Limited-term Lecturers do not have a University maximum, and each campus may manage the number of Limited-term Lecturers it employs.

Appointments

Continuing Lecturers are regular staff and must have a total FTE of .50 or greater through any combination of exempt benefit-eligible classifications. All Continuing Lecturer appointments will normally be on an academic-year basis. A Continuing Lecturer is responsible for teaching a minimum number of credit hours each semester. The number of credit hours is proportional to the FTE appointment. Generally, six credit hours of instruction a semester, averaged over the academic year, would be equivalent to a .50 FTE appointment for a Continuing Lecturer. A Continuing Lecturer also is expected to contribute to the infrastructure of his or her college's/school's instructional programs by performing the appropriate and necessary duties related to the academic programs of the college/school. For summer appointments of Continuing Lecturers, three credit hours is the typical expectation for a one-month appointment at 1.00 FTE.

Limited-term Lecturers are not regular employees of the University. The number of credit hours is proportional to the FTE appointment. Generally, three credit hours of instruction for a semester would be equivalent to a .25 FTE appointment for a Limited-term Lecturer. The term of appointment may not exceed one semester. There is no limitation on the number of semesters that an individual may be employed as a Limited-term Lecturer if the individual's FTE for all Limited-term Lecturer positions is less than .50 FTE per semester. An individual who holds a Limited-term Lecturer position(s) with an FTE of .50 or greater may not be employed as a Limited-term Lecturer for more than six continuous academic-year semesters without the approval of the President or his/her designee. The Deans are responsible for tracking the pattern of Limited-term Lecturer employment in their unit, and the Provost (West Lafayette campus) and

Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs are responsible for monitoring compliance with these limits.

The proper steps for new appointments, reappointments, non-renewal of appointments and salary payments are outlined in the Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments.

Benefits

Continuing Lecturers accrue the same benefits as administrative/professional staff. Limited-term Lecturers are not benefit-eligible employees of the University.

Termination of Employment

The University may terminate the employment of any Lecturer before the end of his/her term of appointment for misconduct, poor performance or inefficiency upon written notice to the Lecturer. Lecturers are not entitled to the procedures for cases of termination for cause that are available to faculty classifications. Procedural disputes in cases of termination for cause before the end of the term of appointment may be grieved pursuant to the policy on Faculty Grievances (I.B.1). If a Lecturer's employment is terminated prior to the expiration of his/her appointment, the University will pay his or her salary either 1) through the last day of employment for a Continuing Lecturer or 2) based on the number of credit hours taught through the last day of employment for a Limited-term Lecturer. The University will not pay the Lecturer's salary for the remainder of his or her term of appointment. The final salary payment will be paid in the individual's final paycheck according to the University's normal payroll practices.

The employment of a Limited-term Lecturer may be terminated prior to the expiration of the contract when the University elects to cancel the course due to not meeting the minimum enrollment requirements for the course. If this occurs, the University will provide written notification to the Limited-term Lecturer and the pay practice outlined above will apply.

A Continuing Lecturer will give the University written notice of his/her intent to resign at least one academic semester before the end of the current appointment. For purposes of this notice, summer session is not considered an academic semester.

University Policies and Procedures

Lecturers are bound by and obligated to familiarize themselves with the University's written policies, procedures, standards, guidelines and regulations, including but not limited to, Anti-Harassment (III.C.1), Political Activities (III.B.4), Intellectual Property (I.A.1), Amorous Relationships (III.A.1), Conflicts of Commitment and Reportable Outside Activities (III.B.1) and Individual Financial Conflicts of Interest (III.B.2).

REASON FOR THIS POLICY

This policy articulates the terms of employment for Lecturers at Purdue University and the methods implemented to monitor and manage this staff classification.

INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES AFFECTED BY THIS POLICY

All colleges, schools and departments that employ Lecturers and any staff who serve in a human resources or business manager capacity.

EXCLUSIONS

None.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Provost

- Administer this policy.
- Monitor the distribution of Continuing Lecturers on the West Lafayette campus
- Monitor the semester limits of Limited-term Lecturers on the West Lafayette campus.

Academic Department Heads

- Adhere to the provisions of this policy and the requirements outlined in its supporting operating procedures.
- Ensure that high academic standards are applied to the employment and review of Lecturers.

Deans

- Adhere to the provisions of this policy and the requirements outlined in its supporting operating procedures.
- Ensure that high academic standards are applied to the employment and review of Lecturers.
- Monitor the duration of employment of Limited-term Lecturers in their unit to ensure compliance with this policy.

Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs

- Monitor the distribution of Continuing Lecturers on their campus.
- Monitor the semester limits of Limited-term Lecturers on their campus.

Deans (West Lafayette campus) and Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs

- Provide an annual report to the Provost detailing the number and FTE of Limited-term and Continuing Lecturers employed in their unit of responsibility.

Lecturers

- Adhere to the terms of their employment as outlined in this policy and in their employment contract.
- Become familiar with and follow all policies and procedures related to their employment, both those now published and those adopted from time to time by the University.

DEFINITIONS

Additional defined terms may be found in the central [Policy Glossary](#).

Lecturer

A unique employment classification of University staff consisting of Continuing Lecturers and Limited-term Lecturers.

Continuing Lecturer

A category of Lecturer staff employed by an academic unit of the University to instruct a course or courses on an ongoing basis, and to perform other appropriate and necessary duties relating to the course or courses, their students, and the college's/school's instructional programs.

Continuing Lecturers are not considered faculty and do not have faculty voting privileges, nor are they eligible for tenure or sabbatical leave.

Limited-term Lecturer

A category of Lecturer staff employed by an academic unit of the University to instruct a course or courses on a semester-by-semester basis. Limited-term Lecturers are not considered faculty and do not have faculty voting privileges, nor are they eligible for tenure or sabbatical leave. Limited-term Lecturers are not benefit-eligible employees of the University.

RELATED DOCUMENTS, FORMS AND TOOLS

- Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments [Hyperlink TBD]
- [Procedures for Appointing and Paying Limited-term Lecturers with Concurrent Appointments](#)
- [Disclosure Statement for Nonexempt Limited-term Lecturers](#)

Policies (this list is not exhaustive; Lecturers are held accountable under all applicable University policies)

- Purdue University [Faculty and Staff Handbook](#)
- [Amorous Relationships \(III.A.1\)](#)
- [Anti-Harassment \(III.C.1\)](#)
- [Conflicts of Commitment and Reportable Outside Activities \(III.B.1\)](#)
- [Faculty Grievances \(I.B.1\)](#)
- [Individual Financial Conflicts of Interest \(III.B.2\)](#)
- [Intellectual Property \(I.A.1\)](#)
- [Political Activities \(III.B.4\)](#)

Forms

- Offer Letter Templates for New Lecturer Appointments
 - [Continuing Lecturers](#)
 - [Limited-term Lecturers](#)
- [Lecturer Reappointment \(Form 19L\)](#)
- [Payroll Action \(PA\) Form](#)
- [Notice of Non-Renewal of Contract \(Form 19E\)](#)

WEBSITE ADDRESS FOR THIS POLICY

www.purdue.edu/policies/human-resources/vif4.html

HISTORY AND UPDATES

[Date TBD]: Policy was updated to the new template, which included moving the procedures to a separate document. Language regarding Clinical/professional faculty was added to the basis by which the maximum number of Continuing Lecturers is calculated and the percentage limit was changed. The use of teacher contact hours was replaced with credit hours when determining a Lecturer's FTE.

November 18, 2011: Policy number changed to VI.F.4 (formerly IV.14.4).

January 1, 1999: This policy defines the employment classification of Lecturer and described the terms and conditions of their employment. Updates to the policy were done on August 1, 2003, and February 20, 2007. For additional reference, see the [University Policy on Lecturers Implementing Guidelines issued August 2003](#)

APPENDIX

There are no appendices to this policy.

Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments

These procedures supplement the policy on [Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers \(VI.F.4\)](#). Refer to the policy for contact information and applicable definitions.

Effective Date: [TBD]

NEW APPOINTMENTS

Continuing Lecturer: All appointments to the Continuing Lecturer staff must be made using an offer letter, which requires approval by the president or his/her designee.

Limited-term Lecturer: All new appointments to the Limited-term Lecturer staff must be made using an offer letter, which requires approval by the president or his/her designee. The begin date and the end date of the appointment must be set forth in the offer letter. If the Limited-term Lecturer already holds a concurrent appointment or will be adding an appointment, please refer to the [Procedures for Appointing and Paying Limited-term Lecturers with Concurrent Appointments](#) to determine how the appointment should be processed.

Offer letter templates are provided in the Related Documents, Forms and Tools section of the [policy](#).

REAPPOINTMENT

Continuing Lecturer: Continuing Lecturer appointments must be renewed each academic year by action of the board of trustees' approval of the annual operating budget for Purdue University or by approval of a Payroll Action (PA) Form by the president or his/her designee. Contract (Form 19L) extensions are not normally required unless the current contract included an end date.

Limited-term Lecturer: If the Limited-term Lecturer appointment is being renewed, a Form 19L is required for each semester the University employs the Limited-term Lecturer (exception: renewal for a summer session that is preceded by a spring session appointment does not require completion of Form 19L, but an offer letter is required to outline the duties for the summer). If the Limited-term Lecturer holds an additional appointment, please refer to the [Procedures for Appointing and Paying Limited-term Lecturers with Concurrent Appointments](#) to determine how to renew the appointment.

NON-RENEWAL OF APPOINTMENT

Continuing Lecturer: If the University does not intend to continue the appointment of a Continuing Lecturer, written notice of this intention will be given on University Form 19E (Notice of Non-Renewal of Contract). The University will give the written notice to the Continuing Lecturer at least one academic semester before the end of the current appointment. For purposes of this notice, summer session is not considered an academic semester.

Limited-term Lecturer: Limited-term Lecturer contracts are made for one semester at a time. No further notice is required.

TRANSFERS FROM A NON-BENEFITS ELIGIBLE POSITION

In the case where a person is in a non-benefits eligible position and transfers to a Continuing Lecturer position, only service after being classified as a Continuing Lecturer will be considered when determining eligibility for University benefits including, but not limited to, calculating the waiting period of any benefit program. Where a staff member transfers to a Continuing Lecturer position from another benefit-eligible classification, the service period will include time in the prior position.

SALARY PAYMENTS

The University will pay employees with one Lecturer appointment according to the monthly payment schedule set forth in the University payroll calendar. The respective unit will set the rate of compensation for its Lecturer staff. The rate of pay for Lecturers is subject to modification if there is any legislative reduction in the state or federal appropriations from which the compensation is paid. Salaries derived from other sources will be paid to the extent funds are available.

For information on salary payments for Limited-term Lecturers with concurrent appointments, see [Procedures for Appointing and Paying Limited-term Lecturers with Concurrent Appointments](#).

HISTORY AND UPDATES

[Date TBD]: These procedures were updated and separated from the policy on Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers (VI.F.4).

September 28, 2016

TO: Jeffrey Malanson, Presiding Officer
Fort Wayne Senate

FR: Lesa Rae Vartanian, Chair
Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

RE: Comments on IFC Resolution 15.08 and draft documents VI.F.4

FAC met on Monday, 9/19/16 and discussed IFC Resolution 15.08 as well as the draft documents VI.F.4 (*“Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers”* and the supplement document *“Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments.”* Below is a summary of our questions, comments, and concerns.

We agree that Continuing Lecturers (CLs) and Limited Term Lecturers (LTLs) “play a vital role” in helping Purdue campuses meet their common core mission of providing an excellent undergraduate education. We also generally agree with points 1 through 8 listed under the ‘Situation Analysis.’ At the same time we believe it is imperative to protect existing tenure-track faculty lines, we recognize the nature and conditions of the appointments of non-tenure-track faculty disadvantage CLs and LTLs in real-world, tangible ways (e.g., compensation, stability of employment, access to resources needed and/or desirable for maximum instructional performance). This reality is inconsistent with the values of social justice and equity we usually promote in higher education. Though Purdue policy does not regard CLs and LTLs as “faculty,” we are hard-pressed to see how we, at IPFW (where just over 15% of our teachers are CLs or LTLs), would meet our instructional needs or responsibilities without these colleagues, or with significantly fewer of them.

We also agree that long-term goals or initiatives such as curricular design and innovation can be hampered by the unpredictability/lack of stability in the human infrastructure of an educational institution (although, obviously there’s never any guarantee that someone hired on tenure-track will in fact stay for the long term). While the concern certainly makes sense on a conceptual level, we do wonder if there are data indicating that this is in fact an empirical reality?

Likewise, members of the committee had many questions about the 10% rule. How was the figure of 10% determined? Are there data suggesting or supporting this as an optimal limit, or is the 10% an arbitrary figure? It would seem useful to know what percentage of *courses* on a campus are taught by CLs and LTLs (and graduate assistants, for that matter). Is there any indication that the quality of instruction is somehow significantly different as a function of instructional job title? Perhaps capping the *percent of classes* taught by non-tenure-track faculty would be a more direct way of addressing the curricular/pedagogical issues? Given the differences in the structure, resources, and mission of our campus from the one in West Lafayette, we question whether it is feasible to expect the same ratio of CLs/LTLs to tenured/TT faculty to be appropriate for all campuses. Again, examination of our own numbers reveals that at present, 61 of the 399 individuals who teach at IPFW are CLs—15.28%. Given that we well exceed the stated 10% max, what exactly would or will be the consequence? The policy is

unclear on this issue—saying only that the VCAA is to manage the percentage. How, we wonder, will that be managed?

When the comparison of individuals who teach revolves around the issue of being eligible to pursue promotion and/or tenure, then grouping CLs with LTLs may make sense. However, there are important differences between those two job titles that we think may be obscured by treating them as if they were the same within these documents. For example, a CL teaches a full load and has service expectations, whereas an LTL might teach a single course each semester year after year. The typical length of appointment differs as well. We are wondering why an LTL who teaches more than .50 is only allowed to teach for six semesters while one teaching less than .50 can teach indefinitely? There are situations in which having an LTL teach continuously may be the best curricular decision. While we think the issues of fairness and justice should apply to all, we wonder if separate policies might be more appropriate, in light of the differences between CLs and LTLs. It also seems to be the case that LTLs are mentioned more frequently in the “Situation Analysis” section than are CLs.

We did not understand Recommendation #5; at present, many academic departments at IPFW are already involved in the hiring and supervision of CLs and LTLs who teach courses for academic credit, and while that seems a good thing, there is no explanation or rationale accompanying the recommendation to spell out why it is being recommended.

Lastly, we are not sure how changing job titles (i.e., “Continuing Lecturer” to “Lecturer” and “Limited Term Lecturer” to “Visiting Lecturer”) would impact the situation. We note, in the final paragraph of the resolution, “many institutions similar to Purdue have experienced positive outcomes for the mission of enhanced undergraduate education when they have made provision for non-tenure-track faculty appointments for people who focus on effective undergraduate instruction.” We suggest that the position and recommendations offered in the resolution would be much more compelling if the successes other institutions have experienced were discussed in detail.

March 21, 2017

TO: Jeffrey Malanson, Presiding Officer
Fort Wayne Senate

FR: Lesa Rae Vartanian, Chair
Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

RE: Comments on Revision of Draft Document VI.F.4

On September 28, 2016, FAC provided a report to the presiding officer of the Fort Wayne Senate on Resolution 15.08 and a draft document of VI.F.4 *“Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers.”* On February 14, 2017, FAC was asked to provide feedback on the latest draft of VI.F.4.

We note with appreciation that our comments regarding the restrictive nature of the original 10% cap seem to have been heard: This latest draft now includes a cap of 25% on CLs—more than double the prior cap of 10%. As we indicated in our 9/28/16 report, our campus teaching force includes just over 15% CLs/LTLs, and we would have a very difficult time fulfilling our mission if we were forced to reduce to 10%. That said, now we wonder how or why 25% has been proposed as the cap. We had noted in September that the figure of 10% seemed arbitrary, as it was not grounded in any empirical data suggesting that figure as an optimal limit; that seems to be the case once again. Furthermore, though we still believe our CLs and LTLs play an important and vital role in the delivery of our teaching mission, we also think preserving tenure track lines to the fullest extent possible should be a priority. Thus, whereas we felt 10% was too small, we are concerned that 25% may be too large (we also think that how the 25% would be calculated may be a more important issue).

In September, we had said, *“Given the differences in the structure, resources, and mission of our campus from the one in West Lafayette, we question whether it is feasible to expect the same ratio of CLs/LTLs to tenured/TT faculty to be appropriate for all campuses.”* Perhaps the Northwest campus has been operating with more than 15% (or 20%) CLs/LTLs, and that’s the reason for such a seemingly drastic increase? We wonder if it is necessary for the main campus to set the same cap for the campuses not located in West Lafayette. Perhaps the Northwest and Fort Wayne campuses would be best served by having greater leeway in setting their *own* caps in accordance with a) a set of basic values agreed upon throughout the system (e.g., replacing tenure-track lines with CLs as a cost-savings measure is undesirable) and b) their own particular circumstances and needs.

Finally, it appears to us that although the feedback we provided in September extended beyond the single issue of a cap for CLs/LTLs, the issue of that cap is the only facet of the document that has been modified in this latest draft.