

FORT WAYNE SENATE AGENDA
MONDAY
December 9, 2019
12:00 P.M., KT G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 11 and November 18
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Toole
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. IFC Representative – J. Nowak
 - b. Deputy Presiding Officer – J. Toole
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – A. Nasr
6. Special business of the day
7. Unfinished business
8. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-9) – K. Dehr
 - b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-10) – K. Dehr
 - c. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 19-12) – G. Schmidt
9. Question time
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 19-20) – A. Livschiz
 - b. (Senate Reference No. 19-24) – A. Livschiz
 - c. (Senate Reference No. 19-25) – C. Erickson
 - d. (Senate Reference No. 19-27) – L. Lin
 - e. (Senate Reference No. 19-28) – Executive Committee
10. New business
 - a. (Senate Document SD 19-11) – S. Carr
11. Committee reports “for information only”
12. The general good and welfare of the University
13. Adjournment*

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

Approving

A. Marshall

A. Nasr

J. Nowak

K. Pollock

M. Ridgeway

J. Toole

N. Younis

Opposed

Non-Voting

C. Ortsey

Absent

Attachments:

“Guiding Principles for Promotion of Lecturers at PFW” (SD 19-9)

“Procedures of Promotion for Lecturers at PFW” (SD 19-10)

“Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Expanding Membership of the Revenue Subcommittee” (SD 19-12)

“Question Time – re: Restructuring Savings (SR No. 19-20)

“Question Time – re: Website Difficulties” (SR No. 19-24)

“Question Time – re: Early Retirement” (SR No. 19-25)

“Question Time – re: Public Safety” (SR No. 19-27)

“Question Time – re: Administrator Courses” (SR No. 19-28)

“Signing the U.S. Academic Joint Statement on the Escalation of Tensions in Hong Kong and at the Polytechnic University of Hong Kong” (SD 19-11)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Talia Bugel, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: November 8, 2019

SUBJ: Guiding principles for promotion of Lecturers at PFW

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate approved guiding principles and procedures for tenure-track faculty at IPFW in the spring of 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate determined that it was prudent to draft separate guiding principles and procedure documents for promotion of Lecturers;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt SD 19-XX as the guiding principles for promotion of Lecturers at PFW.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Talia Bugel Karol Dehr Hui Di Andres Montenegro Joseph Khamalah Dong Chen				Marcia Dixson

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PROMOTION OF LECTURERS

(Based on SD 14-35)

PFW is a comprehensive university that is committed to maintaining a standard of excellence for teaching, scholarship and/or creative endeavor, and service in its diverse programs, departments, and schools/colleges. Employing and promoting Lecturers who share this mission contributes significantly to the attainment and maintenance of this standard.

The most important decisions in the academic profession, for Lecturers and for the institution, regard the awarding of promotion. Promotion is recognition of past achievement.

Lecturers provide invaluable contributions to the University community, its students, and the community at-large. It is through promotion that the University rewards those contributions. Retaining Lecturers who are focused on teaching, and who are more oriented to practice than to scholarship and/or creative endeavor ensures the University is able to meet its mission.

Significant diversity exists with respect to the needs and goals of programs, and the ways in which Lecturers contribute to the university. Such diversity is essential to the intellectual health of the university and its success in meeting its mission. At the same time, pursuit of the university's mission and goals unifies all programs and gives a sense of shared purpose while preserving and fostering diversity of work. This document lays out guiding principles that are reflective of the university's mission, vision, goals, and values. Departments must define criteria for promotion for their Lecturers that are appropriate for their respective disciplines, but that are also in keeping with these guiding principles.

The awarding of promotion is the university's recognition that individual Lecturers have successfully met their department's criteria, and in so doing, have worked to advance the university's mission and goals. Promotion criteria are the standards for summative judgment, and as such, must be guidelines for Lecturers' development. Departments must develop their own promotion policies, defining criteria for excellence in teaching. A department's policy should define what the department means by "teaching," and list activities and achievements properly associated with those terms, along with qualitative standards by which they may be judged.

The promotion policies developed by each department must be clear, meaningful, and include criteria for being promoted. They must be consistent in content with the guiding principles laid out in this document. The promotion policies and criteria adopted by a department must be used uniformly as the only standard by which to judge cases for promotion from that department.

All candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer must demonstrate excellence in teaching. Lecturers may seek promotion after five years in-rank.

TEACHING

At PFW Lecturers function in a faculty role. Our faculty are expected to demonstrate a significant and ongoing commitment to advancing student learning and fostering student success. Such a commitment is reflected, in part, by remaining current in the content and pedagogy appropriate to one's discipline, but is also reflected in the continual consideration of one's own teaching effectiveness. This expectation extends to all faculty who teach, regardless of rank.

Teaching by Lecturers occurs in a variety of contexts including, but not limited to, credit courses, non-credit programs and workshops, seminars, continuing education programs, and the supervision of the clinical work of students / interns / practicum students. A range of activities that affect student learning – directly and indirectly – should be considered when documenting and evaluating one's teaching effectiveness. Documentation of formative and summative evaluation should take place over time, and be informed by multiple measures that represent multiple perspectives (e.g., students, professional peers, self-evaluation). Demonstrating excellence must include input from outside the department which might be on or beyond the campus.

The specific standards of teaching, as well as how they are to be documented and evaluated, shall be established by the department and articulated clearly in their promotion criteria document.

SCHOLARSHIP AND/OR CREATIVE ENDEAVOR

While PFW Lecturers are expected to maintain currency in their discipline, they are not specifically required to engage in professional productivity or scholarship and/or creative endeavors. A department may elect to allow Lecturers who have made significant contributions to the department's scholarship and/or creative endeavors to include that in support of their promotion case.

SERVICE

PFW Lecturers generally take an active role in the campus beyond teaching. Some departments may elect to encourage them to contribute their expertise on a community, regional, national, and/or international level and/or to participate in professional organizations. If so, Lecturers are encouraged to include such activities in their promotion dossiers.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Talia Bugel, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: November 8, 2019

SUBJ: Procedures of promotion for Lecturers at PFW

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate approved guiding principles and procedures for tenure-track faculty at IPFW in the spring of 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate determined that it was prudent to draft separate guiding principles and procedure documents for promotion of Lecturers;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt SD 19-XX as the procedures for promotion of Lecturers at PFW.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Talia Bugel Karol Dehr Hui Di Andres Montenegro Joseph Khamalah Dong Chen				Marcia Dixson

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OF LECTURERS

(Based on SD 14-36)

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

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

The procedures and guiding principles for evaluating Lecturers for promotion are discussed in separate documents (see SD 19-XX for guiding principles for Lecturers), but the two are interrelated. The procedures for evaluating Lecturers are the method for implementing the guiding principles.

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

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

1. Document Review and Approval

1.1. Department documents

- 1.1.1. Departments must include procedures and criteria for promotion of Lecturers.
- 1.1.2. Department procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in college and Senate documents.
- 1.1.3. Department criteria must align with college guiding principles, if such exist.
- 1.1.4. Department procedures must be submitted to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for feedback and then reviewed and approved at the college level. The feedback from the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be forwarded to the college.
- 1.1.5. Department criteria must include:
 - 1.1.5.1. Criteria for quality of performance in teaching for promotion to Senior Lecturer.
 - 1.1.5.2. Rationale of the department for the criteria.

- 1.1.6. Department criteria must be reviewed and approved at the college level. The review by the college must focus on:
 - 1.1.6.1. The completeness and clarity of the department criteria document.
 - 1.1.6.2. The alignment of department criteria with Senate and (if such exist) college guiding principles.
 - 1.1.6.3. Compliance with Purdue procedural document Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments
- 1.1.7. If a college rejects the criteria of a department, a thorough explanation of the rejection must be sent to the department.
- 1.1.8. If there is a disagreement between a department and college about criteria, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee will arbitrate the disagreement.
- 1.1.9. Upon passage of this document by the Senate, departments with Lecturers have one calendar year to draft, approve, and seek review of department Lecturer promotion documents.
- 1.2. College documents
 - 1.2.1. Colleges must include procedures and guiding principles in documents. Colleges may choose to elect the campus Lecturer guiding principles as the guiding principles of the college.
 - 1.2.2. College procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in senate documents.
 - 1.2.3. College procedures and guiding principles must be reviewed and approved at the campus level first by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and then by the Senate.
2. Decision Levels: Nominations for promotion to Senior Lecturer shall be considered at several levels. The quality of the evidence presented in the case is best evaluated at the department level. Candidates may respond in writing to recommendations at all levels. Written responses must be submitted within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and proceed with the case. Cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer will be submitted on the same time schedule as tenure and promotion cases.
 - 2.1. The department committee
 - 2.1.1. Establishing the department committee: The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the college in compliance with Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.
 - 2.1.2. Composition of the department committee:
 - 2.1.2.1. A faculty member deemed the equivalent of a department's "head for teaching and learning"¹(i.e., chair of curriculum or faculty affairs committee, a faculty member recognized for teaching excellence), one or more faculty with teaching responsibilities in the same general area as the Lecturer, and one or more Senior Lecturers (if not available from within the department, recruited from another unit).
 - 2.1.2.2. If, by established departmental criteria, fewer than three persons are eligible to serve on the department committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the college the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department

committee. From this list, the chief academic officer of the college shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to between three and five.

- 2.1.2.3. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
- 2.1.2.4. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.
- 2.1.3. Primary Tasks: The department committee shall review the evidence presented in the case, compare the case to department criteria, and make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.1.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the department committee shall be based on the case and department criteria and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including commenting on the candidate's professional standing.
- 2.1.5. Other:
 - 2.1.5.1. Any faculty member, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer subject to the procedures and guiding principles of promotion to Senior Lecturer or promotion/ tenure at PFW shall have the opportunity to read and provide feedback on cases in their home department until the department committee has made a recommendation regarding promotion. Any document that is provided does not become part of the case and does not move forward with the case.

2.2. The chief academic officer of the department

- 2.2.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the department shall:
 - 2.2.1.1. Review the case and compare the case to department criteria.
 - 2.2.1.2. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
 - 2.2.1.3. Review the recommendation of the lower level.
 - 2.2.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.2.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the department shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the case in light of department criteria, the process to this point, and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decision of the lower level.

2.3. The college committee

- 2.3.1. Establishing the college committee: The college committee composition and functions shall be established by the college faculty and Lecturers, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the college, and approved by the Senate. This procedure shall be periodically published, simultaneously with the Bylaws of the Senate, as and when the Bylaws of the Senate are distributed.
- 2.3.2. Composition of the college committee
 - 2.3.2.1. Members of the college committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the college committee.
 - 2.3.2.2. The college committee will include at least one Senior Lecturer. If the college does not currently have Senior Lecturers, one or more may be invited from other colleges to serve this role.

- 2.3.2.3. Members of the college committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be staggered and may not be longer than three years.
 - 2.3.2.4. Members of the college committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
 - 2.3.2.5. The chief academic officer of the college may not serve on the college committee or participate in the meetings.
 - 2.3.3. Primary Tasks: The college committee shall:
 - 2.3.3.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.
 - 2.3.3.2. Review the recommendation of the lower levels.
 - 2.3.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.3.3.2.2. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.
 - 2.3.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the college committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.4. The chief academic officer of the college
- 2.4.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the college shall:
 - 2.4.1.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
 - 2.4.1.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels. This review:
 - 2.4.1.2.1. Shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.4.1.2.2. May include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a decision from a lower level is judged to be contrary to the evidence.
 - 2.4.1.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.4.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the college shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.5. The Senate Lecturer Promotion Committee (a.k.a. the campus committee)
- 2.5.1. Establishing the campus committee - this committee should be established each year in case it is needed
 - 2.5.1.1. Members of this committee shall be selected to staggered, three-year terms, by the Chief Administrative Officer of PFW and the two Speakers of the Faculty.

- 2.5.1.2. The committee members will be selected from a panel of nominees composed of at least two representatives from the faculty of each college elected according to procedures adopted by the college faculty and incorporated into the documents which define the protocols of faculty governance within the college. If a college has more than three Senior Lecturers, then at least one representative from that college should be a Senior Lecturer. The vote totals from the elections shall be included with the panel of nominees.
- 2.5.2. Composition of the campus committee
- 2.5.2.1. The campus committee shall consist of seven (7) members.
- 2.5.2.2. A minimum of five (4) academic units must be represented on the campus committee and no more than three (3) members of the campus committee may be from one academic unit.
- 2.5.2.3. At least two members of the committee should be Senior Lecturers when that is possible given the panel of nominees.
- 2.5.2.4. Members of the campus committee may serve at the department level, but not at the college level in the promotion and process while serving on the campus committee.
- 2.5.2.5. Members of the campus committee may not serve consecutive terms.
- 2.5.2.6. Members of the campus committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
- 2.5.2.7. The chief academic officer of PFW may not serve on the campus committee or participate in the meetings.
- 2.5.3. Primary Tasks: The campus committee shall:
- 2.5.3.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.
- 2.5.3.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels.
- 2.5.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
- 2.5.3.2.2. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.
- 2.5.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.5.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the campus committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.6. The chief academic officer of PFW
- 2.6.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of PFW shall:
- 2.6.1.1. Recognize the credibility of the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.6.1.2. Review split votes and/or inconsistencies in findings and recommendations at, and between, lower levels. When there is a split vote and/or inconsistency, the chief academic officer of PFW will focus the review on that part of the case dealing with the split vote and/or inconsistency.
- 2.6.1.3. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures.

- 2.6.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.6.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of PFW shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of recommendations from lower levels, the process to this point, and must clearly explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of the lower level(s).
- 2.7. The chief administrative officer of PFW will make final determination of promotion to Senior Lecturer.
- 3. Case Process: Nominations for promotion shall be considered at several levels.
 - 3.1. The candidate must identify the criteria document that should be used to judge the case. The department criteria document used must have been in effect at some point during the five years preceding the submission of the case.
 - 3.2. All cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer shall pass sequentially through the decision levels above.
 - 3.3. No information, other than updates to items in the case, can be added to the case after the vote and recommendation from the department level. The intent is that each level will be reviewing the same case. Each decision level is responsible for determining if items submitted after a case has cleared the department committee should be included in the case or considered to be new evidence that should be excluded.
 - 3.4. Each decision level forwards only a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments or supplemental information.
 - 3.5. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may submit a written response to the statement to the administrator or the committee chair within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and must proceed with the case. At the same time that the case is sent forward to the next level, the administrator or committee chair shall also ensure a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons, and the candidate's response, if any, are sent to administrators and committee chairs at the lower level(s).
 - 3.6. The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No abstentions or proxies are allowed. Committee members must be present during deliberations in order to vote.
 - 3.7. If a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending for promotion, the input and vote of the promotion committee at the same level must be sought.
- 4. Individual Participation
 - 4.1. Only tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers may serve as voting members of promotion committees at any level.
 - 4.2. No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for promotion is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own promotion nomination.
 - 4.3. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (college or campus).
 - 4.4. Voting members of committees and chief academic officers shall recuse themselves from considering cases of candidates with whom they share significant credit for research or creative endeavor, team teaching, service projects or other work which is a

major part of the candidate's case or if they have other conflicts of interest. The committee will decide if committee members who collaborate with the candidate need to recuse themselves. The next highest administrator will decide if a chief academic officer who collaborated with the candidate needs to recuse her/himself.

- 4.5. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.
- 4.6. Chief academic officers who have written a letter of recommendation as part of 2.2.2. will recuse themselves from discussion or vote on that candidate's case at a higher level.

REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION

In compliance with Purdue's Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointment, each Lecturer will be reviewed for promotion at least every five years.

SPECIAL ABBREVIATED PROCEDURE FOR FIRST YEAR OF SENIOR LECTURER PROMOTION PROCESS

Given the timeline involved for department criteria and approval and subsequent approval at all levels of cases and the fact that we currently have no Senior Lecturers to fulfill the roles required by this process, the first year should include an abbreviated process for promotion to Senior Lecturer such that Lecturers who meet the following criteria may submit their cases for review by a department committee **by March 15, 2020**. The Department Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair who then recommends to the Dean and, subsequently, Vice-Chancellor for promotion of Lecturers who:

- Have been at PFW/IPFW for at least 7 consecutive years; and
- Have had positive reappointments for the past 5 years; and
- Have made a substantial positive contribution to the campus which must be supported via:
 - Demonstrated commitment to student success
 - Continued reflection upon and improvement of their teaching;And may also be supported via:
 - Administrative responsibilities
 - Course or curricular revisions
 - Mentoring others' teaching
 - Service and/or community engagement
 - Research/creative endeavor.

OR

- Meet approved department criteria

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Gordon Schmidt, Chair University Resources Policy Committee

DATE: November 20, 2019

SUBJ: Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Revenue Subcommittee Resolution

WHEREAS, the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) is the parent committee of the Revenue Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, the Revenue Subcommittee requested that URPC review a resolution related to its membership; and

WHEREAS, URPC completed the review and voted in support of the document going forward;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the attached resolution be considered by the Senate.

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Resource Policy Committee and Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Nathan Rupp, Chair of the Revenue Subcommittee

DATE: 10/15/19

SUBJ: Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate:

Expanding membership of the Revenue Subcommittee

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.3.5.2.1.8.2.3.) that the Revenue Subcommittee shall “Make annual recommendations on sources of revenue”; and

WHEREAS, The Revenue Subcommittee believes recommendations regarding revenue would be enhanced from increased focus on sources of funds beyond the reoccurring funds of tuition/fees and state appropriations; and

WHEREAS, The ability to identify potential sources of these additional funds would be enhanced by regular input from the Development Office, Office of Financial and Administrative Affairs, the Student Government Association and the Office of Student Affairs; and

WHEREAS, The Revenue Subcommittee voted on 10/15/19 to expand the membership of the Revenue Subcommittee to include the Purdue Fort Wayne Chief Development Officer or a designee as a nonvoting representative;

WHEREAS, The Revenue Subcommittee voted on 10/15/19 to expand the membership of the Revenue Subcommittee to include the Chief Financial Officer or a designee as a nonvoting representative;

WHEREAS, The Revenue Subcommittee voted on 10/15/19 to expand the membership of the Revenue Subcommittee with the Purdue Fort Wayne Presiding Officer of the Senate requesting the Purdue Fort Wayne Student Government Association to select a nonvoting student representative to serve for one year, with their terms to commence one week before the beginning of regular fall classes;

WHEREAS, The Revenue Subcommittee voted on 10/15/19 to expand the membership of the Revenue Subcommittee to include the Purdue Fort Wayne Chief Student Affairs Officer or designee as a nonvoting representative;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the text of Section 5.3.5.2.1.8.1. of the By-Laws of the Senate be amended to read: “The Revenue Subcommittee shall consist of eight members of the Voting Faculty and continuing lecturers elected by the Senate, with no more than three from any one Major Unit; one clerical or service staff member; and one administrative/professional staff member; **the PFW Chief Development Officer or a designee as a non-voting member; the PFW Chief Financial Officer or a designee as a non-voting member; the PFW Chief Student Affairs Officer or a designee as a non-voting member; and a student representative as a non-voting member.** The Presiding Officer of the Senate shall request the Clerical and Service Staff Advisory Committee to select the clerical or service staff representative, and the Administrative Council to select the administrative/professional staff representative, **and the PFW Student Government Association to designate the student representative.** The clerical or service staff representative, and the administrative/professional staff representative, **and the student representative** shall serve for one year, with their terms to commence one week before the beginning of regular fall classes.”

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Melissa Dietrich				
Steven Hanke				
Donald Linn				
Haowen Luo				
LV McAllister				
Nathan Rupp				
Guoping Wang				

Question Time

When restructuring was announced in Fall 2016, it was supposed to bring about great savings for the institution. How much money was actually saved through the restructuring, taking into account expenses associated with retraining faculty impacted by the restructuring and students who left due to the changes. To clarify, I am asking this question now because we are being told that there is pressure from PWL for additional cuts in the interest of saving money. Therefore, real data on the financial impact of the restructuring may be beneficial in presenting a case against further cuts to PWL.

A. Livschiz

Question Time

I submitted this question in October 2018, and my question was not accepted at the time because it was deemed to be “too early” to ask it. Since the situation has not improved and if anything has gotten worse, I would like to resubmit it. When the new website was launched in 2018 and a number of people complained about the difficulties using it (mostly the inability to find useful information easily or at all), we were told that the reason we (i.e. people who work at PFW) are experiencing difficulties using the new website and are having a hard time finding the information we need, is because the website is not aimed at us, but rather at prospective students. The situation has not improved. Is it possible to have another version of the website or portal that is aimed at people who are already at PFW, to make it easier for them to do their jobs?

A. Livschiz

Question Time

Could the administration please explain why certain faculty members across campus are being targeted for early retirement? How many faculty are on this list and what does the administration hope to accomplish? To what extent did the administration think about the impact of suggesting early retirement to faculty who are still happily engaged in their teaching, research, and service? Moreover, is it not the case that departments, and not the administration, should determine what kinds of faculty lines are needed?

C. Erickson

Question Time

That public safety is supremely important is a consensus few would dispute. University campus is a public domain with open access internally to its employees and externally to the public. Federal laws require that all employers provide a safe work environment. I am aware that there have been complaints about a bullying and harassing culture going on campus, and there have been requests to install security cameras in ALL buildings that don't have cameras yet as a security mechanism to counter such bullying culture. Public places like Target, T J Max, Kroger, Rang Dong Grocery Store, Cookie Cottage, to name just a few, all have security cameras in place.

How many buildings on campus have cameras and what are these buildings? Does the University have plans to install cameras in those buildings?

L. Lin

Question Time

In reference to Senate Document SD 96-4 which states the following:

"That it be the policy of Indiana University-Purdue University that all administrative personnel who hold academic rank be expected, as a condition of their appointment, to be responsible for the teaching of one class per year in the department in which they have academic affiliation."

Could you provide the Senate with an updated report delineating the number of administrators above departmental chairs who have academic "rank" and the course number, title, number of students, and semester each has taught in the past three years?

Executive Committee

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Steven Alan Carr, Voting Faculty

Date: 20 November 2019

Re: Signing the U.S. Academic Joint Statement on the Escalation of Tensions in Hong Kong and at the Polytechnic University of Hong Kong

WHEREAS, the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) have stormed universities chanting “slaughter the cockroaches,” used violence indiscriminately and to excess, and laid siege to protestors seeking shelter at college campuses, and;

WHEREAS, indiscriminate mass arrests; disappearances; staged suicides; gang rapes of detainees in police custody; tear gas and live bullets being fired directly into crowds and at individuals all have targeted students, professors, and others now seeking shelter at Polytechnic University of Hong Kong (PolyU), and;

WHEREAS, over fifty universities and colleges within the United States have signed the “U.S. Academic Joint Statement on the Escalation of Tensions in Hong Kong and at the Polytechnic University of Hong Kong” as of 18 November 2019, including two within the Big Ten, the University of Michigan and the University of Minnesota;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate add Purdue University Fort Wayne to the list of universities and colleges signing this statement on behalf of our students, alumni, faculty, and staff, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chancellor of the Purdue University Fort Wayne Campus notify the President and Purdue Board of Trustees of Purdue University that the Fort Wayne Senate has presented its views to them on this matter.