

Minutes of the  
Second Regular Meeting of the Fourth Senate  
Purdue University Fort Wayne  
October 11 and 25, 2021  
Via Webex

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 13 and September 20
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. Annual Report on the Budget (Senate Reference No. 21-10) – G. Nakata
7. Unfinished business
8. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-5) – A. Marshall
  - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-6) – A. Marshall
9. New business
10. Question time
  - a. (Senate Reference No. 21-7) – A. Marshall
  - b. (Senate Reference No. 21-8) – A. Livschiz
11. Committee reports “for information only”
  - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 21-9) – A. Marshall
12. The general good and welfare of the University
13. Adjournment\*

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

---

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

Attachments:

- “Annual Report on the Budget” (SR No. 21-10)
- “Approval of Replacement Members of the Student Affairs Committee, University Resources Policy Committee, and Nominations and Elections Committee” (SD 21-5)
- “Civics Literacy Requirement Resolution” (SD 21-6)
- “Question Time – re: Dean of Student’s Office Changes” (SR No. 21-7)
- “Question Time – re: Vaccination Shots” (SR No. 21-8)
- “Charge to Assess the Impact of Dissolution of On-campus Printing Services” (SR No. 21-9)

Senate Members Present:

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

Senate Members Absent:

B. Chen, Z. Chen, C. Drummond, A. Livschiz, M. Perkins Coppola, R. Shoquist, A. Smiley, N. Virtue, D. West, M. Zoghi

Guests Present:

M. Ball, A. Blackmon, K. Burtnette, S. Davis, M. Dixon, M. Frye, C. Gurgur, M. Helmsing, C. Hine, D. Hoile, M. Kelsey, H. Kintz, C. Kracher, T. Luce, J. Malanson, C. Marcuccilli, D. Moore, C. Springer, T. Swim, K. Wagner, R. Weiner

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Nowak called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 13 and September 20: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:
  - A. Marshall moved to accept the agenda.
  - Agenda approved by voice vote.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
  - a. Deputy Presiding Officer:
    - N. Younis: Good afternoon colleagues,

I heard you and I agree with you regarding the concerns of many academic departments this semester about:

1. Printing and Xerox services
2. Marketing

It is worth noting that the faculty leaders have discussed both issues with the chancellor.

As a result, thank you to Greg Justice for soliciting the concerns from our colleges about the impact of printing services closure and its effect on the academic programs. I look forward to learn the results of the meeting with Xerox and the steps will be taken to make printing services for academic departments as it should be.

I hope Marketing too will soon be asking the academic departments about the issues that are hindering their recruiting activities and affecting the faculty in achieving their programs' educational outcomes.

Have a wonderful week.

b. IFC Representative:

A. Livschiz: (Read by A. Marshall). Today is a very important senate meeting.

We are going to have the opportunity to discuss and vote on the resolution on the creation of the ad-hoc Civics Literacy Requirement Implementation Committee. We know that this is not a project that we as a campus chose to undertake this year, but there is room for cautious optimism that through it we will have the opportunity to shape the way the requirement is going to look like for our students.

We will also hear today the presentation on the university budget from our new VCFA Glen Nakata, followed by an opportunity to ask questions. So many of the concerns we have had over the last few years ultimately come down to budgetary issues, so this opportunity for questions is an important one for this body.

Related to the budget, I wanted to draw everyone's attention to two things:

Please note the charge from Senate EC to Senate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee to look into the costs associated with the shutting down of campus-based Printing Services, leaving campus without a functional and reliable printing service. This is one of a number of closures initiated by the administration that has negatively impacted academic units on this campus,

without an effort to get any input from the affected academic units, and we very much appreciate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee for taking this project.

Senate EC also wanted to share that FAC and the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee have agreed to take another look at the LTL pay project from last year. Inadequate LTL pay has been a cause for concern for a while now, and we want to thank FAC and the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee for their willingness to take on this project.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Nowak: I would like to remind the Senators to please make all faculty and staff aware of the URL for the Fort Wayne Senate website, pfw.edu/senate, which includes a list of all the Senate committees and membership of the Executive Committee, and just to let everybody know that we all wish to hear of any ongoing good and welfare, including any concerns, so that we may work together on all of our behaves to make PFW the best place of employment possible.

N. Younis moved to suspend the rules in order to discuss Senate Document SD 21-6 (Civics Literacy Requirement Resolution).

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a poll vote.

8. Committee reports requiring action:

b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-6) – A. Marshall

A. Marshall moved to approve Senate Document SD 21-6 (Civics Literacy Requirement Resolution).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Annual Report on the Budget (Senate Reference No. 21-10) – G. Nakata

Please see attached PowerPoint.

S. Buttes: I wanted to say thank you to Vice Chancellor Nakata for sharing this information and for the comments that he just made. I sent a question to the Executive Committee and they responded to say that since we were going to have the budget presentation that I could just ask it on the Senate floor, so that is what I am doing. I wrote a pretty long question, but I will just summarize it by saying that the general thrust of the question is that looking back at past Senate documents and Senate references, one topic that has often come under consideration during times of budget analysis is the athletics budget. Earlier in the meeting, we were talking about

printing services and that it was closed because it was not economically self-sustainable. One of the natural questions to ask in this context is also about the athletics budget.

Looking back at some of the Senate documents, for example Senate Reference No. 20-9, which is the Chancellor's Annual Report to the Faculty Senate on Intercollegiate Athletics, there was a deficit in academic year 2018-2019 in the athletics budget of \$130,921, and this was after accounting for both the \$8.92 per credit hour athletics subsidy that students pay in fees and the subsidy from the university general fund that is transferred to athletics each fiscal year. According to Senate Reference No. 17-28, that transfer from the general fund was \$2,804,186 in fiscal year 2018. So, the general question is for Chancellor Elsenbaumer and for Vice Chancellor Nakata, if the budget analysis process for athletics will parallel printing services? Will it be a different kind of process that will be used to gauge analysis of those budgets? I also had a question for the faculty leaders, which I had sent to them in relation to this, about what faculty leaders could do on these issues, but I will turn it over to you, Jeff, to field that lengthy question. Thank you.

J. Nowak: Thank you, Steve. Glen, would you like to respond?

G. Nakata: Steve, thank you so much for your question. I appreciate it. I will say, obviously, as I have been here for all of two months, I have been delving into the budget process and how things are done. I will be honest. I don't have an answer for your question as of now, but I have jotted down what you are asking and I will look and see what the funding sources and how athletics is being funded, if it is all internally by themselves as self-funded or if it is general funds being used. I know Dr. Nazarov has contacted Athletic Director Hutton to present the athletic budget to the subcommittee, so that will definitely be part of that discussion when we present to them, discussing the different funding sources for the athletics budget.

J. Nowak: Thank you, Vice Chancellor. I will also just mention that the athletics report will be on the November agenda.

S. Betz: I have two questions that I will ask one at a time and give other people a chance after I ask the first question. My first question is, overall can you give a summary of what the financial picture will look like when the HEERF money and other COVID related funds do get entered into the budget? That is my question. Overall, when those monies are added, what does our current financial picture look like?

J. Nowak: Typically, before a Senator has a chance to ask a second question it has to go to everyone first, but, Stacy, you are the only hand up right now. Glen, I will let you respond to question one from Stacy before she asks number two.

G. Nakata: Great. Thank you, Stacy. The HEERF money, the reason it was not presented in my numbers is because I wanted to show operationally how we as a

university are situated without what I will call one-time money, which HEERF and CARES money is really, one-time money. But, essentially, we have put together a plan to utilize those monies either via student aid or institutional aid to help us to capture lost revenues or support of students during this fiscal year, so it will be kind of almost an in and out from that standpoint. When we receive the money, we will go right in and turn around and utilize it to support our students and the institution.

S. Betz: My second question is about the note that some of the difficulties with the budget are related to reduced institutional aid through a reduction in Pell grants and scholarship requests. So, it is kind of a multipart question to try to figure out what is going on here. First of all, is this reduction, especially in Pell grants, is that proportional to the overall reduction in enrollment and overall tuition and revenue that we are bringing in, or as our enrollment is going down, are we seeing enrollment changes in the percentage of students we serve who qualify for Pell grants?

The second part is in relation to the scholarship. Is that external requests for scholarships, like our students aren't bringing in as many external scholarship funds?

G. Nakata: If it is okay, do you mind if I ask Chancellor Elsenbaumer to address those issues?

S. Betz: Sure. Whoever has the answer. That is fine.

R. Elsenbaumer: Mr. presiding officer, if you wouldn't mind, I would like to at least address those two issues, if I can?

J. Nowak: You have the floor.

R. Elsenbaumer: Thank you. Stacy, yes, it is a combination of what you just mentioned as possible explanations. Absolutely, the demographics of our student population have been changing over the last several years, and you may know this, and I think you did mention it, that the percentage of our students now coming to us that are Pell eligible have been declining. So, yes, the amount of federal funds that we were getting from Pell grants has been going down significantly because of that point. You are right. Your second part of that explanation was correct.

I would like to ask that you repeat the second question again so that I am clear as to what the second question was.

S. Betz: Thanks for the answer to the first part. Actually, can I ask a follow up to the first part before we go on? Do we know if the reduction in Pell grant is, I know this is really impossible to figure out if students don't fill out the FAFSA, but what is sort of the impression, is it that truly the percentage of students who are Pell eligible is decreasing or do we think that there are some students who might be eligible that aren't filling out the FAFSA in order to qualify?

R. Elsenbaumer: Yes, I believe it is a combination of both.

S. Betz: Okay. Thank you. The second part was about the scholarship requests. It states that there is a reduced institutional aid due to Pell grants and also scholarship requests. My question was, is that referring to external scholarship monies that students would bring in to the university to pay for their tuition bills?

R. Elsenbaumer: Yes. Stacy, we are seeing some reduction in external sources of scholarships like the twenty-first century scholarships and those sorts of things. You are absolutely right. There is some reduction in those as well.

D. Bauer: I just have a pretty simple question that should probably be pretty easy to answer. I am a little not clear about everything that was explained, so I need a little bit more clarification, if possible. First of all, after Steve asked about the athletics budget, I was just curious where the athletics budget fits in the PowerPoint slides that we are looking at, if it is part of something else that is here or if it is just missing altogether. If that is the case, where it fits in with our total budget. I was hoping that the vice chancellor had a comment, could he explain a little bit more about what we are looking at when you explain on slide three that there was a reflection of transfers that happened between departments. Just looking at the kind of budget by segment, it looks like almost every department has increased, so is that transfer supposed to be a balance? Or why are we looking at pretty much all increases instead of decreases with the transfer of staffing?

G. Nakata: Deborah, the Athletics department is actually in the Finance and Administration budget, so it is within there. Getting to your question about the transfers, obviously within any segment's area you have a number of increases and decreases within the budgets every year, especially within twenty-one, where there was a fairly significant amount of what I will call rightsizing of the budget were done to where the finance and accounting staff looked at what I will call run rates of departments and segments and seeing what they were really spending during the year and then making sure that we had sufficient resources allocated to each of those areas. So, when you see the staffing, there is a lot of different things that go into it, but yeah, we have people moving from one area to another. The dollars move along with the fringe benefits, but it may have been offset by a decrease we move, but it may have been offset by an increase in other expenses because based on their current run rates, and what we were looking to do to right size the budget, it offset those reductions.

R. Friedman: Thank you, vice chancellor, for the presentation. I have a quick question. On the one slide it says July 1 there were fifty-five non-faculty/staff positions that became vacant, do we have an idea of how many of those fifty-five have since been filled? Thank you.

G. Nakata: We have filled twelve of those fifty-five.

J. Badia: To follow up on Dean Friedman's question, so the remaining staff positions, is there a plan to exam those positions and fill them? Are we at all concerned where we allow staff positions to sit vacant the more staff exiting the university we are going to have as they start finding their workloads increasing and unbearable and have increased opportunity to leave for other positions elsewhere?

G. Nakata: Absolutely. Our goal, very much, is to post these positions as quickly as possible and hopefully find some great candidates that we can have apply for it and replace the positions. We are not holding positions or trying not to fill them. As you said, it gets to be very hard for the staff still in the department when you have gaps within staffing. So, definitely, our goal is to get these filled as quickly as possible.

R. Friedman: So, a follow up for that. I know when a staff position is applied for to try to get approval it would have to go to a hiring committee, does anyone have a sense of what percentage of those requests of the hiring committee actually get approved and how many get denied?

G. Nakata: I have just been doing it for the past couple of months here, but I will say that I don't know the exact percentage but I would say most, if not all, have been approved by the hiring committee, especially if it has been a pure replacement. In other words, a person leaves and then the department wants to hire in at the same budgeted amount, the hiring committee very much approves those to move forward to be posted.

A. Marshall: I appreciate the main takeaway is that your emphasis is on growing revenue and that is key to budgetary health. I wonder if you could just expand upon that a little bit. I also am wondering that perhaps for long-term growth in enrollment and retention there needs to be investment in the funds in that objective. I just wondered if you had perhaps budgetary best practices about how to think about that. Of course, I am sure every institution is unique in doing that, but I would be interested in your reflections on that objective.

G. Nakata: Hello, Ann. Very much so. This is one area where what I have been able to do in other institutions is what I will call a cost benefit analysis where we look at the impact of what we are trying to do with regards to new programs with regards to enrollment and retention and then looking and seeing what is that estimate to us in increasing enrollment and retention. So, what does that mean in increased tuition to the university? We can look at it and say, does it make sense if we are going to spend a \$100,000, but only generate \$50,000 in tuition income, does that really make sense? No. We want to look at programs and initiatives that help us to really generate strong revenue dollars and thereby bring more resources to the institution and allow us to bring new programs and new initiatives.

R. Friedman: I have another question. I know recently we have changed the budget model so that we look at the past couple of years of spending and I think the biggest fear I have in that is that you have a lot of departments that really try to be fiscally



responsible and a little bit more fiscally conservative, and therefore, maybe don't spend as fully as the money allows because they want it to roll over for other various reasons. I fear when that happens it is basically the adage of no good deed goes unpunished because you have these units that are really trying to watch out for the good of the university and then in subsequent years they don't get the budgeting that they really need. I would like to hear how one tries to address that type of situation. Thank you.

G. Nakata: Dean Friedman, one of the things that I try to pride myself on is that I love seeing departments and areas that are being fiscally responsible. That shows that they want to have a positive impact on the university. But, in the following years when we go through the budgeting process and they need new resources to implement new initiatives and new programs then that is when we work together and talk to figure out a way to fund this, that is those resources to make sure that departments and areas of this university have what they need to get through the next fiscal year. So, that is one thing that I am very open to, is having discussions with deans in different colleges and department heads as we go through the budget process to see what resources they would need in the following year and not just be held to their current year budget.

M. Cain: (Question in the chat). I'm wondering how it's possible to measure the benefits of some majors, programs, and departments in this bottom line way? And for those units that don't show an immediate increase in revenue but will, in the long haul, produce? And how do we weigh our mission with the immediate need for resources?

G. Nakata: One thing that I have learned working at other institutions is that there isn't necessarily an immediate positive financial impact with some programs. It does have a ramp up period of anywhere from two to three years, and you have to take that long-term view to understand the resources that are needed. That is kind of one thing that I would like to do, is look at programs that are new that will take a couple of years of ramp up and then come up with a multiyear plan, and then be able to support it. But, then at the end of that period that we agree to making sure they are hitting those metrics, and if they aren't, then we will have to reevaluate the program at that time.

A. Nasr: Thank you, Vice Chancellor Nakata, and welcome to PFW. I understand that it has been just a short while that you have been here but I am sure you are also familiar that we have gone through many ups and downs with our administration of the university, whether we have had a split between IU and Purdue University and the ramifications of that. I very much appreciate your thoughts and very much appreciate your strategy or your framing of issues about development. I am just following up and inspired by the questions before me, especially that of Mary Ann's, where she says something about the bottom line. It really scares me to think about how we are approaching this from the perspective of what is it that can keep us not just financially viable in a way, which is great, I understand that this is a very

pragmatic approach. We have to be financially viable, but I am just concerned about our way of serving our community is based upon money and based upon the income that we are having, and not really catering to student needs and giving them the profound or deep form of education that is very diverse and global, and by doing so, having to close departments or shift resources around, not looking at education as a holistic experience. This is more of a comment rather than a question.

I am just wondering how we can better approach this. Your comment earlier in your slide says something to the effect of “we are all in this together.” I find this to be, yes, we are, we love to be, we always as faculty have always vouched for inclusivity and being part of the decisions that the university made, but this particular statement coming now, especially that we are seeing things again shift, like printing services and other things that have developed in the past few weeks, and I will leave it to our representatives in the Senate to vouch to that, such as the marketing and all of that, it just doesn’t point to something that serves our students and our student community. It just serves to keep the university intact financially, which is great, I do understand the vitality of that, but whatever happens to students and the type of education that we are getting because this is the biggest loss that we are having, which on the long-term is going to impact us financially. Thank you very much, again.

G. Nakata: Assem, thank you. I totally understand your complaints and your feelings. One thing that I have always tried to pride myself on in the accounting world is to not be a bean counter because that means you are there to say no and not do what is right. I pride myself on being a partner and that is where I like to look at different things from a different standpoint to make sure we are doing the right things. What I mentioned in the presentation about rightsizing budgets, that includes also expanding departmental budgets if they have programs that they need resources for, and that is one thing that I will continue to do in this role and especially as we enter into the fiscal twenty-three budgeting process.

L. Whalen: Assem and Mary Ann said something along the lines of what I was going to say as well, but I found it a little bit depressing honestly to look at the slideshow and see, for example, amid the talk of rightsizing, there is three hundred eighteen administrators and only two hundred forty-five tenure-track faculty or tenured faculty. Again, in terms of rightsizing, I just believe our primary mission is education here, but Academic Affairs, the 4.8 million that is to come notwithstanding, is constantly being asked to shoulder a disproportionate burden, I think, especially given the mission of a university. Again, it is more of a comment than a question, but I am hoping that as we think about rightsizing we can address that constant cutting of academic affairs. Thank you.

M. Cain: I don’t know if Vice Chancellor Nakata alone wants to answer this question alone since he is relatively new here, and welcome, by the way. But, my question is, in thinking over the history of my time at the university, it used to be that we actually would lobby for money in the state legislature. There were bus tours and students and faculty would get on the bus, and we would go down and lobby the

legislators. It just seems like, since I have been on the Senate these last few years, there really isn't any talk of money coming from outside, obviously other kinds of grants or things, but not from getting more from the state. It just seems like we have thrown in the towel on that, or maybe there is just no discussion, but maybe the chancellor would like to address this question. What are we doing in terms of lobbying for more money from the state?

R. Elsenbaumer: Lobbying the state legislature is a privilege I would say, and a very significant added benefit that we have in Indiana that many other states do not have. We have been taking advantage of the fact that even though we are part of the state agency, we are able to lobby our state legislators. Since I have been here, we have done significant lobbying of our state legislators. In particular, going after those funds that were originally supposedly promised to the institution following the transition from IPFW to Purdue Fort Wayne. We spent a considerable amount of time working with our legislature, not this past legislative session, but the previous legislative session, working very hard with all of them and getting to know them, and also making it very clear to each of them individually and collectively what the value proposition is of Purdue Fort Wayne to northeast Indiana, and what it is that we need as an institution to be very responsive and reflect the educational needs of our community. We were not successful two years ago, but we were successful this past legislative session and what I would consider to be a very significant way in bringing substantial resources to the institution with a \$4.8-\$5 million appropriation coming to this campus for academics. We asked for more, but we got nearly all of everything we asked for. It won't be the last that we make. We are already working on the next legislative request for our academic programs that will be coming up in the future. So, we are trying to do everything we can and I think we have been pretty successful at bringing in good money, significant money, to the campus for that purpose.

J. Badia: Vice Chancellor Nakata, could you talk a little bit more, I know you mentioned it during your presentation, about your philosophy towards collaborative budgeting. I have been dean of the College of Liberal Arts since July 1 and one of the things that has really stood out to me is how often there is no real rhyme or reason to some of our department budgets, our LTL budgets. We have departments that rely heavily on LTLs, but have lower LTL budgets than some who hardly rely on them at all and have large LTL budgets. It seems to me that a lot of these oddities could be addressed proactively if we had a collaborative budgeting process where deans actually got some input into how budgets were shaped at units below them. Could you talk a little bit about how, I know we spent a lot of time talking about this this academic year, but going forward, what you would be doing differently or if you in fact will be looking at a more collaborative budget method?

G. Nakata: Yes. You and I are on the same page on this one because this is something I really tried to task our business managers to start working with the different colleges that they are responsible for, and as part of the budgeting process, I want to make sure that, like I said, departments have the resources that they need. If

one department has a budget that is probably more than they actually need to support a certain area, but another one is looking for resources, then moving those monies back and forth to me is part of that rightsizing, and even within a college, I think that is something that we need to do to make sure that departments have sufficient budgets for LTLs. I very much am in favor of allowing deans and colleges to be able to shift the monies internally within the college to support their different departments.

R. Friedman: The chancellor had mentioned the \$4.8 million from the state and supposedly that is designated for faculty lines. I was wondering how that is going to work? Do we expect that there will be some searches for faculty positions happening soon or do we need to spend that money within a certain amount of time if we do start opening some searches? I realize that money is just for a year. How do we deal with the recurring nature of those faculty salaries? I was just wondering what the current thoughts are with regard to that \$4.8 million. Thank you.

A. Downs: There are a number of items on the agenda that I was hoping we could get to still yet today without needing to extend this meeting beyond the fall break, so while I think budget discussions are interesting, I might be one of the few in the minority who like budget discussions, but I think it would be a good idea if we could get to the other items on the agenda as well. Thank you.

J. Nowak: I would like to request that Vice Chancellor Nakata briefly provide a synopsis to Ron's question and then we are going to move forward to unfinished business.

G. Nakata: I will be honest. I don't know about the funding. I would actually defer to Chancellor Elsenbaumer regarding the academic expansion funding.

J. Nowak: These further questions are very important. They are significant. They affect us all. We would like to continue that, so Ron, if you would, please have that discussion. If you would like to even email questions to the Executive Committee then we would be willing to help negotiate your getting the accurate responses. With that, given the other Senate concerns, we are going to move forward.

7. Unfinished business: There was no unfinished business.

8. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-5) – A. Marshall

A. Marshall moved to approve Senate Document SD 21-5 (Approval of Replacement Members of the Student Affairs Committee, University Resources Policy Committee, and Nominations and Elections Committee).

S. Buttes moved for unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Resolution passed.

- b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 21-6) – A. Marshall

Resolution passed earlier in the meeting.

9. New business: There was no new business.

10. Question time:

- a. (Senate Reference No. 21-7) – A. Marshall (question from an anonymous voting faculty member)

Given the staffing and organizational changes in the Dean of Student's office, what is the plan for that position/office moving forward? How will this affect CARE Teams, academic dishonesty cases, and other functions of that office?

R. Elsenbaumer: The changes in the Dean of Students Office are solely personnel and name changes in nature. They do not have any effect on office operations, service to students, university policies, or collaborative work with university faculty and staff.

The CARE Team has been, and continues to be, fully engaged while making a few upgrades to better fit with the National Association for Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment (NABITA) standards and ensure timely and personalized attention to students. All referrals are being processed, and all students are receiving outreach from the office. All COVID-19 tracking is also continuing.

With the approval of the Code of Conduct, all conduct-related services are continuing, as well, as outlined in the new Code.

A search is currently underway for an Assistant Director and an Administrative Assistant, and those vacancies will be filled very soon. Once the office returns to full staff and there is a new name for the department, updated information will be disseminated to campus.

Faculty and staff are more than welcome to reach out to Abby Blackmon, Director, as well as Dr. Krissy Creager, Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management and the Student Experience, with any additional specific questions or concerns.

S. Buttes: Just for clarification, will there be a Dean of Students hired? I ask this question primarily because we often refer students to the catalog for the last word on what the processes are, and in this body, we just approved a modification to the Student Code of Conduct back in the April 26 meeting. The general concern is that

students don't necessarily know what the process is going to be. The really specific and clear role that the Dean of Students has throughout that document, who is going to be handling that Dean of Students' role, that part in the process and procedures? So, I guess the question is, is there going to be a Dean of Students hired? If not, then it seems like we will probably have to revisit that document.

R. Elsenbaumer: I don't believe a Dean of Students is going to be overseeing this department, but I do think that it will require for some clarification, and so that is due noted. We will make sure that that clarification is made very soon. Thank you.

J. Badia: (Comment in the chat). Departments and faculty also often have policies of their syllabi that refer students to the Dean of Students.

R. Elsenbaumer: I think this is going to clearly be handled by Dr. Krissy Creager and this falls under her purview. I think that additional questions or concerns should be directed to her.

K. Creager: Hi everybody. I don't want to take too much time here, and I am more than happy to answer questions offline as well. The easiest way to say of this transition is that the Dean of Students title has been replaced by the director of dot, dot, a forenamed office. Right now, that is the director, Abby Blackmon, the Director of Student Conduct & the Care Team. As the chancellor noted, we will be hiring an assistant director to fill a vacancy, as well as an admin assistant to fill the other vacancy to flush out the office. So, yes, to your point about syllabi, etc., that is simply a name change with the Student Code of Conduct at least still speaking to that one. Being a fluid and often updated or needing those small tweaks when things of the institution change, we will absolutely get those things done and have them back to you.

The other thing is that we are going to message to students. Once this decision or once a name has been chosen, and Abby has the opportunity with her care team to flush out all of the details, we will be messaging to the students directly so that there is no confusion between what position is this and what position is that and where someone goes. Obviously, we will make sure that you all have all of that information as well, as the ones who interact with the students most closely in your classrooms.

b. (Senate Reference No. 21-8) – A. Livschiz

In the PFW Ready Committee's response to the vaccination mandate resolution on the September senate agenda, a claim was made that the university is already "encouraging vaccinations" and that's just as good as mandating them. Last week in Inside PFW, we learned that those students who got their first vaccination shot on campus were going to have to go elsewhere for their second appointment, because our partners at Walmart were not going to be coming to campus to administer those. Can someone explain how this situation qualifies as "encouraging vaccinations"? Did the affected students get individual notification, or did they learn about it from Inside

PFW? Is anyone following up with the students to make sure they know what to do to get their second shot? Is there a reason that we partnered with Walmart, rather than the CVS pharmacy on our campus, or through collaborative work with the IU Health practitioners on campus?

R. Elsenbaumer: Representatives of Purdue Fort Wayne and IU Fort Wayne collaborated starting in December 2020, when COVID-19 vaccines first became available, to attempt to set up a vaccination clinic on the Purdue Fort Wayne campus. Over the ensuing four months, attempts were made to operate a clinic independently or to partner with the Allen County Department of Health, Lutheran Health, and with Indiana University to set up an on-campus vaccine clinic. At each turn, potential partners were either unable to assist us or it became clear that we did not have the internal resources, personnel, or expertise to set up and sustain a vaccination clinic, even with external support. Critical challenges included vaccine storage, preparation, and administration. (We also reached out to Meijer Pharmacy, as they had been running vaccination clinics at Fort Wayne Community Schools, but they did not respond to our inquiries until after we had already set up a clinic with Walmart Pharmacy.)

Walmart Pharmacy reached out to IU Fort Wayne in March 2021 to inquire about running on-campus vaccine clinics. (As of March 2021, CVS was not yet administering COVID-19 vaccines in Indiana.) Representatives from Purdue Fort Wayne and IU Fort Wayne collaborated with Walmart (our only option) to offer vaccination clinics on April 20 and 21; May 18 and 19; and August 19, 25, and 26. Other than the August 19 clinic, which was only for new international students, all clinics were open to all Purdue Fort Wayne and IU Fort Wayne students, staff, and faculty. Across the four April and May clinics, approximately 475 doses of the Moderna vaccine were administered (mostly to students who received first and second shots at the two sets of clinics). Across the three August clinics, approximately 25 doses of the Moderna vaccine were administered. Neither Purdue Fort Wayne nor IU Fort Wayne collected identifying information from anyone who came to any of the vaccine clinics—all of the tracking and reporting was done by Walmart Pharmacy. This included individualized reminders for second doses.

When Walmart Pharmacy informed Purdue Fort Wayne that they would be unable to come to campus for scheduled vaccination clinics on September 22 and 23, they explained that this was due to (1) significant staffing shortages, (2) limited campus demand for vaccinations, and (3) constrained vaccine supplies from Walmart corporate due to declining demand for vaccinations in the community at large. Walmart assured us that they would individually contact the students who were originally scheduled to get their first shot on campus to explain where they could go to get a second shot (any Walmart Pharmacy, or any other location administering the Moderna vaccine). PFW also ran multiple notices in *Inside PFW* and *Don Life*.

In addition to the seven on-campus vaccine clinics, Purdue Fort Wayne ran almost weekly updates and reminders throughout the Spring 2021 semester about expanding

vaccine eligibility and the efficacy and safety of the COVID-19 vaccines, and have continued to periodically remind students, staff, and faculty throughout the summer and Fall 2021 semester about the importance of getting vaccinated.

The meeting is suspended at 1:15 until noon, Monday, October 25, 2021.

Session II  
(October 25)

Acta

Senate Members Present:

N. Adilov, J. Badia, D. Bauer, S. Betz, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, M. Cain, S. Cody, K. Creager, Y. Deng, A. Downs, C. Drummond, P. Eber, B. Elahi, R. Elsenbaumer, R. Friedman, K. Gyi, D. Holland, V. Inukollu, P. Jing, M. Johnson, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, C. Lawton, J. Leatherman, J. Lewis, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, D. Maloney, A. Marshall, J. Mbuba, A. Nasr, I. Nunez, J. O’Connell, E. Ohlander, A. Pinan-Llamas, M. Ridgeway, T. Soule, H. Strevel, D. Tembras, N. Virtue, L. Whalen, S. Wight, N. Younis, Y. Zhang, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

Z. Bi, B. Chen, Z. Chen, K. Dehr, M. Gruys, M. Hammonds, S. Hanke, G. Nakata, M. Perkins Coppola, G. Schmidt, R. Shoquist, W. Sirk, A. Smiley, D. West

Guests Present:

M. Ball, A. Blackmon, N. Borbieva, K. Burtnette, J. Cashdollar, R. Clark, M. Dixon, C. Gurgur, M. Helmsing, D. Hoile, D. Johnson, M. Kelsey, T. Luce, J. Malanson, C. Marcuccilli, S. Randall, T. Swim

J. Nowak reconvened the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on October 25, 2021.

10. Question time:

b. (Senate Reference No. 21-8) – A. Livschiz

In the PFW Ready Committee's response to the vaccination mandate resolution on the September senate agenda, a claim was made that the university is already "encouraging vaccinations" and that's just as good as mandating them. Last week in Inside PFW, we learned that those students who got their first vaccination shot on campus were going to have to go elsewhere for their second appointment, because our partners at Walmart were not going to be coming to campus to administer those. Can someone explain how this situation qualifies as "encouraging vaccinations"? Did the affected students get individual notification, or did they learn about it from Inside PFW? Is anyone following up with the students to make sure they know what to do to get their second shot? Is there a reason that we partnered with Walmart, rather than



the CVS pharmacy on our campus, or through collaborative work with the IU Health practitioners on campus?

R. Elsenbaumer: Representatives of Purdue Fort Wayne and IU Fort Wayne collaborated starting in December 2020, when COVID-19 vaccines first became available, to attempt to set up a vaccination clinic on the Purdue Fort Wayne campus. Over the ensuing four months, attempts were made to operate a clinic independently or to partner with the Allen County Department of Health, Lutheran Health, and with Indiana University to set up an on-campus vaccine clinic. At each turn, potential partners were either unable to assist us or it became clear that we did not have the internal resources, personnel, or expertise to set up and sustain a vaccination clinic, even with external support. Critical challenges included vaccine storage, preparation, and administration. (We also reached out to Meijer Pharmacy, as they had been running vaccination clinics at Fort Wayne Community Schools, but they did not respond to our inquiries until after we had already set up a clinic with Walmart Pharmacy.)

Walmart Pharmacy reached out to IU Fort Wayne in March 2021 to inquire about running on-campus vaccine clinics. (As of March 2021, CVS was not yet administering COVID-19 vaccines in Indiana.) Representatives from Purdue Fort Wayne and IU Fort Wayne collaborated with Walmart (our only option) to offer vaccination clinics on April 20 and 21; May 18 and 19; and August 19, 25, and 26. Other than the August 19 clinic, which was only for new international students, all clinics were open to all Purdue Fort Wayne and IU Fort Wayne students, staff, and faculty. Across the four April and May clinics, approximately 475 doses of the Moderna vaccine were administered (mostly to students who received first and second shots at the two sets of clinics). Across the three August clinics, approximately 25 doses of the Moderna vaccine were administered. Neither Purdue Fort Wayne nor IU Fort Wayne collected identifying information from anyone who came to any of the vaccine clinics—all of the tracking and reporting was done by Walmart Pharmacy. This included individualized reminders for second doses.

When Walmart Pharmacy informed Purdue Fort Wayne that they would be unable to come to campus for scheduled vaccination clinics on September 22 and 23, they explained that this was due to (1) significant staffing shortages, (2) limited campus demand for vaccinations, and (3) constrained vaccine supplies from Walmart corporate due to declining demand for vaccinations in the community at large. Walmart assured us that they would individually contact the students who were originally scheduled to get their first shot on campus to explain where they could go to get a second shot (any Walmart Pharmacy, or any other location administering the Moderna vaccine). PFW also ran multiple notices in *Inside PFW* and *Don Life*.

In addition to the seven on-campus vaccine clinics, Purdue Fort Wayne ran almost weekly updates and reminders throughout the Spring 2021 semester about expanding vaccine eligibility and the efficacy and safety of the COVID-19 vaccines, and have

continued to periodically remind students, staff, and faculty throughout the summer and Fall 2021 semester about the importance of getting vaccinated.

(The following discussion took place after a vote of unanimous consent to move back to Senate Reference No. 21-8).

A. Livschiz: I appreciate the chancellor's explanation. I am still a little bit concerned. The more details that are shared, the more questions come up. I don't fully understand, for example, the explanation for why we didn't use CVS, which might have been more convenient just because they weren't offering vaccines a long time ago. I don't quite understand why these decisions seem to be locked in place in the way that they are, whereas more flexibility might be appropriate. But, more broadly, part of the question was how were we encouraging vaccination, and I still don't see how we are doing that. Since a decision has been made not to have a vaccine mandate, can we kind of think about how it is that we are encouraging vaccination in a meaningful way besides simply saying "we are encouraging vaccination." We don't have accurate data on the rate of vaccination among our students at all. It is hard to formulate policy, and it is hard to move forward, when you don't have accurate data to base any decisions on. That is the follow up concern that I have to that answer.

R. Elsenbaumer: We certainly do appreciate the concern, and we do appreciate the intent to try to get as many people vaccinated as possible. We fully support that. We clearly understand that not everybody wanted to be our partner early on. But, today, I believe CVS is actually offering vaccinations, and I do believe that the Coliseum is also opening for vaccinations, so there are plenty of opportunities for anyone who wants one to get one. As far as providing other types of incentives for enticing people to get vaccinations, maybe we should ask you what are some of those that we should be considering.

J. Malanson: Just to add to what the chancellor just said and what was in the response that got emailed out this morning, I would just also note that in terms of helping to promote getting vaccinated, since vaccines first became available to people in Indiana aged 65 and older on February 1, 2021, the university has sent more than 35 separate communications to faculty and staff with information about expanding eligibility, accessibility, safety, cost, and everything else. Since vaccines were made available to everybody in Indiana who are 16 and older, the university has sent more than 20 communications to our students with the same information about accessibility, effectiveness, cost, and things of that nature. We have held 7 vaccine clinics on campus to this point. We have offered information in our weekly PFW Prepared, now PFW Ready, committee sessions, about ongoing dialogues, about eligibility, accessibility, booster shots, things of that nature. As you recall, in the spring, we also gave staff, and all employees, paid time off to attend vaccination appointments if they were able to schedule them during the work day. We have done quite a bit to help promote the importance of getting vaccinated. They certainly understand that folks think we can always do more and there are likely additional things that we can do, but I do want to note that we have done quite a bit to this point to help educate our

campus community about the availability and success rates of the vaccine, and help them understand where they can get them.

A. Livschiz: I want to say two things. The first one is, I don't want to make this sound rude, but, I have a full-time job. My full-time job does not involve figuring out how to encourage people to get vaccinated. We have people on this campus who have those responsibilities. The Chronicle of Higher Education has done a really remarkable job of collecting and publicizing all sorts of things that over 1,000 institutions of higher learning in this country are doing. Dean Badia is copying and pasting some suggestions for the different incentives that other institutions are offering. I appreciate the fact that we have been sending out emails, but I think realistically, to say that sending out a bunch of emails is equal to encouraging vaccination, I am not sure that that is an accurate way of characterizing it, given what we know about our students and how often they read emails and all of those kinds of things. I see there is some more people, just off the top of their head, copying and pasting different suggestions about incentives. None of which, to the best of my knowledge, have been tried at our university. Respectfully, again, we have no accurate data on what is going on on our campus, as far as vaccination. We don't have accurate data on the rate of infection either. We are basing our policies on bad data, inaccurate data, imprecise data, and this is a serious problem. It would be a serious problem in any case to base decisions on incomplete and bad data, but in this case, this is a question of public health, so it becomes extra significant.

N. Virtue: I would just like to hear what the chancellor or Jeff Malanson has to say in response to all of the information about incentives. Have these been considered? Were you aware of them? If not, would you consider them? Can we get a reaction? That would be helpful. Thank you.

R. Elsenbaumer: Yes. We have looked at some of these. We have been trying to find potentially some incentives that would be useful for our campus. Some of these are not so useful, some of them could be. We appreciate the feedback that we are getting, and it certainly worth continued consideration. Thank you for that.

M. Cain: My question is that the Biden administration has announced that they are going to be requiring vaccination mandates for any public institution that gets federal monies to require vaccines. We already see some universities, in anticipation of that, are requiring vaccinations. What effect, if any, will that have on our campus? Thank you.

J. Malanson: The Biden administration announced two separate federal vaccine mandates. The first is for federal contractors, which only applied to people who have federal contracts, not to universities or institutions that receive federal grants. Grants or student aid monies of that nature aren't considered part of the federal contractor piece. Purdue Fort Wayne is not a federal contractor under that regulation, so it does not apply to our university.

The other announced federal mandate was the OSHA rule for employers of over 100 employees. That rule has theoretically been developed at this point, but has not been announced in any way, shape, or form, as far as we have seen. It is important to note that OSHA does not regulate state and local government, which includes public higher ed. So even once OSHA does issue that rule, it will not directly apply to Purdue Fort Wayne. Indiana's version of OSHA, IOSHA, does issue rules that would apply to higher ed, and theoretically, we would have 30 days from whenever IOSHA issues its rule to issue a rule of equal or greater strength. But until such time as IOSHA issues a rule, it is impossible to know what will be in that rule, or what approach IOSHA will take to respond to that.

L. Whalen: This is more of a comment lending support to Ann and the others who have suggested the sort of urgent need to continue with these discussions related to vaccines. I don't know if people have seen the reports that came out in *The Washington Post*, for example, and elsewhere, that protection against symptomatic illness in the J&J vaccine apparently fell from 80% in March to 3% in August, according to one large study. So, this is an ongoing thing. It is not that everyone gets vaccinated and that is it. As we are understanding more and more about vaccine efficacy over time, this remains a really crucial element of how we should approach our responsibility to our community. Thank you.

11. Committee reports "for information only":

- a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 21-9) – A. Marshall

Senate Reference No. 21-9 (Charge to Assess the Impact of Dissolution of On-campus Printing Services) was presented for information only.

J. Nowak moved for unanimous consent to move back to Senate Reference No. 21-8.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

12. The general good and welfare of the University:

N. Younis: My intention is not to bring the Xerox and Printing Services issue back, but my report last week mentioned that I am looking forward to the report from Greg Justice about Printing Services. As the chancellor mentioned that he sent us the report, I would just like to say kudos to Ron Friedman, Greg Justice, and the chancellor for the initial report. It is not, in the words of the chancellor, where we all want to be, but there is a progress in that regard. We are moving in the right direction regarding Printing Services. It is not final yet.

13. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon

Assistant to the Faculty

**OCTOBER 2021**

# **Senate Reference No. 21-10**

# **FY22 ANNUAL BUDGET**

---

**PURDUE**  
UNIVERSITY®  
FORT WAYNE

# CORE TUITION CHANGES

	Enrollment Revenues		
	FY21 Actuals	FY22 Budget	Fall 21 vs. Fall 20 Actuals
UG Resident	-5%	-6%	-3%
GR Resident	11%	-12%	12%
UG Non Resident	-4%		-5%
GR Non Resident	-11%		-7%
UG International	36%		61%
GR International	30%		51%
<b>Total Enrollment Changes</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>-3%</b>
<b>Revenue Changes</b>	<b>-\$2,580,981</b>	<b>-\$3,923,055</b>	<b>-\$957,118</b>

- Even with continual budget reductions, PFW still does not have a balanced budget and continues to suffer from a structural deficit

# FY22 BUDGET

- The FY22 Budget of \$139.8MM represents a \$2.0MM reduction (-1.4%) over the FY21 Budget
- The budget reflects:
  - Reduced institutional aid due to a reduction in Pell Grant and scholarship requests
  - Transfer of staffing between departments (e.g., ODEI, Student Advising, Admissions)
  - Website development costs and recruiting
  - Right-sizing budgets across the university
  - Reductions in travel, supplies and other expenses
- The balances do not include the impact of \$16.3MM in HEERF related spending



# FY22 BUDGET BY SEGMENT

	FY22 Budget	FY21 Budget	FY22 vs. FY21 Inc/(Decr)	Percent Inc/(Decr)
Institutional Aid	22,587,087	25,176,204	(2,589,117)	(10.3%)
Chancellor	1,199,226	597,663	601,563	100.7%
ODEI	795,739	261,786	533,953	204.0%
Communications & Marketing	3,032,209	2,287,818	744,391	32.5%
Development	1,488,182	1,405,749	82,433	5.9%
Student Affairs	15,807,939	16,772,870	(964,931)	(5.8%)
Finance & Administration	38,546,055	36,953,560	1,592,495	4.3%
Academic Affairs	56,314,733	58,271,140	(1,956,407)	(3.4%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>139,771,170</b>	<b>141,726,790</b>	<b>(1,955,620)</b>	<b>(1.4%)</b>

- The structural deficits are not going away anytime soon
- We have to take an “All in this Together” approach to get PFW back to financial stability

# CUMULATIVE BUDGET CUTS FY20 – FY22

Budgeted Expenses	FY2019	FY2020		FY2021		FY2022		FY2020 - FY2022	
	Base Year	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change
Institutional Aid	24,993,381	(631,957)	(2.5%)	814,781	3.3%	(2,589,118)	(10.3%)	(2,406,294)	(9.6%)
Chancellor	3,107,449	1,864,435	60.0%	(4,374,220)	(88.0%)	601,563	100.7%	(1,908,223)	(61.4%)
ODEI	328,559	21,055	6.4%	(87,828)	(25.1%)	533,953	204.0%	467,180	142.2%
Communications and Marketing	1,137,190	632,943	55.7%	517,686	29.2%	744,391	32.5%	1,895,019	166.6%
Development	1,522,090	(474,791)	(31.2%)	358,450	34.2%	82,433	5.9%	(33,908)	(2.2%)
Student Affairs	14,453,301	1,674,727	11.6%	644,843	4.0%	(964,931)	(5.8%)	1,354,638	9.4%
Academic Affairs	61,401,325	275,592	0.4%	(3,405,777)	(5.5%)	(1,956,407)	(3.4%)	(5,086,591)	(8.3%)
Finance & Administration	42,313,873	4,243,967	10.0%	(9,604,279)	(20.6%)	1,592,495	4.3%	(3,767,817)	(8.9%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>149,257,167</b>	<b>7,605,970</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>(15,136,344)</b>	<b>(9.6%)</b>	<b>(1,955,622)</b>	<b>(1.4%)</b>	<b>(9,485,997)</b>	<b>(6.4%)</b>

- Over the last three fiscal years, PFW has reduced its total budget by almost \$9.5MM (-6.4%)
- Institutional Aid has had the largest percentage drop of -9.6% followed by the Finance & Administration with an -8.9% reduction.
- Academic Affairs will receive \$4.85MM from a Legislative appropriation

# HEADCOUNT AND FTE REPORT

							FY22 vs. FY20	
	FY20		FY21		FY22 Budget		Increase/(Decrease)	
	Reported Headcount	FTE	Reported Headcount	FTE	Reported Headcount	FTE	Reported Headcount	FTE
<b>FACULTY</b>								
Tenure/Tenure Track	238	230	226	221	245	240	7	10
Clinical/Non-Tenure Track	14	14	18	18	17	17	3	4
Limited Term Lecturer	273	270	230	284	234	288	(39)	18
Visiting faculty	28	25	37	34	16	14	(12)	(11)
Lecturer	52	51	48	47	46	46	(6)	(5)
<b>Total Faculty</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>(47)</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>STAFF</b>								
Administrative	319	317.85	306	306	318	316	(1)	(2)
Clerical	117	113.75	109	106	111	107	(6)	(6)
Service	132	130.75	124	123	128	127	(4)	(4)
<b>Total Staff</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>(11)</b>	<b>(12)</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>1,151</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>1,138</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>1,155</b>	<b>(58)</b>	<b>4</b>

- Since July 1<sup>st</sup>, PFW has had 55 non-faculty staff positions become vacant

# FY21 YEAR END CASH BALANCES

- PFW's year-end cash balance was \$54.1MM
- This represents an increase of approximately \$8.7MM
  - Several items contributed to the increase
    - Reduced spending across campus
    - Deferred FICA payments
    - Cancellation and delays of R&R projects
    - Lost revenues recovered from HEERF/CARES funding
- We are still under our targeted cash balance of \$70MM (4.5-5 mos.)
- PFW Foundation's Unrestricted Cash on Hand was \$1.0MM

# BUDGET GOALS

- A balanced budget every year
  - Resources are aligned with the goals and mission of PFW
  - Right sizing budgets (Control Expenses)
    - Recurring and non-recurring expenses
  - Simplify the budget process and make it consistent from year to year
- 
- Can't “continually cut our budgets to achieve prosperity”
    - Enrollment and retention are key to financial stability

MEMORANDUM OF RESOLUTION

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: A. Marshall  
Executive Committee

DATE: September 24, 2021

SUBJ: Approval of Replacement Members of the Student Affairs Committee, University Resources Policy Committee, and Nominations and Elections 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

WHEREAS, There are three vacancies on the Student Affairs Committee; and

WHEREAS, The Student Affairs Committee has appointed Wylie Sirk, Linda Lolkus, and Hank Strevel as the replacement members for the remainder of the 2021-22 academic year; and

WHEREAS, There is one vacancy on the University Resources Policy Committee; and

WHEREAS, The University Resources Policy Committee has appointed Peter Dragnev as a representative for the remainder of the 2021-2022 academic year;

WHEREAS, There is one vacancy on the Nominations and Elections Committee; and

WHEREAS, The Nominations and Elections Committee has appointed Hank Strevel as the replacement member for the remainder of the 2021-22 academic year;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Senate approve these appointments.

MEMORANDUM OF RESOLUTION

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: A. Marshall  
Executive Committee

DATE: September 24, 2021

SUBJ: Civics Literacy Requirement Resolution

WHEREAS, Purdue University Board of Trustees (BOT) voted to establish a Civics Literacy Requirement for Purdue University undergraduates in June 2021; and

WHEREAS, the BOT gave regional campuses the 2021-2022 academic year to develop an implementation plan for the Civics Literacy Requirement and get it approved by the BOT in time to apply to the incoming class for Fall 2022; and

WHEREAS, the leadership at Purdue West Lafayette (PWL) issued instructions to regional campuses for how to organize the implementation process (see appendix); and

WHEREAS, the instructions include having two representatives from PFW on the Civics Literacy System Coordinating Group—an administrator and faculty representative; and

WHEREAS, the VCAA appointed Dr. Janet Badia, Dean of College of Liberal Arts, as the administrator representative to the Civics Literacy System Coordinating Group; and

WHEREAS, the VCAA delegated responsibility for choosing the faculty representative to Senate's Executive Committee (EC); and

WHEREAS, the PWL instructions also call for creation of a Civics Literacy Advisory Group for each campus that will develop the implementation plan; and

WHEREAS, the two PFW representatives to the Civics Literacy System Coordinating Group must be part of PFW Civics Literacy Advisory Group; and

WHEREAS, the VCAA delegated responsibility for constituting the PFW Civics Literacy Advisory Group to the EC; and

WHEREAS, the existing faculty governance bodies, such as the Educational Policy Committee, cannot take on the anticipated volume of time-sensitive work involved in developing this requirement during the 2021-2022 academic year; and

WHEREAS, Section 5.4.1. of the Bylaws empowers the Senate to create an ad-hoc committee when it believes that a specially constituted group is necessary to accomplish a particular task;

BE IT RESOLVED, that an ad-hoc Civics Literacy Requirement Implementation Committee (henceforth, Committee) will be established to function as PFW's Civics Literacy Advisory Group for the 2021-2022 academic year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee will consist of a total of four Voting Faculty members and Lecturers, with no more than one Lecturer eligible to serve, representing at least three Major Units that bestow undergraduate degrees and Dr. Janet Badia as an *ex officio* voting member; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee run an election for the Faculty membership of this Committee with all due haste; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee, once constituted, will elect the faculty representative from among its Faculty membership for the Civics Literacy System Coordinating Group; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee will provide brief written monthly updates to the Executive Committee on its progress; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee will have a draft plan ready by January 7, 2022; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the committee will hold at least one public forum on its draft plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee will provide a revised draft plan, incorporating feedback from the public forum(s), for the February Senate agenda, in order to ensure that the Senate has time to review and approve the implementation plan and send it to the BOT by March 31, 2022;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that by September 30, 2022, the Senate will make permanent arrangements for the continued implementation and assessment of the Civics Literacy Requirement, including any necessary amendments to the Senate's Bylaws.



# PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Civics Literacy Proficiency Implementation Plan | August 23, 2021

**Overview:** On June 10, 2021, the Purdue University Board of Trustees (BOT) voted to establish a Civics Literacy Proficiency graduation requirement for all undergraduate students system-wide. The new graduation requirement goes into effect for Purdue-West Lafayette (PWL) students entering as new beginners in Fall 2021. The new Civics Literacy Proficiency requirement will go into effect for new beginner students entering Purdue Northwest (PNW), Purdue Fort Wayne (PFW), and the Purdue degree programs in the Purdue Schools of Engineering and Technology and Science at IUPUI – in Fall 2022.

The following statements from the Proposal to Establish Civics Literacy Proficiency as a Purdue Degree Requirement (June 11, 2021) provide the broad objectives of the requirement and its structure:

- *...there is a need for Purdue undergraduate students to demonstrate a foundational understanding of civics.*
- *The requirement as proposed does not mandate additional credit hours beyond those currently required for degree programs.*

The Proposal provides additional directives as to the specific structure of the requirement (ADD LINK TO PROPOSAL.) One principle is a common civics knowledge test across system campuses, with latitude to shape the selectives at the campus level to fit local context, subject to Board of Trustees approval.

**Implementation – system-wide:** A Civics Literacy System Coordinating Group across all campuses will guide the implementation of the Purdue University Civics Literacy requirement.

*Members:* The System Coordinating Group will be comprised of four (4) faculty representatives, one (1) from each campus; four (4) administrators, one (1) from each campus; one (1) (ex officio) undergraduate student representative, selected by Purdue Student Government; and the chair of the System Coordinating Group, selected by the Provost of PWL.

*Meetings:* The System Coordinating Group will meet regularly through the first year of implementation. The Coordinating Group will monitor implementation progress, share ideas between system institutions, surface challenges to implementation, and in general help ensure the requirement is implemented effectively across the system. In addition, the Coordinating Group will engage/communicate with the Purdue system as needed to move implementation of the Civics Literacy requirement forward. The Coordinating Group will issue periodic update reports on the Civics Literacy Proficiency requirement.

*Deliverables:* The Coordinating Group will produce and submit an interim six-month report on implementation of the requirement to the Provost at PWL by January 2022 and will produce an annual report to be presented/shared at the June Board of Trustees meeting.

**Implementation PWL:** A Civics Literacy Advisory Group – West Lafayette will be created to address implementation questions specific to the PWL campus.

*Members:* The group will be comprised of the Purdue Student Government representative (ex officio) and the campus faculty representative to the system-wide Coordinating Group; three additional PWL faculty members, for a total of four faculty representatives; a representative from academic advising; one campus administrator with teaching and learning responsibilities, a representative from the Office of the Registrar; and the chair of the System Coordinating group who will chair the Advisory Group, selected by the Provost. One of the faculty members must represent the University Senate. All will be ratified by the PWL Provost.

*Meetings:* The PWL Advisory Group will meet regularly through the first year of implementation; with a meeting schedule to be determined for subsequent years. The Advisory Group will monitor implementation progress, surface challenges to implementation, provide feedback on selectives, and in general help ensure the requirement is implemented effectively at Purdue West Lafayette. The PWL Advisory Group will engage and communicate with the campus as needed. The PWL Advisory Group will provide data to the system-wide Coordinating Group, as requested, for annual reports to the BOT and to the campus.

**Implementation – PNW, PFW, IUPUI:** A Civics Literacy Advisory Group will be created for each campus to develop the implementation plan for that campus and to address implementation questions specific to each campus.

*Members:* The campus Advisory Groups will be selected by the Chancellor/Provost (Chancellor/Vice Chancellor/Deans at IUPUI) and ratified by the Purdue WL Provost. One faculty member and one administrator member of the campus advisory group will represent the campus on the System Coordinating Group.

*Meetings:* The campus Advisory Groups will meet regularly at the direction of the campus Chancellor/Provost (Chancellor/Vice Chancellor/Deans at IUPUI). These Advisory Groups will prepare and submit the campus proposal for implementation of the Civics Literacy Proficiency requirement to the Board of Trustees for review and approval. Longer term, the Advisory Group will monitor implementation progress, surface challenges to implementation, and in general help ensure the requirement is implemented effectively on the respective campus. The Advisory Groups will engage and communicate with their campus as needed. The campus Advisory Groups will provide updates and data to the system-wide Coordinating Group on a regular basis and contribute to annual reports for the BOT.

Question Time

Given the staffing and organizational changes in the Dean of Student's office, what is the plan for that position/office moving forward? How will this affect CARE Teams, academic dishonesty cases, and other functions of that office?

A. Marshall (question from an anonymous voting faculty member)

Question Time

In the PFW Ready Committee's response to the vaccination mandate resolution on the September senate agenda, a claim was made that the university is already "encouraging vaccinations" and that's just as good as mandating them. Last week in Inside PFW, we learned that those students who got their first vaccination shot on campus were going to have to go elsewhere for their second appointment, because our partners at Walmart were not going to be coming to campus to administer those. Can someone explain how this situation qualifies as "encouraging vaccinations"? Did the affected students get individual notification, or did they learn about it from Inside PFW? Is anyone following up with the students to make sure they know what to do to get their second shot? Is there a reason that we partnered with Walmart, rather than the CVS pharmacy on our campus, or through collaborative work with the IU Health practitioners on campus?

A. Livschiz

MEMORANDUM

TO: Zafar Nazarov, Chair  
Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee

CC: Mark Jordan, Chair  
University Resources Policy Committee

FROM: Ann Marshall, Chair  
Executive Committee

DATE: September 30, 2021

SUBJ: Charge to Assess the Impact of Dissolution of On-campus Printing Services

WHEREAS, Printing Services performed a crucial support function for Academic Units on our campus; and

WHEREAS, the decision to eliminate Printing Services was made without input from Academic Units on this campus into account; and

WHEREAS, the information about the planned closure was not released to the university until the summer when most faculty were not on contract; and

WHEREAS, in response to questions from faculty leaders during the summer, the chancellor said that in making plans for how the new system would be implemented, there would be listening sessions and requests from input from units on campus deemed “heavy users;” and

WHEREAS, this did not happen, and no effort was made to find out how academic units on campus utilize printings services, in an effort to have the new system be based on the needs of university constituents; and

WHEREAS, the new system was announced over the summer, making it harder for academic units to properly prepare for its input; and

WHEREAS, the new approach—having all orders go through the department secretaries and having to build in at least a week of extra time to get requests—runs counter to actual practices of users on campus; and

WHEREAS, there have been numerous complaints from departments and colleges that the costs associated with the new Printing Services model have increased for academic units, and this increase was not taken into account in determining this year’s budgets; and

WHEREAS, the new Printing Services model has basically left the university without a reliable and function on-campus access to a vital service, and has forced Academic units on campus to individually seek out solutions to their printing needs; and

WHEREAS, the new approach is justified with claims that it resulted in “savings;” and

WHEREAS, According to the By-laws of the Senate, this issue falls into the charge of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee to be “concerned with the PFW budget” and to “[a]dvice the administration ... and the Senate on budgetary matters pertaining to the needs of the campus” with special attention “to the ways the budget and the budgetary process can affect this institution’s ability to carry out its mission to provide excellence in higher education for northeastern Indiana” (By-laws, sections 5.3.5.2.1.7.2.1–2).

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS) be charged with collecting and presenting data about the financial impacts and associated quality of service changes as a result of this restructuring, taking into account the expense of equipment recently purchased, raised costs passed on to departments as a result of the change, additional costs in the form of staff time and inconvenience, estimates on the reduction in productivity as a result of the change, and anything else that may be deemed relevant, and the report should be submitted to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee no later than February 25, 2022, (the document submission deadline for the March 13, 2022 Faculty Senate meeting);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the chancellor and/or his designee, work with BAS and ensure that BAS has access to all relevant information.