

FORT WAYNE SENATE AGENDA
MONDAY
November 8, 2021
12:00 P.M., Via Webex

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 11 and October 25
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. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 21-14) – D. Moore
 - b. Athletics Report (Senate Reference No. 21-13) – R. Elsenbaumer
7. Unfinished business
8. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 21-7) – D. Holland
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 21-8) – S. Hanke
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 21-9) – S. Hanke
9. New business
10. Question time
11. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 21-11) – A. Marshall
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 21-12) – A. Marshall
12. The general good and welfare of the University
13. Adjournment*

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

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
B. Buldt				C. Ortsey
A. Livschiz				
A. Marshall				
A. Nasr				

J. Nowak
D. Tembras
N. Younis

Attachments:

“Memorial Resolution-David C. Brennan” (SR No. 21-14)
“Chancellor’s Annual Report to the Faculty Senate on Intercollegiate Athletics” (SR No. 21-13)
“Approval of Filling in of a Vacancy in the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee” (SD 21-7)
“Filling Membership of Advising Subcommittee” (SD 21-8)
“Proposed Elimination of June Degree Conferrals by Purdue University Fort Wayne following the conclusion of Summer Session One and Retention of Grade Submission following the conclusion of Summer Session One” (SD 21-9)
“Charge to Investigate and Recommend Policies for the Use of Brightspace Learning Management System (LMS) Data” (SR No. 21-11)
“Minutes of the Faculty Assembly of Purdue University Fort Wayne, September 17, 2021” (SR No. 21-12)

In Memoriam

David C. Brennan, January 13, 1933 - June 6, 2021

David C. Brennan, the first Director of Continuing Education on the combined Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne campus, passed away on June 6th, 2021. Born in New York State, David moved to Fort Wayne in the early 1960s and began his thirty-year campus career in 1967, as assistant to the Chancellor and Director of Continuing Education at what was then Indiana University Fort Wayne. In 1975, he assumed responsibility for Continuing Education programs at both IU and Purdue Fort Wayne, as the campuses joined to become IPFW. During his leadership as Associate Director, Continuing Studies offered 600 classes each year, both credit and noncredit, and worked with almost every company in Fort Wayne. Notable courses included a popular annual Education Workshop that featured nationally prominent speakers, as well as non-credit courses ranging from hot air ballooning to belly dancing.

In 1982, David joined IPFW's Student Academic Counseling Services, holding a variety of positions until being named director in 1991. He retired from IPFW in 1997.

David Brennan was active in the Fort Wayne Speakers Bureau, Anthony Wayne Rotary Club, and, in the 1970s, organized an IPFW faculty and staff softball team, with then Chancellor Schwartz serving as team pitcher. David received multiple awards from IPFW for his service, including the Ulmer Award in 1998, and is remembered for his kindness, for being instrumental in student success, and for the support he gave to his colleagues.

In response to SD 17-20, which calls for the establishment of goals and measures for athletics, it was discovered in the Faculty Senate archives that such measures and a method for reporting on such measures already exists in the form of SD 03-19. This document calls for an annual report by the Chancellor with set criteria and measures. The document calls for a report and presentation before the Faculty Senate each fall. Some of the measures called for are no longer relevant. If the Faculty Senate wishes to amend SD 03-19 to change or add other metrics, it may do so following the established faculty governance system. What follows is the report for academic year 2019-2020. This report contains a best-faith effort at addressing each metric and request. The intention of the Office of the Chancellor is to issue this report and present it to the Faculty Senate each fall.

The report also has attached the Athletics Departments Annual Report from that same year.

Chancellor's Annual Report to the Faculty Senate on Intercollegiate Athletics

2019-2020

As requested in SD 03-19 following is the Chancellor's Annual Report to the Faculty Senate on Intercollegiate Athletics for the academic year 2019-2020.

Metrics:

1. Percentage and dollar amount of athletic scholarships funded from IPFW administered scholarship funds.

Percentage of Athletic Scholarships compared to total scholarship funds: 23.3%

Dollar amount of Athletic Scholarships: \$2,296,231

Total University Aid: \$9,850,154

2. Percentage and dollar amount of athletic scholarships funded from the Chancellor's Merit Scholarship Fund.

This metric is now irrelevant as this type of scholarship has been eliminated. Academic Aid is awarded unrelated of Athletic Aid and therefore is not funding Athletic Aid.

3. Fees per credit hour used in support of intercollegiate athletics.

A student fee of \$8.91 per credit hour is used in support of athletics.

4. Percentage of total athletic budget funded by student fees.

Student fees fund 15% of total expenses.

5. Total dollar amount of costs of coaching staff and support personnel allocated to the general fund.

This metric is now irrelevant as a general fund subsidy is sent to athletic accounts. Determining how much of the subsidy is specifically attributed to salary and benefits cannot be determined.

6. Surplus or deficit in annual athletic budget as shown on the EADA report.

Surplus of \$268,644

7. Number of “major infractions” assessed by the NCAA in the past ten years.

The university has had one major violation in the last ten years. It was self-reported to the NCAA and was reviewed through the cooperative summary disposition process, with the infractions decision occurring on November 24, 2015. The university was given two years of probation and monitoring for the infraction. The probationary period was completed successfully, and the university has no current major infractions. For this year’s report we have included information on Secondary infractions as well. Secondary infractions are isolated and limited in nature and often inadvertent. Institutions are obligated to monitor their athletics programs and are required to report even the smallest of infractions. At Purdue Fort Wayne, we emphasize and cultivate a culture of self-reporting as we are committed to operating in a manner consistent with the letter and spirit of NCAA, Horizon League, MIVA and institutional rules and regulations. The NCAA considers an institution’s track record of self-reporting as a potential mitigating factor when deciding sanctions. Institutions that report no secondary infractions are scrutinized heavily. In 2019-20, we submitted 10 secondary infractions: two related to amateurism/NIL, one related to social media, one related to official visits, one related to male practice players, four related to practice activities, and one related to promotions/tryouts. As is common practice with secondary infractions, additional rules education was conducted as a result of these violations. When appropriate and required, a reduction in practice hours or recruiting opportunities, deletion of social media posts, and repayment of the value of the impermissible benefit to a charity also occurred.

8. Win/Loss records in the various sports offered.

1. As of July 19, 2021:

	Baseball			MBB		WBB		MSOC			WSOC			MVB		WVB		Softball			Department			Pct.
	W	L	T	W	L	W	L	W	L	T	W	L	T	W	L	W	L	W	L	T	W	L	T	
2020-21	11	35	0	8	15	1	22	3	6	0	3	5	1	6	9	10	7	12	27	0	54	126	1	0.30110497
2019-20	5	10	0	14	19	5	24	3	15	0	4	10	4	10	7	18	15	3	21	0	62	121	4	0.34224598
2018-19	7	45	0	18	15	7	22	10	8	1	4	12	3	17	12	18	14	10	39	0	91	167	4	0.35496183
2017-18	11	37	0	18	15	4	24	5	9	4	1	17	0	18	11	12	19	19	35	0	88	167	4	0.34749034
2016-17	9	43	0	20	13	5	24	9	9	0	3	14	2	5	23	13	18	12	36	0	76	180	2	0.29844961

9. Graduation Rates for the 6-year cohort period for student-athletes, with a comparison to the institution's graduation rate.

IPEDS Graduation Rate Surveys	<u>All Students</u>	<u>Athletes</u>
2013-2014 Cohort	39%	61%
4-class average thru 2013	31%	59%

10. Student-Athlete GPA for the most recent fall and spring semesters.

	<u>Student-Athletes</u>	<u>Student Body</u>
Fall 2019 GPA	3.21	2.79
Spring 2020 GPA	3.37	2.95

11. Attendance at athletic events.

Average single game attendance during season

Women's Basketball: 589
 Men's Basketball: 1,109
 Women's Volleyball: 390

Men's Volleyball: 448

Note: Attendance records are not kept for other sports and admission is free.

12. Gate receipts.

Total Ticket Revenue (four indoor sports)

2015-16: \$91,323

2016-17: \$260,937 (Includes \$170,644.75 from Nov. 11, 2016 Indiana game tickets)

2017-18: \$93,929

2018-19: \$91,691

2019-20: \$93,173

13. EADA comparable institution data, including gender-equity measures. The comparable institutions were selected based on their demographic, financial, and athletic similarity to PFW.

1. EADA – Comparable Institutional Data – all for 2019-2020

	Purdue Fort Wayne	Cleveland State	Northern Kentucky	Oakland	Wright State
FT UG Male Enrollment	2,568	4,247	3,447	5,267	3,297
FT UG Female Enrollment	2,782	4,791	4,715	7,151	3,863
FT UG Total Enrollment	5,350	9,038	8,162	12,418	7,160
Total Male Participants	176	186	120	149	110
Total Female Participants	152	208	135	201	150
Total Participants	328	394	255	350	260
Total Operating Expenses Men's Teams	\$969,266	\$1,129,326	\$1,130,979	\$939,792	\$857,258
Total Operating Expenses Women's Teams	\$745,664	\$853,561	\$887,789	\$998,820	\$605,649
Total Revenues Men's Teams	\$3,578,648	\$4,637,970	\$4,474,244	\$4,800,387	\$5,288,401
Total Revenues Women's Teams	\$3,133,389	\$4,442,474	\$4,319,682	\$5,457,203	\$4,244,196
Total Revenues not allocated by sport	\$ 5,527,560	\$4,114,441	\$3,347,834	\$4,659,945	\$2,570,111
Total Revenues	\$12,239,597	\$13,194,885	\$12,141,760	\$14,917,535	\$12,102,708
Total Expenses Men's Teams	\$3,578,648	\$4,749,771	\$4,474,244	\$4,800,387	\$5,288,401
Total Expenses Women's Teams	\$3,133,389	\$4,473,414	\$4,319,682	\$5,457,203	\$4,244,196
Total Expenses not allocated by sport	\$5,258,916	\$3,971,700	\$3,347,834	\$4,659,945	\$2,570,111
Total Expenses	\$11,970,953	\$13,194,885	\$12,141,760	\$14,917,535	\$12,102,708
Men's Teams Head Coaches	7/50%	8/47%	6/46%	7/44%	6/50%
Women's Teams Head Coaches	7/50%	9/53%	7/54%	9/56%	6/50%
Men's Teams Assistant Coaches	14/48%	17/49%	13/43%	21/53%	11/52%
Women's Teams Assistant Coaches	15/52%	18/51%	17/57%	19/47%	10/48%
Men's Teams Athletically Related Student Aid	\$1,219,621	\$1,564,462	\$1,197,152	\$2,082,108	\$1,355,687
Women's Teams Athletically Related Student Aid	\$1,287,428	\$2,037,850	\$1,749,447	\$2,922,013	\$1,633,361
Men's Teams Recruiting Expenses	\$63,710	\$105,753	\$90,719	\$54,565	\$54,326
Women's Teams Recruiting Expenses	\$59,265	\$80,727	\$57,928	\$46,963	\$70,544
Men's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Head Coaching Position	\$46,685	\$76,662	\$111,616	\$106,030	\$121,017
Men's Number of Head Coaching Positions Used to Calculate the Average Salary	7	8	6	7	6
Men's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Full-time equivalent (FTE)	\$54,466	\$106,660	\$148,821	\$141,105	\$156,825
Men's Sum of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions Used to Calculate the Average	6	5.75	4.5	5.26	4.63
Women's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Head Coaching Position	\$46,196	\$54,718	\$64,654	\$69,098	\$69,566
Women's Number of Head Coaching Positions Used to Calculate the Average Salary	7	9	7	9	6

Women's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Full-time equivalent (FTE)	\$53,895	\$72,957	\$82,287	\$82,918	\$77,583
Women's Sum of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions Used to Calculate the Average	6	6.75	5.5	7.50	5.38
Men's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Assistant Coaching Position	\$18,060	\$39,770	\$40,835	\$31,007	\$60,709
Men's Number of Assistant Coaching Positions Used to Calculate the Average Salary	12	14	10	15	8
Men's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Full-time equivalent (FTE)	\$26,756	\$45,451	\$60,497	\$64,508	\$73,254
Men's Sum of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions Used to Calculate the Average	8.1	12.25	6.75	7.21	6.63
Women's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Assistant Coaching Position	\$19,526	\$30,520	\$27,523	\$29,299	\$44,446
Women's Number of Assistant Coaching Positions Used to Calculate the Average Salary	11	15	14	14	8
Women's Average Annual Institutional Salary per Full-time equivalent (FTE)	\$26,517	\$38,150	\$40,137	\$51,145	\$48,180
Women's Sum of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions Used to Calculate the Average	8.1	12	9.60	8.02	7.38

Part II. NCAA Financial Audit Report - Review of findings

2017-18 Audit (most recent available)

The audit found no exceptions to compliance with NCAA Financial Audit Guidelines.

The report also included the following statistics:

Total revenues	\$12,239,597
Total expenses	\$11,970,953
Net revenue	\$268,644

Part III. Athletics Certification Self-Study Report (2004, completed every 10 years). The NCAA ceased its Athletic Certification process in in April of 2011.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: Donna Holland, Chair
Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: September 22, 2021

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 is one vacancy on the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee; and

WHEREAS, Wylie Sirk (School of Education) is a Senator and is 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.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Deborah Bauer			Hui Di	Marcia Dixson
Talia Bugel				
Bin Chen				
Donna Holland, Chair				

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Steven A. Hanke, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee

DATE: 10/11/2021

SUBJ: Filling Membership of Advising Subcommittee

WHEREAS, SD 21-1 amended the Bylaws to establish an Advising Subcommittee under the Educational Policy Committee; and,

WHEREAS, The membership of the Advising Subcommittee per Bylaws Section 5.3.3.2.3.8.1.3. includes six members of the Voting Faculty or continuing lecturers, who have advising responsibilities, elected by the Senate in such a manner that all Major Units that perform student advising shall be represented and,

WHEREAS, Committee and Subcommittee elections normally take place in April; and

WHEREAS, the Senate believes that the important work of the Advising Subcommittee should begin immediately;

BE IT RESOLVED, that SD 21-1 be amended in the following manner.

BE IT RESOLVED a new Advising Subcommittee be formed, supervised by the Educational Policy Committee, as provided for in the following addition to the Bylaws:

5.3.3.2.3.8. Advising Subcommittee

5.3.3.2.3.8.1. Membership: The Advising Subcommittee shall consist of

5.3.3.2.3.8.1.1. The Chief Academic Officer or a designee (nonvoting);

5.3.3.2.3.8.1.2. Two academic advisors from the Office of Academic Accountability and Student Success;

5.3.3.2.3.8.1.3. Six members of the Voting Faculty or continuing lecturers, who have advising responsibilities, elected by the Senate in such a manner that all Major Units that perform student advising shall be represented:

5.3.3.2.3.8.1.4. One student.

5.3.3.2.3.8.1.5. The Presiding Officer of the Senate shall request the Executive Director of Academic Accountability and Student Success to create a process for selecting the academic advisors and the Student Government to select the student representative.

5.3.3.2.3.8.2. Responsibilities: Responsibility for administering the advising program shall reside with the Executive Director of Academic Accountability and Student Success, assisted by the Subcommittee, which shall report to the Faculty through the Educational Policy Committee. Specifically, the Subcommittee shall:

5.3.3.2.3.8.2.1. Analyze assessment data from the Office of Academic Accountability and Student Success.

5.3.3.2.3.8.2.2. Recommend to the Senate and to the Chief Academic Officer policies related to the campus advising program.

5.3.3.2.3.8.2.3. Conduct an ongoing review of the goals and operations of the program, with biennial reports and recommendations to the Educational Policy Committee and the Chief Academic Officer as appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Nominations and Elections Committee conduct an election for the Voting Faculty or Lecturer membership of the Advising Subcommittee as soon as practicable; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, pursuant to Section 5.1.3 of the Senate Bylaws, the six Voting Faculty or Lecturer members of the Advising Subcommittee shall serve staggered terms, two for the term December 2021-August 2022, two for the term December 2021-August 2023, and two for the term December 2021-August 2024; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Nominations and Elections Committee shall randomly assign which Voting Faculty or Lecturer members of the Advising Subcommittee chosen in this special race shall serve which terms, starting with the two members serving the December 2021-August 2024 term, then continuing with the two members serving the December 2021-August 2023 term, and concluding with the two members serving the December 2021-August 2022 term.

Approved

Hosni Abu-mulaweh
Stacy Betz
Patricia Eber
Steven Hanke
Ann Marshall
Kate White

Opposed

Abstention

Absent

Non-Voting

Cheryl Hine
Terri Swim

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: Steven A. Hanke, Chair of the Education Policy Committee
DATE: 09/27/2021
SUBJ: Proposed Elimination of June Degree Conferrals by Purdue University Fort Wayne following the conclusion of Summer Session One and Retention of Grade Submission following the conclusion of Summer Session One

WHEREAS, conferral of degrees at the end of Summer Session One was an Indiana University policy; and

WHEREAS, Indiana University student teachout has concluded and no additional Indiana University degrees will be conferred by Purdue University Fort Wayne; and

WHEREAS, Purdue West Lafayette's Office of the Registrar has requested the Fort Wayne campus align with the timing of Purdue systemwide degree conferrals with awards granted only in December, May and August; and

WHEREAS, some courses offered within the first six weeks of summer offerings serve as pre-requisites to courses offered to PFW and IUFW students later in the summer semester;

WHEREAS, When situations occur in which a student completes an undergraduate degree or other requirement during summer session that is required to begin a graduate program later in the summer session, for the interim period until summer degrees are conferred, the registrar's office can provide official documentation verifying the student has completed those requirements;

BE IT RESOLVED, Purdue University Fort Wayne will confer degrees in December, May and August and cease to confer degrees in June;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, When needed to begin a graduate program prior to the conferral of summer degrees, the registrar's office will provide documentation that a student has completed the relevant degree program earlier in the summer; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Purdue University Fort Wayne's Office of the Registrar will continue to request final grade submissions from instructors for class sections ending within the first six weeks of summer class offerings in order for pre-requisite checking to be undertaken for summer courses offered later in the summer semester.

Approved

Hosni Abu-mulaweh

Stacy Betz

Patricia Eber

Steven Hanke

Ann Marshall

Kate White

Opposed

Abstention

Absent

Non-Voting

Cheryl Hine

Teri Swim

MEMORANDUM

TO: Erika Mann, Chair
Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee

CC: Steven Hanke, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

CC: Mark Jordan, Chair
University Resources Policy Committee

FROM: Ann Marshall, Chair
Executive Committee

DATE: October 22, 2021

SUBJ: Charge to Investigate and Recommend Policies for the Use of Brightspace Learning Management System (LMS) Data

WHEREAS, Purdue Fort Wayne faculty implemented Brightspace as its Learning Management System for the fall 2020 semester; and

WHEREAS, while Brightspace generates a variety of data regarding faculty and student use of the software, the feature making this data accessible has not yet been fully activated within Brightspace; and

WHEREAS, it has been proposed that the Brightspace data feature be activated; and

WHEREAS, Vice Chancellor Carl Drummond recently met with Educational Policy Committee (EPC) members seeking faculty input on creating policies about the appropriate use of Brightspace data; and

WHEREAS, EPC members recommended that the Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee (ACITAS) be charged with this investigation because of the technical knowledge required; and

WHEREAS, Brightspace data has both: 1) potential pedagogical value in helping faculty enhance their teaching, and 2) has the potential to make public otherwise private data about faculty use of Brightspace that could be used counter to faculty interests regarding classroom teaching; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that ACITAS be charged to investigate and recommend policies and/or procedures for use of Brightspace Learning Management System (LMS) data, including to:

1. Review the data collection and data sharing options within Brightspace.
2. Investigate best practices for making Brightspace data available. This may involve seeking faculty input and/or contacting faculty experts at Purdue Fort Wayne and/or more broadly.
3. Based upon the principles of faculty governance (SD 16-26), recommend a series of practices, policies and/or procedures in the form of either a report and/or Senate resolution that considers both the potential benefits of the data and the potential for the data to be used counter to faculty interests.
4. Consider policies that may (or may not) include, but are also not limited to: a) anonymizing data, b) making certain categories of data either available or not available to particular users or audiences, and c) possible faculty opt-in or opt-out procedures for data sharing.
5. Submit the ACITAS report and/or resolution, including the approval of URPC and the inclusion of any URPC adjustments, to EPC by March 1, 2022; and

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that EPC review this report and/or resolution, making any revisions and/or additional recommendations, with a target date to submit this report and/or resolution to the full Senate by the Senate document deadline of March 25th, 2022.

Senate Reference No. 21-12

To: The Fort Wayne Senate

From: Ann Marshall, Chair of the Executive Committee

Date: October 22, 2021

Subj: Minutes of the Faculty Assembly of Purdue University Fort Wayne,
September 17, 2021

Please see the item below for the minutes of the Faculty Assembly of Purdue University Fort Wayne that took place on September 17, 2021.

Minutes of the
Faculty Assembly of
Purdue University Fort Wayne
September 17, 2021
Via Webex

J. Nowak: Welcome to the Purdue University Fort Wayne town hall. Can everybody hear me okay?

N. Younis: Yes.

J. Nowak: Thank you. We are hosting this meeting today on WebEx. It is being held to discuss the implementation of the Civics Literacy Requirement required by the Purdue Board of Trustees. My name is Jeff Nowak. I am the presiding officer of the Purdue University Fort Wayne Faculty Senate. I would like to call this meeting to order. The date is September 17th, 2021. The time is 1:30 PM.

Please stop and keep your video camera turned off to save bandwidth, and please know that this meeting is being recorded. As this is an assembly and not an official meeting of the Senate, everyone, including guests are invited to participate, but no official business of the Senate will be done. As presiding host of this meeting, I will serve as a neutral party, but given the concerns raised about the topic at hand, we request all questions and comments be made by raising your hand in Webex and responding to the presiding host, myself, only when recognized. You may also post comments in the chat, and those comments may be shared on the main screen via a Google document that I will show in a second. In an effort to be courteous and collegial, direct dialogue between participants should be avoided and all comments should be provided their due respect.

Serving as presiding point of contact, or MC if you will, is Ann Livschiz. She may be called upon more often than others to respond to comments or questions raised on this topic. Your participation in today's meeting is greatly appreciated. We thank you for your engagement as we seek to ensure that Purdue University Fort Wayne is the very best university possible for the benefit of our student body and our greater community.

At this time, I would like to show you the different tabs of what I have available for us by sharing Google Chrome. In the first tab that is pinned, we have the email document that was sent out by Josh Bacon, and this of course has the link that you clicked on to get to this meeting. In another tab, I have the Purdue University Board of Trustees minutes from June 11, 2021, in which the approval of the Civics Literacy Proficiency graduation requirement was made. In the next tab, I have the Civics Literacy Proficiency implementation plan that we received from our Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Carl Drummond. That was produced and distributed on August 23rd, 2021. I also have a link to the Purdue University Board of Trustees minutes, but those are identical to the minutes that I have in a PDF. It is just that this is a website. I also have

a link to the Civic Literacy Proficiency website that was shared in the email from Josh Bacon. I do have a Google doc so that if somebody put something up in the chat that they would like shared then we can copy and paste it here for everyone to see, perhaps more easily.

In the next tab, I have the Senate Document 20-60 from the Purdue University Senate. I also have a document which talks about and was distributed on the AAUP listserv about Senate Document 20-60, where the University Senate passed the reaction to the Purdue Board of Trustees overreach on the topic being discussed today. In the last tab, I have the newsletter from Purdue University's University Senate, and it refers back to the need to demonstrate Civics Literacy through shared governance, Senate Document 20-60. But, again, we do have the document available in the comments from the AAUP.

So, with that, I'm going to return back to our original document, shared by Josh Bacon. I am going to go ahead and introduce Ann Livschiz, who is our MC, also over in Illinois right now. She is doing us a favor by taking time out of a very private matter to serve the better interests of our university. Ann, please share, if you would.

A. Livschiz: That was quite an introduction. The only thing that I want to add to what Jeff already said is that we recognize a lot of the concerns that faculty may have about this situation. This was sprung on us in June. We found out about it because it was put on the agenda. There was no advance notice given to our campus. I guess we can consider ourselves fortunate that we were able to get a one year reprieve from implementing this plan. We hope that this assembly is really the first time that we as a campus have to discuss this particular issue. Obviously, we hope that in addition to the concerns that may be raised, we can also start strategizing about the kinds of things that we might want on our campus that are different from what Purdue West Lafayette is already doing in order to try to make the best of this situation that has been forced upon us by the decisions of the Board of Trustees. If we find ourselves in a situation where this meeting is not sufficient to address all of the concerns, we can then think about whether we need additional opportunities either to express concerns or to solicit feedback. If you know of somebody who wanted to attend and was not able to attend, please encourage them to contact anybody on the Executive Committee, including me, Jeff, or Nash, and share their concerns, so that they can be incorporated into whatever plan we put together. I look forward to having a good productive discussion.

J. Nowak: Thank you, Ann. That is very appreciated. I don't see anything posted in the chat just yet. Does anybody have a question or comment or would like to raise their hand and have the floor?

M. Wolf: I have a point more toward as we move forward. The website says their goals of civic literacy, from what I notice from working on this area, is that the proficiency activities talk about increasing awareness of political issues and engagement and objects for civic participation, but the Purdue activities don't include any civic engagement or campus government engagement, club engagement, and other things. So, I think we should get away from this model here, and

obviously the course based component, I am good with that, but we need to include other kinds of aspects of civic engagement that actually do take place on this campus and off campus where students are often included. I don't know if it wasn't included in the Purdue approach because of the scale of their campus and the nature of their campus, but here I know there are a ton of civic engagement activities. So that this would be less top down, you have to go to this event, you have to watch these podcasts, and be filled by actually what the literature shows to be very informative about civic engagement and producing a very civic kind of activity life that can be engaged in. I would just like to say that. Also, I don't know why Purdue Global is not included in this. It is an accredited university of Purdue University. That is a side complaint.

A. Livschiz: There is one more thing that I forgot to mention and Mike's excellent comments made me think on it. As you may have seen in the email we sent out, the required test has already been created. We have not seen it yet. We hope to soon. However, given the fact that the three Purdue pathways are so drastically different, it is clear that the test cannot possibly be tied to any specific class or any specific activity. I think that that means that the pathway that Mike proposed, the pathway that involves civic engagement, could be an excellent opportunity for our students and something unique and special that we can provide for our students that can be more meaningful. Thank you.

S. Buttes: Two points. One is that there seems like there are two major issues that we have to work out. One being what the content of this is going to be, and the other being the process by which we actually develop that. It seems like those are two different questions that need to be worked out. The other point I wanted to make is Mike's question about Purdue Global, it is not actually part of Purdue. It is not considered part of the university by university definitions and by state law, it is not a state educational institution, so I think that is probably the reason why. They are called trustees, but it is really a board of directors. It is a different place.

A. Livschiz: I would just like to address Steve's concern. Steve, I don't know if you had a chance to see one of the documents that was included in the packet, that is the guidelines from Purdue West Lafayette. We actually don't have that much room to experiment with different ways of developing the process. The process is relatively prescribed for us by Purdue West Lafayette. If we seriously object to it than that is something that we may be able to talk about, but I don't know how much room we have on that and that is why we are kind of emphasizing the content part because that is the part at least on paper that we have been given leeway with.

J. Nowak: Thank you, Ann. Other thoughts or comments? There is nothing else in the chat and currently there are no hands raised.

A. Livschiz: There are questions in the chat. Jeff, can you see them?

J. Nowak: Yes, I posted them. Does everybody see those shared in your screen? The first question is what resources might be appropriate to ask for as we move forward on the board's

mandate? The second question is has the Board of Trustees responded to the Purdue West Lafayette Senate's recent rebuke regarding the civics requirement? David, you have the floor.

D. Schuster: Hello. This is David Schuster and I have a question about motivation. For me, having the civic requirement come to PFW feels like it is being foisted upon us, and there is great irony, if not hypocrisy, with the idea that we are supposed to develop a civics thing for something that seems most uncivic to me. So, I was wondering if anyone has heard anything coming from administration that might give me hope that this is going to be something other than foisted upon us.

J. Nowak: The floor is open for anyone to respond.

D. Schuster: Well, I am a little disheartened by the silence. So administration has not made any overtures as saying they are going to provide money or course releases or anything to allow the faculty to develop the requirement that we are being now told to do?

A. Livschiz: Obviously, I am not in the position to make any promises about what may come next from Purdue West Lafayette. Carl, I don't want to put you on the spot, but I wonder if maybe you would feel comfortable kind of addressing the question of resources a little bit.

C. Drummond: Well, first, I think we have to recognize the campus has an opportunity, it may be even an opportunity that we didn't intend to have, and maybe some of us wish we didn't have this opportunity. But, we do have an opportunity, and that is to determine how this campus will respond to this requirement through the creation of locally designed and locally approved selectives.

Additionally, we have an opportunity through two representatives to have a long-term impact on how this requirement is assessed, evaluated, and revised over time. So where we are at this moment is that the local campus administration, the chancellor and I, are committed to the faculty having the opportunity to do these two things, to respond in the form of the selectives that you as a collective feel are the most important to this campus, and in the participation and long term management of this requirement. How you do that is up to you.

My recommendation to the Executive Committee has been sort of a two-step thing. The first step would be to form an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate that would address the immediate need of identifying a faculty representative to attend the system wide meetings along with Dean Badia, who is the administrative representative. Secondly, to have the subcommittee populated with people who would commit to the effort of identifying what those selectives would be for this campus and achieving approval from the Fort Wayne Senate and the Board of Trustees prior to implementation next academic year.

I think we got the cart before the horse if we are going to begin the conversation with resources because it is not clear to me what resources will be needed. Obviously, this is a trustee

requirement and so if resources are needed to meet that requirement then the campus as an independently budgeted entity will have to identify where those resources will come from and how they will be dispersed. But, at this moment, it is not clear to me what resources are needed other than people's time, energy, and effort. We do not typically give course releases for university committees and we anticipate that that would be the case here.

Beyond that, I think that it is really critical that we understand collectively that if this campus doesn't put forward a set of local selectives that are approved by the Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees prior to the start of next academic year then the default is that we fall back to those selectives that have been approved for the West Lafayette campus, that is the courses, the specific courses, and the C-SPAN videos, and some form of participation in campus events, which seems improbable that our students would travel to West Lafayette to hear speakers. That is the situation we find ourselves in, as challenging or unpleasant as that may be, there is a task to do, and the sooner we get on with the doing of it then the better the outcome will be in terms of true learning for our students.

I would like to address one other thing that Mike brought up, and that is the nature of the activities that will be approved. I strongly encourage the Executive Committee to invite Dean Reingold and Trustee Brouillette to come and speak to this campus about what will or won't work for the trustees. It was made very clear to me in the call with the provost that this requirement has great potential to devolve into partisanship, and so there was a great deal of effort in conversation on the Lafayette campus, that I think this campus was largely ignorant of at the time, about which courses and what types of activities might be appropriate. I think Mike correctly identified that there is a clear focus on sort of constitutional fundamentals, rather than agency or participation or advocacy. I don't think that the trustees are likely to change that position, so the sooner we hear from those two individuals, and understand those boundaries better, I think the better the work will be that is done on this campus.

A. Livschiz: I just wanted to follow up on two of the things that Carl said to get clarification. I understand Carl's point about wanting to know what it is that we are going to do before finding money for it. I think the reason that the resource question is being asked early in part is also for faculty to gauge how ambitious and innovative they should try to be because there is a simple way of solving this, and there is a much more resource intensive way of solving it and ultimately if people spend time developing great ideas, but there is no resources for them, I think it is fair for people to know that ahead of time.

My other follow up question was, if you can just clarify, I know that ultimately everything we do is subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, but are you saying that they could potentially do a line item veto, like we submit a list of classes at our campus that can count, they may go through and cross out some of the classes, or if we list types of activities then maybe they go through and cross out types of activities that we approved, or will they just disapprove of the whole document if there is anything objectionable in what we forward to them, they will just veto the whole thing and we go back to having to follow the Purdue model?

C. Drummond: Well, after seven and a half years on this job, I have learned to try to not predict the actions of the trustees, so I think that that is a question that has to be posed to Dean Reingold and Trustee Brouillette. I don't know. I just know that the provost was adamant that the selectives that were chosen for the Lafayette campus were chosen particularly to avoid classes and activities that were aligned with activism and those sorts of aspects of civic engagement. I can't speak to it any better than that was how it was conveyed to me. I don't know what they will do if they find things objectionable. I would hope that we would engage with Dean Reingold and Trustee Brouillette throughout this process so that we don't end up taking something to the trustees that they have any discomfort with.

J. Toole: I have a few thoughts. I think I generally have the same understanding that Carl has. It is probably because I worked on this, of course, as presiding officer, late last year. What I mean is that I think I have the same general understanding as Carl in terms of how much leeway we might have. The point I would like to make is this, I think we have the power to change the selectives, but presumably not the power to change other fundamental features of this, such as the scope of the project or indeed probably the specific definition of civics literacy that is being used. I would advocate a pragmatic approach to doing whatever we can to customize this for our campus without engaging in a prolonged battle with the Board of Trustees that we may well lose by being forced back on Purdue's selectives.

Jeff, I am wondering if you could open up a new page, if you don't mind. I was going to talk about the definition that is on Purdue's website. It is under that tab "Introduction to Civics Literacy," Civics Literacy Study and Resource Guide in bold and underlined right in the middle of the page. Click on that and we get to "What is Civics Literacy?" This seems to be the working definition in here. I am not telling anyone what to do but it would be my recommendation that we probably follow the definition that has already been established, rather than try to open a whole debate about "what is civics literacy?" That could risk wasting months and having the BOT tell us that we can't do that. Just looking at this definition, it really is all about understanding how government works and developing a knowledge of civics in the United States. It is that, rather than, for example, learning how to be more civil and how we communicate with one another. So, really, it is knowledge of civics, and you see the definition here. It is learning how to stay informed, understanding governmental processes, and knowing how to exercise the rights and obligations of citizenship. It also says we have to have an understanding of the local and global implications of civic decisions.

I would also point out two other things. The broad objectives stated by the BOT is that students demonstrate a fundamental understanding of civics. Again, that is learning about how government and politics work. The test itself, the one that we haven't seen yet, which is a bit of a problem, is described as a civics knowledge test. I assume that is really testing our knowledge of civics. I mean look at the twelve podcasts that are one of the paths that Purdue West Lafayette students can take. Those two are very much focused on knowledge of government and politics.

I will just wrap up by saying that I am fully aware that I am a political scientist. Of course, I want students to learn about government and politics. I recognize that it may annoy some people a lot to hear a political scientist pushing strongly for students to learn about the things that I and my colleagues teach. However, I am saying this not to protect turf, but rather to say that I think if we want a pragmatic approach to this, one that can actually create selectives that are ours, then we may be better off working from their definition and focusing on the selectives, rather than opening up broader debates. Thank you very much.

M. Wolf: I guess I am in sort of agreement with Jamie because I am pragmatic on this as well. It is just that there is a level of confusion. That is why I asked what are the parameters here, because when they state the civics literacy proficiency activities will increase understanding of important contemporary political issues, identify opportunities to grow your engagement in American politics, expand your awareness and options for civic participation, those are going in an engagement direction, and it doesn't have to be advocacy here. They are saying what these activities and outcomes are supposed to be, and they don't fit with the definition that Jamie just read. So, I am asking, how much freedom do we have to re-operationalize that definition to what we would really be doing because their actual definition, like Carl said, may be leaning more toward constitutional understanding and basis' like that, which I understand and have no objection to. But, that is not where their civics literacy proficiency activities outcomes are supposed to be, which is actually on the previous page, right at the top of the things that proficiency will do, not that we have to debate this right now and figure this out. That is supposedly the outcomes, but the definition doesn't fit that. I want to know how much freedom we have to really use a definition and then operationalize our activities behind that or how much are we going to be running into a bus on.

J. Badia: With all due respect to the provost at Purdue West Lafayette, I want to underscore what a lot of people already mentioned in the chat, which is that the idea that we are going to teach about American democracy while avoiding activism seems naïve at best and also contradictory to their own proficiency guide. When you look through that guide, and it specifically says that knowledge about the 19th amendment is important to proficiency and civics literacy, you can't possibly talk about the 19th amendment and avoid the question about activism and political based activism, in particular. All of that is to say, my thinking on this is we put forward what we want and what we believe reflects the structure that they have set up for us and we make the argument for why what we want to do works and fits with the goals that they have outlined, rather than immediately just shying away from things that they may have inclination not to want to accept. I am kind of astonished that anybody could actually make the argument that you can teach about civics and not talk about activism. That is just me. As the administrative lead on this on our campus, I will reflect the interests of our campus, but I want people to think about the possibility that we go forward with what we want and what we value and then work to make the arguments for why that makes sense, rather than just immediately shut off possibilities.

J. Malanson: I want to echo Jamie and Mike's piece about pragmatism, while also echoing Mike and Janet's recommendations about trying to design this to achieve the goals we want to achieve.

I think the one thing we all want to keep in mind as we are doing this though is that the graduation requirement here is two-fold, it is participation in the selectives and it is passing this nebulous test that we haven't seen yet. At one point, the test was described as being similar to or analogous to the citizenship test that they give to people going through the naturalization process. I don't know how much it still looks like that. I think there was some pushback on that piece of it, but I think we want to make sure that whatever we are putting together as a cohesive whole well prepares students to pass that test on the first try so that we are not overly burdening our students more so than the existence of the requirement already does add an additional burden to our students. I think selectives that engage in civic engagement and activism are certainly going to be critically important pieces if we are really about this not just as "do you understand what old dead white men did back in the 1700s," but can you also meaningfully apply that today. I also do think that we want to make sure that we are being attentive to what students need for being able to pass that exam.

E. Ohlander: I don't know if anyone can answer this question. It would have to be somebody with insight into the Board of Trustees in creating this requirement and maybe our counterparts in West Lafayette. I am trying to wrap my head around this requirement in relation to, for example, this is not as germane to us here as it is for the student population in West Lafayette in relation to the experience of international students. I am trying to get a sense of how, at the discussion of the West Lafayette level, this national parochial graduation requirement might impact experience or in some way, input, and might create some type of questions of the experience of international students. Can anyone speak to that?

J. Nowak: The floor is open. I see no hands raised just yet. I see no hands raised to respond to the question on the floor. Ann L., would you like to respond?

A. Livschiz: I don't think I can respond to that question. But, since there was a pause, what I wanted to say is that if people have other suggestions or other ideas besides the one that Mike is proposing, for example, kind of the engagement path, I just think the more ideas that we can collect today the better. There are obviously a couple of different interpretations right now about whether we predetermine visibility or not, but I think it would be great to get to hear more ideas from people if they have ideas or suggestions for the kind of things they have included, for example, I think it would be great if our campus' requirement included a module on the history of the creation of this particular requirement. I think that that would be, regardless of what we end up with in the end, a good lesson in a lot of things for students. It might also help them understand why they have to jump through this hoop that they previously didn't have to jump through. That is just kind of one suggestion. But, if other people have ideas, especially ideas for different pathways that we could possibly explore, I think that would be great.

A. Nasr: I am just wondering, could we possibly think about existing courses that could fit in the general education that we could probably tweak, some of our courses to the extent that they fit in multiple categories or what not? How can we use this to our advantage in the sense that it doesn't add more work per se, but it actually helps us better adjust our curriculum?

A. Livschiz: Purdue West Lafayette has a list of courses that have been approved and you can access that list of courses off of their civics requirement website. Some of those courses have counterparts here, some of them do not. Of course, because we are in the Purdue system, if one of those courses we don't currently have but we want to have, we can obviously bring it here. But, my understanding, at least it was until Carl mentioned that the board could veto anything and everything, was that we could come up with our own list of classes and that is part of the long-term strategy for implementation of this requirement on our campus, and that there would have to eventually be a standing committee that would be responsible for reviewing proposals for classes that would be added to this list, presumably assessing whether the classes still meet that requirement. I was under the impression that this was one of the areas that we did have at least some leeway in figuring out which classes that are already taught may work for this requirement. Again, I want to emphasize the fact that students don't have to take any class and the fact that the classes on the Purdue West Lafayette list are so different. I don't think that there is any reason to really worry about whether any activity that we provide will prepare students for the test because there is absolutely no way that all the pathways that Purdue West Lafayette has, and all the courses that they have, can possibly equally prepare them for that test unless that test is just so completely simplistic that there is nothing there. That may be the case, but I think that the test cannot possibly be specifically tied to any course.

J. Toole: Just a quick point. I think what Ann just said is very interesting and probably worth keeping in mind. It is true that if you look at the three pathways that West Lafayette created, just following any one of those pathways is not necessarily going to help you pass the test. You still need to pass the test, but maybe we can envision the test as being at least somewhat separate from whatever pathways or selectives we create, and the one I am thinking of, specifically when looking at West Lafayette's pathways, is the one where you can go to six events, and we all know, I have served on a lot of panel discussions, many of you have as well. Panel discussions or other types of events, movies and subsequent discussions, or whatever they are, are wonderful and teaches us a whole lot. You go to six of them and you might get hardly anything out of those six that directly help you pass the test. That is not necessarily a bad thing, I suppose. We know the students are going to have to pass the test, but we also know we have freedom in designing our own selectives. So, if we have one or more selectives that won't necessarily contribute to passing the test then that may not be a bad thing and it would seem to be consistent with what West Lafayette has already done.

N. Virtue: I don't have a specific suggestion, but I just wanted to point out that when you look at the definition that Jamie was just discussing about what civic literacy means and the definition that was provided by Purdue. and then you look at their suggested list of courses, there is a disconnect in terms of the global aspect and the international aspect. So, on their list of suggested courses, there is nothing seemingly that addresses any kind of global component. I am just making that observation. Obviously, I am not loving this requirement and the way it was imposed, but as we move forward on implementing it on this campus, I would just hope that we

could find a way to somehow include a more substantive global component and I have no idea what that would look like, but I just thought I would mention it.

S. Buttes: I am sorry that I still don't understand this point, is part of the trustees' mandate for the students to take the exam or not take the exam? Jamie's point maybe asked that question again. Pathways, but with the pathway they have to take the exam in addition to whatever selection of pathways we might come up with? Sorry that I don't have clarity on this, but I am confused again.

J. Nowak: Ann, would you like to respond on clarity? Or Carl? Or anyone?

A. Livschiz: Sure. I am all about clarity. The test is an absolute requirement, and it is a graduation requirement. In order to graduate from Purdue West Lafayette, students that came in this fall and on. For our students, it will be starting next fall and on. They have to have passed that test. But, in addition to the test, they have to do one of the pathways. So, at Purdue West Lafayette, it is three pathways and they have to do one of those. In theory, the idea is that you do a pathway and then you take the test. I think that because of how different the pathways are, I do not see how it is humanely possible for every pathway to bring a student to the same level, as far as the test is considered. Both are necessary, but we don't necessarily have to think of pathways as specifically a way to get students into the test. But, I think we have a little bit more leeway in being creative in thinking about ways that we come up with things that might be better suited for our students. That is part is my personal opinion. The first part is facts.

C. Drummond: Maybe I can provide a little historical context. Initially, the proposal was just to have the test and one of the outcomes of the extended debate was that the West Lafayette Senate wanted, encouraged, demanded, I don't know what, wanted the inclusion of classes and these selective pathways, and that ultimately became part of what the trustees approved even though the Senate ultimately did not approve the plan as implemented. The idea for the selectives came from the Lafayette faculty.

I don't believe that there is any idea that they have to be sequentially linked that you would complete all six of your events or you participate in all twelve of the C-SPAN videos prior to taking the test. I think a student could come in on the first day of classes and study the study guide and maybe pass the test and be done with it for the next four years. I don't think that they are linked in any way. That is not necessarily a good or bad thing. That is just the way it is set up for now. They are not connected.

S. Betz: One idea is that if it turns out that the test is not necessarily required for attendance at these events then maybe including it as part of the freshman success class that many departments have would be one way to ensure that at least a large portion of our student body completes and passes the test without much additional logistical hoops for them to jump through.

S. LaVere: I am just wondering if West Lafayette has developed the way that they are going to try to track the students' participation in various pathways. Obviously, the test, if the student takes it and then passes it then that is recorded, but what is the plan for keeping track of whether they complete the pathways?

C. Drummond: The course based selectives obviously can be evaluated based upon transcript. They have a way of tracking participation in the C-SPAN modules. What I do not think they have at all right now is a swipe card system or something that is linked to events, and they don't have anyway, as I understand it, of having as a reflection component of events participation. But, then again, that is something that I think Dean Badia's participation and the elected faculty members' participation in the system wide group, they would probably learn more about that implementation quicker than anyone.

J. Badia: So, this actually is a question I have for Senate leadership. One of the things that I have been trying to figure out is if I should start moving ahead to get information from Purdue West Lafayette, do what I can do on my end, I have been kind of waiting to see who the faculty representative is going to be so that I can work in concert with that person, what is your timeline for next steps, in terms of keeping this moving forward and getting the committee populated and the faculty representative selected?

A. Livschiz: The committee generally agreed that we really didn't want to move forward until we had a chance as a campus, at least a preliminary conversation about this question. We also just received the guidelines from Purdue West Lafayette and so it sounds like the next step prescribed by West Lafayette, with some modifications as specified by Chancellor Drummond, would be for us as the Senate Executive Committee to have a conversation about it and I assume that the next step would be for us to reach out to the Nominations and Elections Committee and start moving in that direction. What I was going to say is that the end of this would be for the people that are interested in this to please keep an eye out for the call for nominations because while I know that we spent a fair amount of time talking about all the limitations that have been placed on us, ultimately we really want to make sure that people who are interested and invested in making the best out of this particular situation will self-nominate and will run for the positions on the ad hoc committee so that we can have a group of people that can take on the challenge of trying to develop the requirements within the constraints of West Lafayette, but also with some of the suggestions that have been made at this forum and ensure other suggestions that people may have emailed are given to you or the Executive Committee or whoever.

N. Borbieva: So, I keep coming back to this resource issue and already in the course of our conversation I see a couple of things in which we really are going to need resources. The question about tracking, all of those are complicated things that will require software that we will require staff and members from already overburdened units to take on new processes. Also, the

test itself, because that is coming from West Lafayette conceivably, unless we are getting it from the U.S. government, I don't know, somebody has to write it. I am assuming there is going to be somebody with a computer generating program that gives you the questions randomly. Both are going to cost money. We know that West Lafayette will probably want to charge us for that. In thinking about next steps, I really want to ask/beg our administrators who are working with our top level people in West Lafayette to go to those people and please try just to ask for some resources. We are going to need some resources to put this into effect. I know that that could possibly impact our independence, which I have concerns about that, but I want us to be able to do what we want to do. We are going to need some help.

A. Livschiz: I just wanted to express my appreciation to Vice Chancellor Drummond, who came, but also to all the faculty and staff who came, and for all the great suggestions that you gave. Obviously, we are going to save all of this. This is going to be really great material, both for the Senate Executive Committee and for the eventual ad hoc committee to use as a starting point for their work.

J. Nowak: Thank you for that, Ann. That is a great segue. It sounds like we have wrapped up well. I will save this document. I will download all of our chat and we have a recording of this entire meeting, so we have all of the comments. We will use all of this information to help us move forward. There is one other comment here from Steve Buttes that you can see there. There is a model for tracking student attendance and participation in international events, so we will look into that. With that, folks, have a great Friday evening and a great weekend. Thank you so much for participating. Your engagement is truly appreciated. Have a great weekend.