

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Fourth Senate
Purdue University Fort Wayne
January 10, 2022
Via Webex

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 13
3. Acceptance of the agenda – A. Marshall
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Deputy Presiding Officer – N. Younis
 - b. IFC Representative – A. Livschiz
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Nowak
6. Special business of the day
 - a. Purdue West Lafayette Senate Update – T. Cooklev
7. Unfinished business
8. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-13) – A. Marshall
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-14) – A. Marshall
 - c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-15) – A. Marshall
9. New business
10. Question time
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 21-24) – A. Nasr
 - b. (Senate Reference No. 21-25) – A. Nasr
 - c. (Senate Reference No. 21-26) – A. Livschiz
11. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 21-21) – S. Johnson
 - b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 21-22) – S. Johnson
 - c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 21-23) – S. Johnson
 - d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 21-27) – A. Marshall
12. The general good and welfare of the University
13. Adjournment*

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

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

Attachments:

- “Amendment to the Bylaws-Lecturers and Related Matters” (SD 21-13)
- “Amendment to the Constitution-Definitional Changes (e.g., Lecturers and Secondary Effects)” (SD 21-14)
- “Review of Sabbatical Application Process” (SD 21-15)
- “Question Time – re: Professional Development Account Funds” (SR No. 21-24)
- “Question Time – re: Faculty Research Funds” (SR No. 21-25)
- “Question Time – re: Dean of Students Office Restructuring” (SR No. 21-26)
- “Music Minor in Music Industry” (SR No. 21-21)
- “Bachelor of Applied Science with a Concentration in Industrial Engineering Technology” (SR No. 21-22)
- “Bachelor of Applied Science with a Concentration in Construction Management” (SR No. 21-23)
- “Reminder about Faculty Committee and Subcommittee Minutes” (SR No. 21-27)

Senate Members Present:

J. Badia, D. Bauer, S. Betz, Z. Bi, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, M. Cain, B. Chen, Z. Chen, S. Cody, K. Creager, K. Dehr, Y. Deng, A. Downs, C. Drummond, P. Eber, B. Elahi, R. Elsenbaumer, R. Friedman, M. Hammonds, S. Hanke, D. Holland, V. Inukollu, P. Jing, S. Johnson, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, C. Lawton, J. Leatherman, J. Lewis, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, D. Maloney, A. Marshall, G. Nakata, A. Nasr, I. Nunez, J. O’Connell, E. Ohlander, M. Perkins Coppola, M. Ridgeway, W. Sirk, A. Smiley, T. Soule, H. Strevel, D. Tembras, N. Virtue, L. Whalen, N. Younis, Y. Zhang, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

H. Di, M. Gruys, K. Gyi, J. Mbuba, A. Pinan-Llamas, G. Schmidt, R. Shoquist, D. West, S. Wight

Guests Present:

N. Adilov, A. Blackmon, M. Ball, N. Borbieva, K. Burtnette, J. Cashdollar, R. Clark, F. Combs, K. De Leon, S. Ding, A. Dircksen, M. Dixson, C. Erickson, M. Frye, M. Helmsing, D. Hoile, M. Kelsey, S. Koorsen, C. Kracher, C. Kuznar, T. Luce, J. Malanson, C. Marcuccilli, S. Randall, K. Smith, T. Swim, T. Lewis, K. Wagner, M. Wolf

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Nowak called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of December 13: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

A. Marshall moved to accept the agenda.

Agenda approved by voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Deputy Presiding Officer:

N. Younis: Happy New Year colleagues,

I hope everyone spent safe, relaxing, and rejuvenating time with family and friends over the holidays.

Thank you for the one-time service appreciation payment of up to \$1,200 last November. It is a start and I hope this is the year that we tackle the merit increase and pay raise for faculty and staff.

Certainly, we cannot and should not ignore the cost of living and inflation adjustment issues any more. It has been a long time since we communicated to the faculty and staff the metrics to get a merit raise.

In conclusion, rewarding deserving faculty and staff with pay raises can go a long way in boosting morale and improve retention. We really need both.

Have a safe semester.

b. IFC Representative:

A. Livschiz: Welcome back!

I hope that everyone had a restful and safe winter break.

The start of every semester is exciting as it brings us new students as we embark on the process of teaching and learning. But the excitement of a new semester is tempered by our continued public health reality. We continue to operate under “temporary” COVID guidelines. I want to express appreciation to the university for the provision of masks and especially hard to find rapid COVID tests. But we are still not in great shape—we have no incentive system for vaccinations, we have no information about our vaccination rates, and we continue to operate as if we think that this huge social and political issue is going to resolve itself without our participation.

Secondly, I want to draw everyone’s attention to SD 21-15. We need to have a serious conversation about our current sabbatical application process, and I hope we can do that today. It is crucial that we ensure that our policies—in

this case policies related to one of the few remaining research-release times—
are fair and transparent.

I hope everyone has a great teaching week!

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Nowak: I trust and hope everyone had a wonderful Holiday Break! I look forward to serving you as Presiding Officer this semester, and I encourage you, as always, to please reach out to me and/or others on the Executive Committee should you have any questions, concerns or any other matters in which we may help. This concludes my remarks as Presiding Officer.

6. Special business of the day:

- a. Purdue West Lafayette Senate Update – T. Cooklev

Rescheduled for February Senate meeting.

7. Unfinished business: There was no unfinished business.

8. Committee reports requiring action:

- a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-13) – A. Marshall

A. Marshall moved to approve Senate Document SD 21-13 (Amendment to the Bylaws-Lecturers and Related Matters).

A. Downs moved for unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Resolution passed.

- b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-14) – A. Marshall

A. Marshall moved to approve Senate Document SD 21-14 (Amendment to the Constitution-Definitional Changes (e.g., Lecturers and Secondary Effects)).

A. Downs moved for unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Resolution passed.

- c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-15) – A. Marshall

A. Marshall moved to approve Senate Document SD 21-15 (Review of Sabbatical Application Process).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

9. New business: There was no new business.

10. Question time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 21-24) – A. Nasr

In August 2021, PFW faculty received [an email from the Office of Academic Affairs \(OAA\)](#) stating that due to budgetary constraints, professional development account (PDA) funds will not be available for faculty to use for conferences or related travel unless a faculty submits an appeal that require processing on three levels: (1) the academic unit chair's approval (2) the college dean's review, and (3) the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for a final decision. Under our current extenuating circumstances (pandemic and low-enrollment), it is expected that the university takes such measures.

1. Could there be a more efficient appeals process for faculty to use so as not to go through multiple hoops?
2. Could there be a set of criteria that departments and/or Senate can develop to ensure that the appeals process is fair to all faculty who apply for funding?
3. As the pandemic enters its third year and since there are no tangible indications of financial growth, what plans are there for reinstating funds toward scholarly activity/events to foster professional development for faculty?
4. What assurances could you give faculty that current PDA conditions and processes will not be the norm moving forward?

R. Elsenbaumer: Following are responses to the questions:

1. No changes to current practice are planned. The current process for the approval of faculty professional travel requests was purposefully designed to ensure that recommendations for funding are reviewed at multiple levels. The Office of Academic Affairs has received no feedback (prior to this question) that the current process is lacking in efficiency.
2. The Senate is welcome to craft a set of criteria that could inform resource allocation decisions. Such criteria, if created, would of course be advisory in nature. The Office of Academic Affairs has received no feedback (prior to this question) that the current practice has been in any way unfairly administered.
3. Reinstating robust funding for faculty professional travel during fiscal year 2022-23 is a high priority for the Office of Academic Affairs and, as such, has been a topic

of discussion among the VCAA, the VCFAA, and myself as preparations are being made for next year's budget.

4. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs sincerely affirms that there are no intentions to have the limitations currently placed on faculty professional travel become a normative occurrence in future years.

A. Nasr: Thank you to the Chancellor for the response. It is encouraging that there are still plans in providing funding to faculty and no limitations at least due to budget cuts or what have you. Other than that, I was not aware that this is the first time that it has been brought up to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs or to the Chancellor. Thank you for inviting us to create a plan and run it by you. I think that it is incumbent upon us to move forward with this. Thank you.

S. Betz: Just a clarification question. If faculty wish to request professional development funds for this year, is the option to file an appeal, as outlined here through the chair and dean and vice chancellor, still available for the remainder of the spring semester?

R. Elsenbaumer: I would say that that would be the normal process that you should use for your request.

b. (Senate Reference No. 21-25) – A. Nasr (from an anonymous faculty member)

Faculty research grants for summer were slashed significantly this academic year. For example, there was only funding for 2 summer grants, yet 22 applied. The only other active summer grant is the Collaboration Grant. Once again, colleges and departments faced limited TT or CL lines. When allocating the academic year budget, what percentage of funding is being pulled from faculty, department, and college support to subsidize administrative offices programs?

How does administration plan to re-allocate funding for faculty research and TT lines, given the significant cut from the budget this year? And if there are no plans to re-allocate funds for faculty research, then how does the administration intend to deal with low faculty morale prior to the cuts as well as after the cuts?

R. Elsenbaumer: The anonymous author of this question is perhaps somewhat misinformed.

My understanding is that a total of 19 applications for junior faculty summer research grants were received for funding in summer 2020. A total of five of those applications were funded. Initially, only four awards were budgeted, but upon review of the number of applications received, funding for an additional fifth award was reallocated from other OAA sources. These awards provide \$8,000 in summer salary as well as associated fringe benefits.

This year, applications for senior faculty summer research grants were not accepted. Historically, the Purdue Research Foundation provided funds in support of junior faculty summer research awards. That funding source unfortunately no longer exists. As such, all PFW summer grant resources were directed toward junior faculty. It has been a long-standing goal of OAA to provide funding for at least one-half of anticipated summer grant applications. That funding ratio will continue to be a budgetary goal for fiscal year 2022-23.

The call for a collaborate research grant was recently issued. This year, one \$15,000 award is planned.

The Office of Academic Affairs continues to be committed to investing in faculty lines. This fall, 13 new tenure track positions were funded along with eight clinical/professor of practice positions, and five continuing lectures. Of these 26 positions, 19 were conversions of visiting faculty, a practice that will likely continue in the future.

Currently, for fall of 2022, a total of nine new searches have been approved. Eight are for tenure track positions and one is for a clinical/professor of practice position.

The pandemic has indeed affected morale at universities across the country, and Purdue Fort Wayne is no exception. It is up to each of us, at all levels of leadership, to do our part to create and ensure an environment that is stimulating, productive, and rewarding.

A. Livschiz: I am not sure if I heard correctly, did the Chancellor say that the pool of funds from Purdue West Lafayette that was used to give grants to faculty on our campus has been pulled? Was that a one-year decision? Is this a permanent decision? If I heard it correctly, it seems kind of a big deal and this is the first we are hearing of it.

R. Elsenbaumer: I do not have direct knowledge right now whether or not that is a permanent or temporary approach in terms of not providing support to junior faculty research awards. We will have to confirm that. Perhaps Carl has some further information on that, but I don't.

C. Drummond: This is the second year that that funding has not been available. We were able to cover a normal number of grants the first year. We were less able to do so this year. There is no prospect that that sort of funding will be reinstated.

A. Livschiz: This seems like a huge deal. If Purdue West Lafayette is pulling research funds from us, is this Mitch making good on his promise that we shouldn't be doing research? This is a huge change in past practices. It is particularly striking since according to the various emails we receive from Purdue West Lafayette, they are in such great financial shape that they are giving out merit raises, which means that they

can't be using financial issues as the reason for pulling this, which means that it is an ideological choice. This seems really bad.

R. Elsenbaumer: I certainly don't have any additional information to provide, only because I am not familiar with the history here, with respect to the Purdue Research Foundation providing funds to the campus. My experience from previously would be that typically we don't look for money from other sources other than our own, so I don't know. Clearly, we have enjoyed some additional funds coming this way, but I don't know what the Purdue Research Foundation had in mind when it made this decision. We certainly could find out.

J. Badia: It may be that the Chancellor just answered my question, which was, what justification was provided to us and at what time did Purdue make that decision? It sounds like maybe none was, but I guess I am wondering if we did ask why the change happened and why the money was withdrawn.

R. Elsenbaumer: Again, I don't have any firsthand knowledge on this. I don't know if Carl was given any rationale for this change.

C. Drummond: I don't want to just speak, so I will check with Connie and get back with the Senate.

N. Virtue: I just want to kind of build on Janet and Ann's comments. When the administration can't answer a basic question like this about what happened to funding sources, it gives the impression that there is not really strong advocacy for faculty research funds on this campus. That is very demoralizing. I just want to say that there were comments at the last Senate meeting about faculty morale, and this is the kind of action that I actually think would be meaningful in lifting faculty members morale. If we could believe that the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs was advocating for faculty research and faculty resources then I think that would really help. The emails telling us we matter are nice, but honestly, actions speak much louder than words. I just wanted to take this opportunity to say that that would be an opportunity to demonstrate advocacy in faculty interests. Thank you.

c. (Senate Reference No. 21-26) – A. Livschiz

In the October senate meeting, in response to the question about restructuring of the Dean of Students office, we were told that changes were happening and there would be a new name for the office and an announcement about it. We were also told that there were no plans for hiring a Dean of Students. Given the important role that the office, and in particular, the dean of students, is supposed to play in the advocacy for students, could we please have an update on the status of the office, name change for the office, and how the work responsibilities of the Dean of Students will be handled in the newly restructured (and renamed) office.

R. Elsenbaumer: During the last two months, the Dean of Students Office has completed the hiring of two new staff members, Alec DeVries as the Assistant Director and Shellie Campbell as the Administrative Assistant. The office is now fully staffed and is going through onboarding and training.

Through the staffing transitions, the priority has been to focus on students and the availability of services, ensuring there has been no interruption in serving students, faculty, staff, and the campus community. The name change for the office is expected to roll out during the next New Student Orientation cycle — prior to beginning in Summer 2022.

We anticipate the office being fully rebranded with new marketing materials and online information beginning Fall 2022.

The Dean of Students Office will continue to offer all resources and services that have previously been a part of the office. Various responsibilities of the office include COVID-19 reporting, CARE referrals, Student Code violations, academic misconduct violations, student complaint procedures, intakes for Title IX, sexual misconduct, bias, harassment, retaliation, and discrimination-related incidents.

If you have any questions regarding the office, please contact Abby Blackmon, Director of Student Conduct and CARE.

S. Buttes: I was wondering if we already know what the name of the office is going to be? I ask this only because we went through the catalog last year and made a ton of revisions here in the Senate. These changes are going to now require us to go back and revise all of the work. They usually redo the document that we already approved just last spring. I think it was an April meeting when we did that. I am just wondering if we know what the name is going to be so that we can begin the process of making those updates so that if there is new branding for academic year 2022-23 then the catalog for academic year 2022-23 reflects what is the reality on the ground.

K. Creager: The answer is yes, sort of. I say that somewhat jokingly. We are in the last phase of socializing a couple of different naming options with students because we undertook this renaming with their lens and that lens in mind, that they had the ability to be a bit more forthcoming about what the office was and all of the other reasons that we have discussed with you all. We also will be in discussions with the Student Affairs Faculty Senate Subcommittee on that as well. I would say at this point we are to a short list.

Note taken about the edits that will need to be made to the code. We are fully aware of that. We will present those again when able. The same with the catalog, as we move forward with the next academic year's edits and changes.

A. Livschiz moved for unanimous consent to give speaking privileges to Mike Wolf.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

M. Wolf: My concern here has nothing to do with the people involved in this. I really look forward to hearing about the best practices that might be happening around the country and moves to restructure offices like this.

My real concern is that the Dean of Students is like an airline pilot that has to deal with so many things going on with students, including their health, their financial situation, and their academic aspects. Obviously, the responsibilities and the conduct are part of it, but this person is really in charge of protecting students' rights in a bunch of situations of imbalance of rights, and so the Office of Dean of Students is one thing, but this is a person that is vested with independent power from the other institutions on campus in order to provide students their rights.

I think it is really troubling to not have a vested person that is protected and not an at will employee. This has nothing to do with the people that are hired. Institutionally, that is not protected against any pressure that might come within Student Affairs, within Academic Affairs, and with the professors who might be at each other's throats and putting students in the middle.

There are a lot of situations when students really need somebody who has the authority and independence to be able to really advocate for students. I am afraid that this new model, unless we can explain how this is going to be vested in this office, is really leaving students without the rights part and only concentrated on the responsibilities too much.

R. Elsenbaumer: My recommendation would be that we take that under consideration, but I am not sure that the practices on this campus actually had what I would consider to be a Dean of Students in that position the way Mike described. I don't know that that person was necessarily considered to be an independent individual or not an at will employee. But, we will take that under consideration.

M. Wolf: As I said, there might be moves around the country in which this is best practices and I welcome that. I don't question anybody and their intentions here, but historically we did have a Dean of Students who was actually a faculty member and protected by tenure. In addition, recently when we had a campus crisis and restructuring, the Dean of Students, who was an independent actor then, moved also and took on some responsibilities of the Student Affairs side. That kind of blurred the lines here. I am just looking for an answer of how we have a vested institutional office and officer who will be independent of any downward pressure and will protect students' rights.

R. Elsenbaumer: I think we should take that under advisement.

A. Livschiz: I wanted to reiterate Mike's concerns and also to add my concern about the phrase "take it under advisement." With all due respect, that phrase means

nothing in this context. It has been made clear that we are at the branding stages of the process. It is hard for me to understand how we can provide the same level of service if we have gotten rid of a bunch of senior people and replaced them with brand new people. I am very concerned about this loss of independence.

As Mike pointed out, there used to be a Dean of Students and there used to be a Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. When George McClellan retired, it was announced that we wouldn't have a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs anymore because the Dean of Students would take on those responsibilities. Then when that person left, we did a search for a Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and there wasn't going to be a Dean of Students. Then a Dean of Students materialized. Then a Dean of Students disappeared. Then another person from that office disappeared.

There have just been a lot of really weird shifts within that particular area. With all due respect to the branding issue, we have an Office of the Dean of Students, but no Dean of Students. This is extremely confusing for students. Apparently, this is just going to stay in place until students are socialized into a new name, whatever that means. It is just very troubling.

Again, it is clear that it makes no difference what we say on this particular issue because all of the decisions have been made, but I just want to go on record that there are some serious concerns with how this is being handled and some faculty are very troubled by these developments. I guess we will see how it all plays out.

11. Committee reports "for information only":

- a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 21-21) – S. Johnson

Senate Reference No. 21-21 (Music Minor in Music Industry) was presented for information only.

- b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 21-22) – S. Johnson

Senate Reference No. 21-22 (Bachelor of Applied Science with a Concentration in Industrial Engineering Technology) was presented for information only.

- c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 21-23) – S. Johnson

Senate Reference No. 21-23 (Bachelor of Applied Science with a Concentration in Construction Management) was presented for information only.

- d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 21-27) – A. Marshall

Senate Reference No. 21-27 (Reminder about Faculty Committee and Subcommittee Minutes) was presented for information only.

12. The general good and welfare of the University:

A. Downs: As the Senate will recall, in the fall semester there was a document that created an ad hoc civics literacy proficiency committee to address the issue that was mandated by the board of trustees. That document called for a draft plan to be ready by January 7. I am happy to announce that on January 7 the ad hoc committee did vote on a document and it passed. We are to the point where we are ready to begin the public forum portion of what that document calls for. I know that Ann Marshall had suggested January 31 as a possible date. I know enough members of the ad hoc committee can attend on the 31st at noon. Without officially announcing that's when a public forum will be held, I think I am unofficially announcing that a public forum on the draft plan regarding the civics literacy proficiency requirement will be held on January 31st at noon. Thank you very much.

J. Nowak: Thank you, Andy. I think I was unofficially asked to potentially host a meeting on January 31st at noon, so Andy, I am sure we can discuss what the needs are there and if I can be of assistance or not.

13. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:46 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon
Assistant to the Faculty

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Ann Marshall, Chair of the Executive Committee

DATE: November 21, 2021

SUBJ: Amendment to the Bylaws--Lecturers and Related Matters

WHEREAS, Purdue University updated and [supplemented](#) its policy ([VI.F.4](#)) concerning lecturers in AY 2019-2020; and

WHEREAS, these policy alterations, among other matters, replaced the term “continuing lecturers” with “lecturers” and allowed for lecturers to be promoted to “senior lecturers”; and

WHEREAS, these policy changes were fully implemented at PFW by the end of AY 2019-2020; and

WHEREAS, these policy shifts created anachronisms in the language of the Bylaws; and

WHEREAS, neither the Constitution nor the Bylaws contains explicit instructions concerning the selection process for the elected representative of the continuing lecturers; and

WHEREAS, some questions on these matters have arisen in recent months that the Executive Committee believes should be addressed; and

WHEREAS, there is a conflict between the Constitution and Bylaws concerning how special meetings of the Senate may be called;

BE IT RESOLVED, that, except as explicitly noted below, all mentions in the Bylaws of “continuing lecturers” be replaced with “lecturers”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section 2.8 of the Bylaws be amended to read as the following:

“2.8. ~~Affiliations of~~ **The** elected representative of the ~~continuing~~ lecturers

2.8.1. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, all references to “lecturers” in these Bylaws shall apply to both lecturers and senior lecturers.

2.8.2. All lecturers are eligible to vote for, and be elected to, the position of elected representative of the lecturers.

2.8.3. The term of office of the elected representative of the lecturers shall be three years, beginning one week before the start of regular fall classes following election. When necessary, the Nominations and Elections Committee shall conduct this election among the lecturers so that the name of the incoming elected representative of the lecturers shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate on the same schedule as that of incoming Senators. Should a vacancy in the position of the elected representative of the lecturers occur, the Nominations and Elections Committee shall immediately hold an election among the lecturers for any remaining time in that term.

~~2.8.1.~~ **2.8.4.** The elected representative of the ~~continuing~~ lecturers shall be considered a member of the academic department to which the most service is assigned, and the Major Unit to which that academic department is assigned. If the representative of the ~~continuing~~ lecturers serves in more than one unit, the representative shall be counted as a member of the unit to which the most service is assigned; an elected representative of the ~~continuing~~ lecturers who serves equally in two or more units shall inform the Chief Academic Officer, prior to the annual certification, of the unit in which the representative wishes to be counted.

~~2.8.2.~~ **2.8.5.** As stated in the Constitution (VII.A 4.), the elected representative of the ~~continuing~~ lecturers does not count toward an academic unit's apportionment.

~~2.8.3.~~ **2.8.6.** The elected representative of the ~~continuing~~ lecturers shall be eligible to serve on all Senate committees and subcommittees, but may not vote on issues regarding promotion and tenure for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Senate or in committee.”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the first sentence of Section 4.1. of the Bylaws be amended to read as the following: “The Secretary shall distribute agendas and minutes of all Senate meetings and convocations to all members of the Faculty ~~and continuing lecturers.~~”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the first sentence of Section 2.1.2. of the Bylaws be amended to read as the following: “Special meetings of the Senate shall be held upon petition by twenty percent of the **Voting** Faculty, by forty percent of the Senate, or by action of the Executive Committee.”

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Ann Marshall, Chair of the Executive Committee

DATE: November 21, 2021

SUBJ: Amendment to the Constitution--Definitional Changes (e.g., Lecturers) and Secondary Effects

WHEREAS, the definitional article of the Senate Constitution has included the academic rank of “lecturer” for many years; and

WHEREAS, this notation refers to a category that the Purdue system replaced with a university staff classification called “continuing lecturer” in AY 1998-1999; and

WHEREAS, [SD 02-5](#) amended the Senate Constitution to state that continuing lecturers are “associate members of the faculty” but did not remove “lecturer” from that document, leaving that term active; and

WHEREAS, [Purdue Policy VI.F.4](#) on lecturers was updated and [supplemented](#) in AY 2019-2020 to, among other matters, replace the classification of continuing lecturers with lecturers and permit their promotion to senior lecturer; and

WHEREAS, one effect of this policy change has been to make all references to “continuing lecturers” in the Constitution anachronistic; and

WHEREAS, another impact of this shift has been to make it impossible to choose a replacement for the elected representative of the continuing lecturers (see [SD 14-33](#)) since there are no more continuing lecturers at PFW; and

WHEREAS, the term of the current elected representative of the continuing lecturers ends at the conclusion of the present Senate term; and

WHEREAS, a third consequence of this policy update has been that lecturers have technically been treated as members of the PFW “faculty” for the purposes of faculty governance since it was fully implemented on this campus at the end of AY 2019-2020 (see [Senate Constitution](#) Sections I.C. and I.D.); and

WHEREAS, while Purdue Policy VI.F.4. does classify lecturers and senior lecturers as staff, it also contains language that permits units to treat individuals in these classifications as faculty for the purposes of faculty governance in their “bylaws”; and

WHEREAS, the Senate cannot simply replace every reference to “continuing lecturers” with “lecturers” in the Constitution without creating a logical paradox (i.e., lecturers being defined as both faculty in Section I.C. of the document and associate members of the faculty in its Section I.F.); and

WHEREAS, according to the current [certification of the faculty](#) (as authorized by Section II of the Constitution) and the [faculty-staff directory](#) in the 2021-2022 PFW undergraduate course catalog, instructors of all ranks are treated as members of the voting faculty; and

WHEREAS, there is no provision in the Constitution that explicitly authorizes this practice; and

WHEREAS, according to the current faculty-staff directory, there are five active instructors at PFW (two clinical instructors, two instructors, one senior instructor); and

WHEREAS, according to the current faculty-staff directory, the academic rank of “affiliate librarian” has fallen into desuetude; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee believes that there are instances in the Constitution where the distinction between faculty and voting faculty is not as clear as it should be; and

WHEREAS, there is a conflict between the Constitution and Bylaws on the conditions under which special meetings of the Senate can be called;

BE IT RESOLVED, that, except as explicitly noted below, all instances of the term “continuing lecturer” in the Senate Constitution be replaced with “lecturer”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section I.C. of the Constitution be amended as follows: “Positions of academic rank shall include professor, librarian, associate and assistant professor or librarian, instructor, **senior instructor**, ~~affiliate librarian~~, and lecturer, **and senior lecturer.**”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section I.E. of the Constitution be amended as follows:

“The Voting Faculty shall consist of those full-time members of the Faculty and those faculty who are on partial retirement, who are not enrolled in an undergraduate degree program at PFW nor in a graduate degree program in their home department and who:

1. Are tenured or hold tenure-track appointments in units subject to those powers of the Fort Wayne Faculty detailed in Section VI, below, and perform duties at least half of which consists of teaching or other creative/scholarly work; or
2. Are tenured or hold tenure-track appointments with the rank of librarian, ~~or~~ **associate librarian, or assistant librarian, or affiliate librarian**; or
3. Hold the rank of assistant, associate, or full clinical professor; **or**
- 4. Hold the rank of clinical instructor, instructor, or senior instructor.**”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section I.F. of the Constitution be amended as follows: “Associate Members of the Faculty shall consist of emeritus, ~~continuing lecturers~~, and visiting members of the Faculty and persons who have academic appointments but who are not Faculty. These individuals shall have the privilege of attending Faculty assemblies and convocations, but shall not possess the right to vote **during Faculty Convocations** ~~except for the elected representative of the continuing lecturers.~~”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the last sentence of Section II of the Constitution be amended as follows: “Changes in the eligibility of individuals to vote, speak, or stand for elective office shall be effective immediately, but the January certification shall apply in defining the size and distribution of the **Voting** Faculty for procedures such as establishing a quorum, establishing a given fraction of the **Voting** Faculty, and apportionment.”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section IV.C. of the Constitution be amended as follows: “At any Faculty Convocation, any item may be brought up for discussion, and the Senate, the chief administrative

officer of PFW, the President, and the Board of Trustees of Purdue University may be petitioned for action by the convened Voting Faculty. **Only members of the Voting Faculty and the elected representative of the lecturers may vote on such petitions.**”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section VII.A.1.g. of the Constitution be amended as follows: “Additional members of the **Voting** Faculty selected **as Senators** according to procedures in this Article”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the first sentence of Section VII.B.2.b. of the Constitution be amended as follows: “*Special Meetings*. Upon petition by twenty percent of the **Voting** Faculty **or forty percent of the Senate**, a special meeting of the Senate shall be called within a time limit determined by the Bylaws adopted by the Senate.”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the first sentence of Section VIII.A.2. of the Constitution be amended as follows: “The review power shall be exercised by an Academic Personnel Grievance Board elected by the **Voting** Faculty.”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Section VIII.B.1.a. of the Constitution be amended as follows:

“1. Senate actions shall be subject to review and check by the **Voting** Faculty through the following two procedures:

a. At any Convocation of the Faculty, past actions of its Senate may be brought to the floor for discussion. If a majority of those present **and eligible to vote** so direct, the Senate must reconsider its action at its next regular meeting.”; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that these amendments become effective immediately upon Senate approval and ratification by the Voting Faculty in a referendum.

MEMORANDUM OF RESOLUTION

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: A. Marshall
Executive Committee

DATE: December 6, 2021

SUBJ: Review of Sabbatical Application Process

Whereas, PFW faculty have been working in a climate of ever-increasing work responsibilities, which for many faculty have limited their ability to devote appropriate time to research;

Whereas, PFW faculty have been working under significant budget constraints, which reduced their ability to attend conferences and short research trips; and

Whereas, the sabbatical time has been up till now the main option for many faculty to set aside time for their research; and

Whereas, during the review process of sabbatical applications by Professional Development Subcommittee (PDS) in Fall 2021, an unprecedented number of applications (6) were not recommended for a sabbatical, with the VCAA choosing this opportunity to follow the recommendations of PDS, despite overturning their recommendations in the past; and

Whereas, after all the sabbatical applications were submitted, the VCAA met with PDS to offer them suggestions for how they should review the applications; and

Whereas, PDS developed a set of criteria to evaluate sabbatical applications after sabbatical applications were already submitted based on “instructions from the VCAA,” and selectively using wording from SD 06-14, in some cases taking words out of context; and

Whereas, there appears to be an inconsistency in how many years of past productivity PDS considered; and

Whereas, faculty who submitted their sabbatical applications had no idea that PDS would be creating its own criteria after the applications were already turned in; and

Whereas, this process violates established practices of PDS where applications and evaluation rubrics are closely aligned and made available to applicants ahead of time, as is the case with Summer Research Grant Applications; and

Whereas, SD 06-14 states that “each department or division should establish specific criteria for the granting of sabbatical leaves that will serve as the basis of evaluation for applications coming from that department or division, and that are consistent with the above guidelines”; and

Whereas, the actions of PDS and the VCAA appear to be in violation of SD 06-14 as well as past practices of PDS; and

Whereas, these actions have caused tremendous stress for affected faculty, and a great deal of work for many members of the campus community; and

Whereas, the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is the parent Committee of PDS and FAC is responsible for being “concerned with the responsibilities, rights, privileges, opportunities, and welfare of the Faculty, ...” (Bylaws 5.3.2.2.); and

Whereas, the Executive Committee considers this charge to FAC to warrant Faculty Senate deliberation at a Senate meeting;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Affairs Committee undertake a review of the role that Office of Academic Affairs procedures or lack of procedures played in the way PDS carried out its review of sabbatical applications in Fall 2021; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Affairs Committee undertake a review of the way PDS carried out its review of sabbatical applications in Fall 2021; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Affairs Committee make appropriate revisions to SD 06-14, such as clarifying the role of the VCAA, clarifying the role of PDS, clarifying the process for determining criteria for evaluation, determining whether department criteria still have primacy, and any other matters that will prevent any confusion and therefore unnecessary stress for faculty in the future; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that FAC submit its recommendations and/or policy revisions to the Executive Committee by the March 25, 2022 document deadline so that any updated policies can be implemented in fall of 2022.

Question Time

In August 2021, PFW faculty received [an email from the Office of Academic Affairs \(OAA\)](#) stating that due to budgetary constraints, professional development account (PDA) funds will not be available for faculty to use for conferences or related travel unless a faculty submits an appeal that require processing on three levels: (1) the academic unit chair's approval (2) the college dean's review, and (3) the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for a final decision. Under our current extenuating circumstances (pandemic and low-enrollment), it is expected that the university takes such measures.

1. Could there be a more efficient appeals process for faculty to use so as not to go through multiple hoops?
2. Could there be a set of criteria that departments and/or Senate can develop to ensure that the appeals process is fair to all faculty who apply for funding?
3. As the pandemic enters its third year and since there are no tangible indications of financial growth, what plans are there for reinstating funds toward scholarly activity/events to foster professional development for faculty?
4. What assurances could you give faculty that current PDA conditions and processes will not be the norm moving forward?

A. Nasr

Question Time

Faculty research grants for summer were slashed significantly this academic year. For example, there was only funding for 2 summer grants, yet 22 applied. The only other active summer grant is the Collaboration Grant. Once again, colleges and departments faced limited TT or CL lines. When allocating the academic year budget, what percentage of funding is being pulled from faculty, department, and college support to subsidize administrative offices programs?

How does administration plan to re-allocate funding for faculty research and TT lines, given the significant cut from the budget this year? And if there are no plans to re-allocate funds for faculty research, then how does the administration intend to deal with low faculty morale prior to the cuts as well as after the cuts?

A. Nasr (from an anonymous faculty member)

Question Time

In the October senate meeting, in response to the question about restructuring of the Dean of Students office, we were told that changes were happening and there would be a new name for the office and an announcement about it. We were also told that there were no plans for hiring a Dean of Students. Given the important role that the office, and in particular, the dean of students, is supposed to play in the advocacy for students, could we please have an update on the status of the office, name change for the office, and how the work responsibilities of the Dean of Students will be handled in the newly restructured (and renamed) office.

A. Livschiz

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Ann Marshall, Chair
Executive Committee

DATE: December 6, 2021

SUBJ: Reminder about Faculty Committee and Subcommittee Minutes

WHEREAS, the work of Senate Committees and Subcommittees is essential to the success of faculty governance at PFW; and

WHEREAS, meeting minutes facilitate effective committee work, especially given the rotation of committee members and leaders each year;

WHEREAS, [Guidelines for minutes of Senate committees and subcommittees \(S.R. No. 97-1\)](#) explain committee minutes in detail; and

WHEREAS, an example of sub/committee minutes is available at:
<https://www.pfw.edu/committees/senate/meetings/committee-minutes/2017-18/EC%20Minutes%2020180329%20revised.pdf>

BE IT RESOLVED, that sub/committees are asked to be in compliance with the Bylaws, which state that committees “shall keep minutes available to all members of the Faculty” (5.1.4); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that each sub/committee submit its minutes to Josh Bacon at bacojs01@pfw.edu for posting on the [Committee Minutes](#) section of the website on at least a semiannual basis.