

Minutes of the  
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Second Senate  
Purdue University Fort Wayne  
March 23 and 30, 2020  
Via Webex

Agenda  
(as amended)

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. 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
10. 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
11. New business

12. The general good and welfare of the University

13. Adjournment\*

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

---

Presiding Officer: A. Nasr  
 Parliamentarian: C. Ortsey  
 Sergeant-at-arms: G. Steffen  
 Assistant: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“Constitutional Amendment – Apportionment” (SD 19-19)  
 “Approval to Fill a Vacancy on the Curriculum Subcommittee” (SD 19-20)  
 “Approval of Filling 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 Members Present:

J. Badia, S. Betz, J. Burg, S. Buttes, M. Cain, S. Carr, A. Coronado, K. Creager, K. Dehr, Y. Deng, H. Di, C. Drummond, J. Egger, R. Elsenbaumer, K. Fineran, R. Friedman, S. Hanke, J. Hersberger, D. Hess, P. Jing, M. Johnson, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, B. Kim, C. Lee, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, A. Marshall, A. Mohammadpour, J. Nowak, J. O’Connell, H. Odden, M. Parker, S. Randall, M. Ridgeway, G. Schmidt, R. Stone, H. Strevel, R. Sutter, J. Toole, R. Vandell, N. Virtue, G. Wang, D. Wesse, K. White, E. Win, M. Wolf, N. Younis, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

A. Bales, Z. Bi, S. Ding, M. Gruys, J. Lewis, A. Macklin, J. Mbuba, N. Reimer, S. Rumsey, A. Ushenko, L. Vartanian

Guests Present:

M. Dixon, C. Fox, M. Helmsing, J. Malanson, V. Maloney, C. Springer, T. Swim

Acta

1. Call to order: A. Nasr called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 10: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Toole moved to accept the agenda.

Agenda approved by voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. IFC Representative:

J. Nowak: Hello,

I welcome you all to our Senate meeting today being held in an unprecedented way at such an “interesting” time.

Please continue to encourage your colleagues to look to the COVID-19 UPDATES and status banner near the top of our University homepage for current and accurate announcements related to how our University is addressing this pandemic.

I’d also like to applaud and congratulate our senators, faculty, staff, all supporters of our great University, and of course most of all our students for helping make Purdue University Fort Wayne an amazing place to both work and learn. We’ve been able to quickly pull together, address many uncertainties, and move forward with resolve in efforts to continue to collaborate with our many community partners in very unique ways to ensure our students are receiving the best educational opportunities possible.

As we embark on our “all online” phase of this semester there very well may be some hiccups, more uncertainties will likely arise that need to be unraveled, and unforeseen circumstances may require a thoughtful, steadfast tenacity to appropriately address and overcome. Yet one characteristic of our great University, and quality of the people who make it great, has become abundantly clear in recent weeks, we can and will overcome these issues as we unite and work together. I’m proud to be a part of this University because of the people like you who make us great, a destination campus our students choose for their educational pursuits, and it is with optimism I look forward to partnering with you in the days and weeks ahead to solve any new issues we may face.

Thank you.

b. Deputy Presiding Officer:

J. Toole: First of all, I want to thank you, Assem, for doing this meeting. I know that this is unprecedented, and I really appreciate your efforts to pull this meeting together. I know it is not easy.

Second, I want to echo Jeff's comments in thanking the faculty, and, of course, the staff, for everyone's extraordinary efforts to try to pull this off. We will pull it off and we will do it as well as we can possibly do it under the circumstances. We will finish out this semester.

I would also just mention that it is probably a good idea for faculty to think of contingency plans in case there happens to come a point where we just can't make it to campus. I think everybody probably has that in mind, but I think it is worth saying here at the outset.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

A. Nasr: I also just want to say how much we appreciate everything that faculty and staff have done to help our students and to keep us going. These are very stressful times. I just want to make sure that we all know that we are all in this together. However, for us to be able to move forward we need to work within our units first before heading for answers outside of our departments. We are very much encouraged to seek our faculty and staff colleagues in our departments and colleges so that we maintain this closely tightknit communication process. Be in constant communication with each other to share resources and see how things are going. Share with students as much as possible in terms of alleviating any stress and anxiety, despite our being stressed out and anxious.

I also want to talk about pre-corona panic from a few weeks back. We had an Access Follett's program open forum meeting for all faculty back on February 19 to discuss the proposal that Follett's put forth for breaking down individual student costs for texts and charging them a set fee per credit. At that meeting, and prior to that with the email I sent out to all faculty, this was met with a resounding objection from faculty and concern from students. Vice Chancellors Drummond and Wesse also expressed concerns about this proposal and will not pursue it. The proposal is basically rejected and we are not moving forward with it. I just need to mention that and make that clear. This has been resolved by not being taken into account.

I also want to mention very briefly that there is a report from PFW's representative to the University Policy Committee, Bob Barrett. There have been three policies that West Lafayette has been considering. They are drafts. I will make sure to send those to Josh so that Josh can actually send those by email to all of us. The first one is the Dispute Resolution for Staff, Graduate Staff, Student Staff, Postdoctoral Researchers, Clinical Residents, and Clinical Interns. Basically the policy is to provide a fair and equitable process for employees to have their disputes heard and complaints resolved formally. Management and Professional Staff Advisory Committee (V.B.2). This is the policy to

solicit and carefully consider suggestions and advice from management and professional staff. The third one is Campus Support Staff Advisory Committee (V.B.6). It is the Purdue University's policy to seek, receive, and consider suggestions and advice from Administrative and Operational Support staff. These are the three things that I just want to go over briefly because I think it is important for us to consider them, so I will send those drafts to you by email. If you have time to go through them then that would be great. If you have any feedback then just let me know or contact Bob Barrett.

For today's meeting, I just need to make sure that everybody is on the same page. This is online and it is impossible to take a vote by voice as we have seen. Instead, what we have is an option to take votes using the polling tool in Webex. Seeing the number of people calling in and not using Webex by using their actual phones is not going to work out. I just want to ensure that there is the most democratic or most possible way where we can get votes efficiently. I am concerned that the Webex polling might leave people out that are joining us by phone. This leaves us with a second option, which is to do a vote by roll call. This means that we will be calling everyone's name and basically hearing their vote.

No objections to roll call voting.

6. Special business of the day: There was no special business of the day.

7. Unfinished business:

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

J. Toole moved to approve Senate Document SD 19-19 (Constitutional Amendment – Apportionment).

Motion to approve passed on a roll call vote.

8. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 19-20) – V. Maloney

V. Maloney moved to approve Senate Document SD 19-20 (Approval to Fill a Vacancy on the Curriculum Review Subcommittee).

M. Wolf moved to pass a vote of unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Motion to approve passed.

b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-21) – H. Di

H. Di moved to approve Senate Document SD 19-21 (Approval of Filling a Vacancy in the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee).

S. Carr moved to pass a vote of unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Motion to approve passed.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-22) – H. Di

H. Di moved to approve Senate Document SD 19-22 (Procedures of Promotion to Include Clinical Faculty).

M. Wolf moved to pass a vote of unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Motion to approve passed.

d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 19-23) – S. Hanke

S. Hanke moved to approve Senate Document SD 19-23 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne: Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee).

Motion to approve passed on a roll call vote.

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 19-24) – S. Hanke

S. Hanke moved to approve Senate Document SD 19-24 (Senate Document 19-24 and Procedures for Senate Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee).

S. Carr moved to postpone.

Motion to postpone passed on a voice vote.

The meeting is suspended at 1:15 until noon, Monday, March 30, 2020.

Session II  
(March 30)

Acta

Senate Members Present:

J. Badia, A. Bales, S. Betz, J. Burg, S. Buttes, M. Cain, S. Carr, A. Coronado, K. Creager, K. Dehr, Y. Deng, H. Di, C. Drummond, R. Elsenbaumer, K. Fineran, R. Friedman, M. Gruys, S. Hanke, P. Jing, M. Johnson, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, B. Kim, C. Lee, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, A. Marshall, A. Mohammadpour, J. Nowak, J. O’Connell, H. Odden, M. Parker, S. Randall, M. Ridgeway, G. Schmidt, R. Stone, H. Strevel, J. Toole, N. Virtue, G. Wang, K. White, M. Wolf, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

Z. Bi, S. Ding, J. Egger, J. Hersberger, D. Hess, J. Lewis, A. Macklin, J. Mbuba, N. Reimer, S. Rumsey, R. Sutter, A. Ushenko, R. Vandell, L. Vartanian, D. Wesse, E. Win, M. Zoghi

Guests Present:

M. Dixon, C. Fox, M. Helmsing, J. Malanson, V. Maloney, T. Swim

A. Nasr reconvened the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on March 30, 2020.

J. Toole moved to amend the agenda by moving Committee reports “for information only” to come before Question time.

Motion to amend the agenda passed by voice vote.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

- a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 19-32) – V. Maloney

Senate Reference No. 19-32 (Department of Psychology Certificate in Death Education) was presented for information only.

- b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 19-33) – V. Maloney

Senate Reference No. 19-33 (School of Music Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Music Performance) was presented for information only.

- c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 19-34) – V. Maloney

Senate Reference No. 19-34 (Department of Human Services Concentrations in Human Services) was presented for information only.

- d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 19-40) – J. Toole

Senate Reference No. 19-40 (Report on Designated Items) was presented for information only.

10. Question time:

- a. (Senate Reference No. 19-35) – S. Buttes

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.

R. Elsenbaumer: Response to Question 1:



- a. This website you reference is out-of-date, but is currently maintained on the university's web site for historical context.
- b. The university aligned its strategic planning and campus master planning efforts so that the development of the strategic plan would directly shape the development of the master plan. For example, the current master planning effort did not begin in earnest until February 2019, after the university's high-level strategy (mission, core values, vision, and aspirations) were determined. Throughout the campus master planning process, there was an ongoing discussion of how the campus master plan would align with and support the strategic plan. To further support alignment efforts, the Director of Strategic Planning and Implementation served on the Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee and met with the master planning consultants and campus master planning leadership to walk through the strategic plan and the ways in which it could and should inform the master planning process. The current drafts of the Campus Master Plan all reflect this direct alignment and engagement with the university strategic plan. Our consultants have been extremely good at linking the Master Plan to the Strategic Plan in all presentations.

Response to Question 2:

- a. A web site for the current, draft masterplan is in development. Meanwhile, there have been numerous public forums and presentations open to the entire campus community. Meaningful updates and discussions on the master planning process took place and we received valuable feedback.

Response to Question 3:

- a. Master planning consultants (Ayers Saint Gross) were engaged to develop the campus master plan, and special consultants (Brailsford & Dunlavey) were also brought in on to help with dining and housing. Ayers Saint Gross is the same firm Purdue University used to develop its recent masterplan.
- b. The consultants have been excellent, strategic partners in this process, readily answering any and all questions brought to them by the Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee, actively participating in campus forums and presentations, and directly incorporating relevant feedback into successive drafts of the plan.

Response to Question 4:

- a. Representatives from Purdue West Lafayette, Indiana University Fort Wayne, Indiana University, and the Purdue Fort Wayne Foundation all served on the Master Plan Advisory Committee.
- b. In addition to the Master Plan Advisory Committee, there is also a steering committee that had a more direct hand in shaping the master plan and process—some ad hoc groups were formed to look at more specific master planning options.
- c. Greg Justice and/or Jay Harris can provide membership rosters for all relevant committees.

Response to Question 5:

- a. Multiple faculty members who also serve on the Fort Wayne Senate were members of the Master Plan Advisory Committee: Gordon Schmidt, Stacy Betz, and Steven Hanke.
- b. Marcia Dixon, in her capacity as Associate Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning, was also deeply involved in the master planning process.
- c. Additional faculty may have also served on the Steering Committee and/or subcommittees.
- d. Beyond representation in the planning process, a variety of data was collected directly from faculty, department chairs, deans, and others about current campus space (classrooms, labs, offices, student spaces, etc.), utilization, strengths, needs, etc., that directly informed the campus master plan. (The consultants held 27 Departmental and Topic Area meetings on campus in March 2019.) Space utilization data was benchmarked against other higher education institutions to further help the university understand areas for needed improvements.
- e. All of this input is reflected in the new master plan, but as specific proposals come online in the future for the rehabilitation or renovation of existing spaces or the construction of new spaces, every effort will be made to ensure that these improvements best meet the current (and projected, future) needs of students, faculty, and staff
- f. In addition to faculty members, representatives from APSAC, CSSAC, SGA, and facilities also served on the Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee.

Response to Question 6:

- a. The final review process is currently being determined, including an eventual presentation to the Board of Trustees.

G. Schmidt: I think the chancellor covered this well. The URPC has also been talking about the master plan and we have been having regular updates. We have been included through the URPC, which makes sense as we are the closest committee to the involvement that the Senate would have.

S. Carr: At this point, would it not be official for Senate to weigh in on the campus master plan before it goes to the Board of Trustees?

R. Elsenbaumer: You would want the Senate committee to make the recommendation.

- b. (Senate Reference No. 19-36) – L. Lin

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?

R. Elsenbaumer: Recognized student organizations have multiple sources for securing funding both internal and external to the university. Additionally, support does not come only in the form of financial contributions. The Office of Student Affairs, in various capacities, continues to value, promote, and support all recognized student organizations. During this academic year, and we are aware of similar actions under prior administrations, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs has provided financial support for nearly 40 percent of the cultural student organizations, contributing funding to all organizations who have approached the VCSA with such requests. There have been no concerns brought to the VCSA regarding lack of support for international student organizations.

c. (Senate Reference No. 19-37) – J. Badia

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 moved to table Senate Reference No. 19-37.

Motion to table passed by voice vote.

d. (Senate Reference No. 19-38) – A. Livschiz

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.

R. Elsenbaumer: There is a significant amount of research, feedback gathering, and planning that goes into the development of New Student Orientation that brings in approximately 3,200 people every summer. The assertion that feedback was not taken seriously or listened to is probably not totally accurate. Nonetheless, feedback is important for consideration. It is important to note however, that the result of listening to feedback does not necessarily equate to implementing the desires of the person providing feedback. The feedback gathered from students, faculty, and staff informs the schedule of the day. Additionally, New Student Orientation is aligned to nationally normed standards such as those provided by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), mapped to numerous student development theories, and assessed by nine Academic College Orientation learning objectives as well as university learning objectives.

The specific questions and concerns posed were answered and addressed at college-level meetings held individually over the last few weeks where all lead advisors were invited. The questions raised here were apparently addressed at a College of Arts and Sciences meeting not long ago.

As it relates to Orientation days, dates are chosen based upon a myriad of inputs: scheduled events on campus, physical space constraints, summer capital projects and improvements, projected enrollment numbers, and historical admit data. Without the determined number of dates, we would not be able to accommodate all incoming students whereby limiting university enrollment.

A. Livschiz: The only context in which this makes sense is to marginalize faculty advisors. From what we heard about the process, those that were able to formerly meet one on one with their students have now been reduced to a cattle call.

R. Elsenbaumer: I meant to state more on this.

Per the question of separating the acts of advising and registration, as I discussed in last year's amendments to the university advising structure, it is critical for new students to meet with both a faculty member and primary role advisor. This partnership and team-centric design is crucial for a comprehensive transition to and through the university.

As such, this partnership plays out at New Student Orientation in the following process: 1) student learns about, meets and builds affinity with, and discusses major and associated courses with the College and/or department faculty, 2) student brings this faculty-provided information to a primary role advisor to compare with dual credit, placement tests, transfer credit, financial aid support, life-demands, etc., and then 3) student takes the resulting schedule to the nuts and bolts portion of registration.

Separating these processes also allows for ample student reflection, taking care of business, and space to discuss courses, proposed schedules, and requirements with family members and supports systems. As well, this also provides 90 minutes for students to be completely immersed in their academic college, department and major, meeting directly with faculty to learn what it means to major in their department, to take courses in the discipline, and to be fully engaged in the college. Additionally, feedback informed the adding of a faculty breakout session which allows students and family members to discuss faculty and classroom expectations, placing faculty at the center of the Orientation process and dissemination of academic and curricular information.

A. Livschiz: We were told in January that small departments would be able to still continue their process. This standardized process that was implemented from above does not take into account these small programs.

e. (Senate Reference No. 19-39) – A. Livschiz

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?

R. Elsenbaumer: Let me try to put this into a different perspective:

First, policies associated with the active management of summer offerings by department chairs are apparently not new. As I understand it, they were first developed for summer 2016 and have been fully implemented since 2017. Second, the policies of active management of summer offerings do not set specific thresholds for enrollment for individual sections. Rather, it is the duty and responsibility of the department chair, in collaboration with her or his dean, to manage the range of courses offered, the instructor assignments, and the modalities of delivery used, to optimize curricular offerings and cover costs.

All of this was again revisited at the October 25, 2019 Academic Affairs retreat when summer enrollment policies were once again discussed in great detail.

Within each department and academic program, a variety of classes can be offered in the summer. For each section there is a cost (as driven by the summer salary of the assigned instructor) and revenue (as determined by the number of enrolled students). Costs and revenue for summer are aggregated to the level of the academic department. As such, it is the Chair's task to balance instructional cost with projected revenue to maximize net summer revenue. This is important because summer instruction comes with a much lower overhead cost as noted in the question in that both the physical plant and personnel benefits are costed against academic year revenue. Therefore, summer instruction results in significantly greater marginal net revenue per credit hour than does academic year instruction. In order to incentivize effective active management of summer instruction, the following policies have been in place for five years.

Recall that the unit of financial aggregation is the department. Therefore, each department chair is expected to create a set of course offerings, modalities of instruction, and instructor assignments that will result in net revenue equal to the course cost. That is, the base target is for net revenue to equal instructional cost.

If through active management, the department is able to achieve net revenue in excess of 175 percent of course cost, 20 percent of the revenue above the 175 percent threshold is returned to the department as a revenue sharing incentive.

If net revenue exceeds 200 percent of course cost, 40 percent of the revenue above 200 percent is also returned to the department.

While for management purposes the cost and revenue for every section offered during the summer is provided to chairs and deans, it is essential to remember that the level of financial aggregation is the department. As such, it is entirely possible and perhaps essential that for curricular or pedagogical reasons a high-cost, low-enrolling, section

be offered during the summer. There are a few examples of this. Obviously, if every course offered by a department fails to meet the minimum expectation of generating net revenue at least equal to instructional cost, the department chair must reconsider the offerings, the modality of instruction, and the instructional cost.

M. Wolf: Maybe this policy shouldn't be followed as closely with what is going on this summer.

R. Elsenbaumer: I don't think we know what the summer has in store yet, but we can address this in the second part of the question and answer session.

S. Carr: Is it my understanding that chairs for Summer I will have some additional flexibility given the extraordinary circumstances that we are now in?

R. Elsenbaumer: Yes. I believe that you can achieve what you want to achieve and still meet the outcomes.

A. Livschiz: I understand the goal is to maximize profits. However, from an advising point of view it is very hard to tell if a class is going to survive or if we need several backup plans.

11. New business: There was no new business.

12. The general good and welfare of the University: There was no general good and welfare of the University.

13. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon  
Assistant to the Faculty

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**  
Ann Marshall  
Assem Nasr  
Jeffrey Nowak  
Mark Ridgeway  
James Toole  
Nashwan Younis

**Opposed**

**Abstention**

**Absent**

**Non-Voting**  
Craig Ortsey



MEMORANDUM

TO: James Toole, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Vincent Maloney, Chair, Curriculum Review Subcommittee *Vincent Maloney*

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.

|                 |                |                   |               |                   |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <b>Approved</b> | <b>Opposed</b> | <b>Abstention</b> | <b>Absent</b> | <b>Non-Voting</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|

Clare Cholewa  
 Seth Green  
 Teresa Hogg  
 Carol Lawton  
 Sarah LeBlanc  
 Haowen Luo  
 Vincent Maloney

Terri Swim

Jin Soung Yoo

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.

| <b>Approved</b>  | <b>Opposed</b> | <b>Abstention</b> | <b>Absent</b> | <b>Non-Voting</b> |
|--|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Dong Chen<br>Karol Dehr<br>Hui Di<br>Mark Jordan<br>Andres Montenegro<br>Michelle Parker |                |                   |               | Marcia Dixon      |

## **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 Clinical 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.

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.

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

Senate Document 19-24  
Postponed, 3/23/2020

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

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

DATE: 2/20/2020

SUBJ: Senate Document 19-24 and Procedures for Senate Curriculum Review Subcommittee and Graduate Subcommittee

---

WHEREAS, Senate Document 19-23 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 19-23 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 19-23 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**

Stacy Betz  
Zhuming Bi  
Steven Hanke  
Donna Holland  
Shannon Johnson  
Kate White

**Opposed**

**Abstention**

**Absent**

**Non-Voting**

Cheryl Hine  
Teri Swim

## 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.

### 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 if 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

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

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

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

### 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