

Minutes of the
Seventh Regular Meeting of the First Senate
Purdue University Fort Wayne
March 11, 2019
12:00 P.M., KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 14, January 28, and February 11
3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Deputy Presiding Officer – R. Hile
 - b. IFC Representative – J. Nowak
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Clegg
6. Special business of the day
 - a. Faculty Senate Question Time (Senate Reference No. 18-36) – J. Clegg
 - b. Presiding Officer’s Response on the 2 Question Rule (Senate Reference No. 18-37) – J. Clegg
7. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 18-11) – K. Pollock
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 18-12) – K. Pollock
8. Question Time
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 18-38) – A. Nasr
 - b. (Senate Reference No. 18-39) – A. Livschiz
 - c. (Senate Reference No. 18-40) – Executive Committee
9. New business
 - a. (Senate Document SD 18-13) – C. Erickson
 - b. (Senate Document SD 18-14) – C. Erickson
10. Committee reports “for information only”
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: J. Clegg
Parliamentarian: W. Sirk
Sergeant-at-arms: G. Steffen

Assistant: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“Faculty Senate Question Time” (SR No. 18-36)
 “Presiding Officer’s Response on the 2 Question Rule” (SR No. 18-37)
 “Resolution to Re-establish PFW Senate Right of Advisement in the Development of the University Strategic Plan” (SD 18-11)
 “Disclosure of Pay Scales for Staff” (SD 18-12)
 “Question Time – re: Discouraging Early Promotion and Tenure Cases” (SR No. 18-38)
 “Question Time – re: Job Family Structure Review Process” (SR No. 18-39)
 “Question Time – re: Loss of Purchasing Power for Faculty and Staff” (SR No. 18-40)
 “Purdue Online” (SD 18-13)
 Orderly Process for Course Cancellations Based on Enrollment Minimums” (SD 18-14)

Senate Members Present:

J. Badia, P. Bingi, M. Bookout, B. Buldt, M. Cain, D. Chen, K. Creager, K. Dehr, Y. Deng, S. Ding, C. Drummond, C. Elsby, K. Fineran, R. Friedman, M. Gruys, R. Hile, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, S. King, C. Lee, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, A. Marshall, A. Nasr, Z. Nazarov, J. Nowak, H. Odden, M. Parker, K. Pollock, R. Rayburn, N. Reimer, G. Schmidt, R. Sutter, R. Vandell, N. Virtue, K. White, N. Younis, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

T. Bassett, J. Burg, D. Cochran, B. Dupen, R. Elsenbaumer, J. Hill-Lauer, D. Holland, M. Johnson, B. Kim, D. Linn, A. Macklin, LV McAllister, J. O’Connell, G. Petruska, B. Redman, P. Reese, S. Stevenson, A. Ushenko, D. Wesse

Guests Present:

S. Carr, A. Dircksen, M. Dixson, C. Erickson, C. Hine, L. Lin, J. Malanson, D. Smith, C. Springer

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Hile called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 14, January 28, and February 11: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

K. Pollock moved to accept the agenda.

Agenda approved by voice vote.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Deputy Presiding Officer:

R. Hile: No one has nominated themselves or their friends to be the PFW Representative to the Purdue University Senate. We need somebody to do this. You will get reimbursed for your mileage. You will also be on the Intercampus Faculty Council, but you won't have to drive anywhere for that. You can do it through conference call. The Purdue Senate meetings are on the third Monday of the month. If you are already maxed out being on the Fort Wayne Senate then you can ask your friends. The Representative must be a tenured member of the voting faculty, and needs to have a schedule that will allow them to attend the meetings. It is a three-year term lasting from 2019-2022.

There was also a question that came in after I had already started trying to find an answer to the question and it was too late to go on the agenda. So, I am just sort of answering it, but if people still have questions then they can submit more questions for next month. There is an upcoming change to the sabbatical policy. The ultimate goal is to get it more in line with Purdue policy because we are now fully a branch campus of Purdue. The idea, and this has been happening for the past several years, is that all of our policies are slowly getting lined up with Purdue policies. Previously, sabbatical policy was sort of a hybrid of IU policies and Purdue policies. From the perspective of the Professional Development Subcommittee, which deals with these applications every year, there are some downsides to our current policy. The bonus of revising the policy, from the perspective of the PDS, is that it will ease problems with confusion caused by the wording of the current policy regarding the timetable for second and subsequent sabbaticals.

Vice Chancellor Drummond started to revise in response to this Purdue policy [Purdue University Office of the President Executive Memorandum No. B-11]. The most important thing about this is that you can have a sabbatical after a minimum of six semesters of service with one semester of half pay, or at a minimum of twelve semesters of service then one semester at full pay or two semesters at half pay. This takes out the kind of flexibility that our previous policy had regarding if you are desperate and feel you will die without a sabbatical then you can't take it early and you just have to wait.

Carl made that change in response to try to get in line with the Purdue policy. Then he started talking to the Professional Development Subcommittee and they said we should also be in line with the Senate document that is governing this, even as they acknowledge that the Senate needs to update its documents to be in line with our new identity. So, Carl made another round of revisions to get in line with the Senate document [SD 06-14]. Meanwhile, the Professional Development Subcommittee sent something to the Faculty Affairs Committee and perhaps we will see that next month. The goal will be to have the OAA memo in alignment with Senate documents, and both of those in alignment with Purdue policy.

There will be the possibility of appeals for special cases as we transition to a new sabbatical policy.

That is what I found out by talking to Vice Chancellor Drummond and Andy Downs, the chair of the Professional Development Subcommittee. If you still have questions then you can submit a question for question time.

b. IFC Representative:

J. Nowak: Good afternoon and welcome back from what I hope was for you an enjoyable Spring Break.

I'd like to congratulate Rachel Hile for being declared elected for the position of Presiding Officer of Senate for next year, and Jamie Toole for being declared elected to the position of Speaker for the 2019-2021 term.

Also, please assist in helping us determine the next Learning Management System that we will be using in replacement of our current Blackboard instance. On March 1st, Adam Dirksen, Director of CELT, emailed a LMS Review Update.

Three Learning Management System providers have been identified as the finalists that are most likely to meet our campus and system needs: Desire2Learn, Canvas, and Blackboard Ultra. These providers will visit our campus on the following dates for demonstrations and presentations, all in Walb Union's International Ballroom, Salon A:

- Wednesday, March 13: Desire2Learn
- Friday, March 22: Canvas
- Wednesday, March 27: Blackboard Ultra

The schedule for each day will be identical, with faculty/staff sessions held from 10:00-11:15 am and a second, identical session from 1:30-2:45 pm. A Qualtrics link to RSVP attendance at these sessions was included in Adam's email. Purdue Fort Wayne's input and impact on this process has been substantial. Please continue to assist us in that effort.

Additionally, you are encouraged to spend some time reviewing the finalists' 30-day trials, access to each can also be found via links in Adam's original email.

If you have lost the email and need the links, please see or email Adam, CELT Program Assistant Regina Gordon, or myself and we can forward the email to you.

When each LMS provider visits our campus, we will ask again for your feedback based on your experiences with the faculty sessions and the 30-day trials. That feedback will be used by our campus Academic and Technical teams to help determine our recommendations to the System Teams, who will make recommendations to the Purdue System Executive Steering Committee.

- [Blackboard Ultra trial](#)
- [Canvas trial](#)
- [Desire2Learn trial](#)

As a final note: When the LMS providers visit campus (on 3/13, 3/22, and 3/27), each day from 11:30-12:15, a session for students will be offered and that link is also in Adam's email. [Please share this registration link with students](#), encourage students to attend, and feel free to share the links to the 30-day trials with them. We will also be collecting more feedback from students to help us in developing our recommendations.

Thank you.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Clegg: Nothing to report.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Faculty Senate Question Time (Senate Reference No. 18-36) – J. Clegg

J. Badia: I would just like to make a comment about tone policing. One of the things that I think we need to be careful of is what comprises civility. There is a way in which tone policing is used as a derailing tactic. I want to really emphasize here that being emotional or angry does not make one's point any less valid.

The second thing that I want to say is that not being angry is a luxury to those that are privileged to not have been impacted by decisions that are made or by the questions being debated. I think it is important that when vetting questions for Senate that the Executive Committee recognize that emotions are valid and that anger is valid.

Finally, I just want to point out that there is a double standard in judging courteousness. It is well documented and well researched. We all suffer from implicit biases. Men are often permitted to speak in angrier tones than women. Men frequently face less harsh consequences when they speak angrily or discourteously. They are often then seen as still being credible when they speak angrily or discourteously. There are many competing values that dominate academic debates. Transparency, honesty, and directness are some of those values.

All I want to say is that I hope that the Executive Committee is considering and recognizing their own implicit biases when judging tone in particular.

N. Virtue: I had a different comment and it is just to point out that the bylaws do not charge the Executive Committee with vetting questions. It merely charges the Executive Committee with placing them on the agenda.

G. Schmidt: Is this something that gets set by the Executive Committee or is this something that the Senate can create if they want to include the question types?

R. Hile: Bylaws are revisable.

G. Schmidt: So it could happen?

R. Hile: Yes, bylaws are revisable. It would require a change to them.

B. Buldt: I heard that the Executive Committee is writing some sort of policy for this. Is this correct?

R. Hile: Guidelines rather than a policy.

B. Buldt: I do not know whether this has ever happened, so I do not know if this will ever be needed. But, if the Executive Committee is writing something then maybe there should be a clause that people can look for. Suppose Bruce submits a question over and over again, but gets turned down. Then if he believes he was turned down for the wrong reasons, should there be a way for him to appeal? I am just raising this question for consideration. I am not asking this to get an answer. This is just a comment.

R. Hile: I do believe I am not supposed to answer things. I am supposed to be the traffic director. But, if a member of the Executive Committee wanted to answer that then I think that would be appropriate.

K. Pollock: I think the real purpose of question time is just to get questions to administrators early. If someone wants to bring up something under good and welfare they could always be free to do that. Administrators would be free to say that they are not prepared to answer it. They could defer it or just not answer it. They would have an option to do that. For someone that is turned down, they still have a place to bring it up, under good and welfare.

A. Livschiz: I might just need clarification on this. I am a little concerned that we seem to be almost equating bringing something up during new business or old business and bringing up something under good and welfare. My understanding is that the content of one is treated very differently than the content of the other. If something is brought up in good and welfare then it doesn't even have to go in the minutes. If something is brought up in good and welfare then there is no debate or

discussion or answer required by the rules of our body. There is a reason why we want to actually get answers rather than just talk. We want to place this somewhere else in the agenda because our understanding with this is that that is the way we can get responses and make sure that it is in the minutes. This interchangeability of bringing up something under good and welfare is problematic. Unless I am misunderstanding how good and welfare works.

K. Pollock: I would tell you that in question time an administrator would not have to answer questions. I think under question time, if we submitted something to the administration and they felt that it is something that they could not publicly respond to then they would just tell us that. To me, I don't see it as being different than good and welfare because both are asking the question. We may or may not get an answer, but we pretty much document everything that we talk about. So, I think it would still be under good and welfare.

A. Livschiz: Procedurally, there is a difference between submitting a question and the administration refusing to answer it under question time. That is an answer in its own way, right? Whether the reasons are good or not is irrelevant. That is a statement that the administration is making when they are refusing to answer. Not answering a question under good and welfare is following the rules of this body. They are just completely different things, with completely different weight being attributed to not responding or responding. Am I misunderstanding the way that this works?

R. Sutter: Further, by the administration choosing not to respond, it would be on the record during question time.

A. Nasr: Two comments. I think, yes, except that sometimes we have answers to questions that are not quite answers. We also have the limit of the two questions per period, which kind of limits the voice we have. How do you vet this? How do you actually get a solution to get to the resolution of the question that is being asked?

The other point that I wanted to make is that I am not sure why the Executive Committee, and I am a member of the Executive Committee, has taken on this responsibility of how we vet questions. Understandably, the Presiding Officer is there to kind of assist in setting the agenda. But, I feel that in order for this to govern the Senate then the whole Senate should be involved in how is it that we decide on questions or not. Not decide on questions per se, but decide on the laws of doing that. I think it is us, as a Senate, not as an Executive Committee, that are in charge of how we run the Senate, and maybe we should all have a voice. Maybe I should make a motion on making the decision as a Senate on how we vet questions. I am just trying to take it away from the Executive Committee to the Senate at large.

N. Virtue: I wonder if proposing alternate wording to the bylaws right now in the form of a resolution would be useful. Is that something I can do?

- R. Hile: Well, that would be new business, wouldn't it? That would be something you could do. That would give you fifteen minutes to wordsmith.
- D. Kaiser: I don't understand why we need to vet questions. Just send questions forward and if they don't like the tone then don't answer the question.
- R. Sutter: Just one other comment about the merits of question time. It does give the administration notice and time to put together a prepared and perhaps clear response, as opposed to putting people theoretically on the spot.
- M. Cain: I am not sure what the purpose of new business versus good and welfare is. At a department meeting good and welfare is like a last minute announcement. New business is something that is scheduled, right? It seems that good and welfare also has the connotation of being lesser than, as if it is not as important somehow. Maybe that is just how I am understanding it. I would be happy to hear an explanation about what new business is versus good and welfare. They just seem to get conflated.
- R. Hile: I think that your interpretation is correct. New business involves business. Good and welfare does not involve business. So, if you want something that people have to act on then you introduce it as new business.
- W. Sirk: Senate has the authority to set a special meeting for any topic that they think is worthy to further discuss. I just wanted to remind people of that.
- b. Presiding Officer's Response on the 2 Question Rule (Senate Reference No. 18-37) – J. Clegg

A. Livschiz: I appreciate Jens' attempt to answer the question. There was a second part of the question asking for how he plans to enforce this rule equitably that he did not address. I will focus on the things that he did talk about.

There are three main issues that I have with this response. The first is that this was a decision that was made by the presiding officer without consulting the Executive Committee. This was a decision that was a significant change from past practices of this body for this body's entire existence, and it was presented as fact and business as usual by the presiding officer.

The second concern that I have is that the answer does quote Robert's Rules and implies that it is a very clear interpretation, but I don't believe the interpretation is quite as clear as Jens is suggesting. Just to be clear, I certainly am not an authority on Robert's Rules. I consulted two people who I consider to be the greatest authorities on Robert's Rules on this campus. My concerns are very much influenced by their explanations to me. The quote that the presiding officer uses applies to situations where there is a motion on the floor that is being debated. Question time is not a debate. There are no motions during question time. The rules of Robert's Rules of Order, at least those cited in the answer, don't actually apply. We established in our

last meeting that question time is an internal invention that was introduced after the rules for the Senate were already established. There are actually no rules that were ever created to handle question time. If we as a body feel that we need to have rules then that is something that we as a body should discuss, rather than having a presiding officer arbitrarily enforce rules that don't necessarily apply.

There is also ambiguity in the interpretation of what it means to speak twice on the same question. Robert's Rules talks about ten minute speeches, but is that the same as asking questions for the purpose of information gathering? Jens is advocating that we introduce motions, but in order to have a meaningful motion, we need to be able to ask questions. That way one can have the necessary data in order to be able to have a meaningful motion. I am prepared to make a motion if necessary, depending on how this body feels, whether we want to go back to the way that things have always been done, or if we as a body want to have a discussion about what kind of rules we want to have governing question time.

M. Cain: I am really in favor of looking at what the rules are because we don't have that continuity of membership where people remember what we have done in the past. So, I think if we codify that and have a discussion then I think that would be very helpful.

J. Badia: I appreciate Ann's observations. This really is Robert's Rules being cited as Robert's Rules only to debating on motions, not to question time.

The other thing that seems worth pointing out is that this is a cherry picking of Robert's Rules. In other words, there are many principles that the presiding officer is supposed to follow in managing debate and motions. This one seems to be the only one out of many that is being enforced. Things like confining remarks to the narrative in question, I can remember three presiding officers in the past frequently using that rule to direct debate. I haven't witnessed it being used once this year.

Secondly, if we are going to have the two question rule then presumably we are also going to follow Robert's Rules' next step, which would be to allow due process for those times when the two question rule is being waived, which adds complexity to the debate management.

I just wanted to observe that this seems to be a cherry picking of the rules. I also want to second the idea that the debate should lead to what works for our Senate.

C. Elsby: I would also like to point out that at this very moment we are engaged in a very polite discussion. Perhaps the unsatisfactory part of this answer isn't that it is Robert's Rules, but because Jens didn't respond to the charge that he needs to reflect on, which is why he chooses to apply this rule only to Ann? So, I think we need to also discuss the equitable application of the rule.

G. Schmidt: I think we need to clearly define what the rules are. Part of the issue is that we haven't done that very well, and it just leads to issues about application. So, I am certainly very much in support of getting it defined, which it seems we all agree on. The part where there is disagreement is on how this should be applied or how we are using it. I am certainly not an expert on Robert's Rules, but it would be good for us to define that. If we want Robert's Rules then great, but if we want something else that we feel more fits our needs then also great. But, I think it is that defining it which is going to help us.

R. Hile: I think it would be very easy because all of our concerns are kind of clustered around questions on the bylaws. It would be very easy to address all of these concerns with one simple motion.

M. Cain: Just to build on that, a user's guide, especially for new Senate members saying how we operate. That way people don't need to dig in.

R. Hile: Jeff Malanson has speaking privileges. What happened? Who has the original word document of the cheat sheet?

J. Malanson: I have it. Andy has it. We used to do a primer in the first meeting every year if the parliamentarian coming in knew Robert's Rules and was able to do that. The past couple of parliamentarians, we were trying to expand the Senate's reach, so those people didn't necessarily have the expertise to confidently stand up and do that. There is no reason I couldn't come back and do that, or that Wylie, now that he has more experience, couldn't do that next year.

R. Hile: The cheat sheets. People took them away and they never came back.

K. Dehr: Is there anything in the document that says the presiding officer can't use his or her discretion with questions?

R. Hile: Discretion has been used in the past.

K. Dehr: So there is that precedent that the presiding officer can use discretion to allow someone a third question if he or she chooses. That can happen, right?

R. Hile: They can use discretion to move things along, or as Janet mentioned, saying people are off topic.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

- a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 18-11) – K. Pollock

K. Pollock moved to approve Senate Document SD 18-11 (Resolution to Re-establish PFW Senate Right of Advisement in the Development of the University Strategic Plan).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 18-12) – K. Pollock

K. Pollock moved to approve Senate Document SD 18-12 (Disclosure of Pay Scales for Staff).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

8. Question Time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 18-38) – A. Nasr

Has West Lafayette instructed, either formally or informally, the PFW Office of Academic Affairs on whether early promotion and tenure cases will receive treatment different from other cases for promotion and tenure once they have left this campus? If so, what is the basis for that differential treatment, and what criteria will West Lafayette use in its decisions, once early cases leave this campus with a favorable recommendation?

C. Drummond: Prior to realignment, Indiana University Executive Vice President John Applegate informed me that cases coming forward for early consideration of promotion and tenure would not be forwarded to President McRobbie. I believe at least one current senator was impacted by this policy. Conversely, Purdue University has been less explicit regarding early cases. In November of 2011 a Provost's task force undertook a review of the Purdue promotion and tenure policies. Item 2 of the 11 issues considered by the taskforce was "Time to tenure: Eliminating the concept of early consideration; using impact instead of time elapsed to determine when one is considered for tenure; reconsidering the six year timeframe." The taskforce presented recommendations during the fall of 2012 and a revised policy was approved by the University Senate and the Board of Trustees in the spring of 2015. The current Purdue procedures document "Procedures for Granting Academic Tenure and Promotion." Part I.B. states "Prior to the penultimate year (of the probationary period), faculty members may be nominated for tenure and promotion by any member of the Primary Committee. Those whose nominations are seconded will be voted on by the committee." This process of nomination and second has not, to my knowledge, been put in practice on our campus and is not reflected in our Senate Document 14.36. Interestingly, despite the specific topics of the taskforce's review, greater clarity regarding early cases was not established within the current Purdue system policy.

In conversation with Provost Akridge regarding early cases he has informed me that they are extremely rare on the West Lafayette campus and that when an early case does come forward it is documenting extraordinary accomplishments.

“Extraordinary” is not defined within any policy or procedure. On the Fort Wayne campus, there are two general reasons a case might come forward early.

First, it is not uncommon for us to hire faculty who have had some experience as members of the faculty at another institution. When this occurs a conversation with the candidate typically includes some discussion of “how many years count” towards our tenure clock. It has been my position that when hiring new faculty who have previous experience, the full probationary period is established in the offer letter. Likewise, it has been my position that only accomplishments achieved while in probationary status on our campus count towards meeting the expectations as defined by the departmental criteria. Accomplishments achieved prior to coming to our campus can supplement and inform consideration of the case, but should not be part of the case. Given that a faculty member who comes to our campus with previous university experience may be able to achieve the expectations of the department in less than the full probationary period, consideration of such cases at some time after successful completion of the third year review might be reasonable.

Second, faculty for whom their first appointment is here at Purdue Fort Wayne might have accumulated a set of accomplishments in teaching, research, and service that meet or exceed departmental criteria prior to the conclusion of their probationary period. Such cases should also be characterized by a very strong third year review and very positive annual reappointment recommendations. Additionally, if an early case is to come forward, its status as early should be an explicit part of the deliberations of faculty committees and administrators. Successful cases, early or on time, should consist of more than the achievement of a numerical threshold of peer reviewed publications and should highlight more than simply the passage of time. As stated in our Guiding Principles document SD 14-35 “The decision to grant tenure ... must depend in part on what has been achieved in teaching, research, and service, and, to a greater degree, on what the candidate can reasonably be expected to achieve in these areas in the future.” It is this concept of “future promise” that is critical when considering an early case.

While early cases are allowable within campus and system policy, certain risks should be considered by the candidate. First, the case might be subjected to an undefined “extraordinary” standard. Second, an unsuccessful early case might illustrate weaknesses or highlight achievement gaps that linger in the minds of committee members when the case comes forward later. Third, advancing early cases could call into question the sufficiency of departmental criteria.

I firmly believe the decision to grant tenure and promotion is a commitment between the institution and the individual made on the basis of the evidence of, and promise for, significant contributions to the mission of the institution over the remainder of the academic career. That evidence and promise can be documented in less than the full probationary period but I hold that the best decisions are made when more, not less, evidence is presented.

C. Elsby: So are you in fact saying that what I was told previously, that should I decide to submit an early tenure case and receive favorable recommendations from every level of this campus that it may be arbitrarily determined by the provost at West Lafayette that according to some definition of extraordinary that my case may be denied for purely bureaucratic reasons?

C. Drummond: No.

C. Elsby: Okay.

G. Schmidt: If that is the policy then that is the policy, but for me it is very weird to say that they have all of these procedures, and then say except for when you go up early then it has to be extraordinary beyond these standards. If you want to define what it would mean to go up early then you need something extra, which to me doesn't make sense. I know from my experience getting ready for tenure it is always very confusing. It says there is this number or this criteria, but maybe it means something else. I don't think it serves tenure-track faculty very well that they have to be worried about if they need to do an extra thing even if that other criteria may not be enough. That is a problem. I think it is a retention issue as well because what is enough? That presents all kinds of problems.

C. Drummond: So what is enough is what the department criteria state. What I am trying to convey is what actually happens. Historically we have found more early cases proportionally from the regional campuses than from West Lafayette.

B. Buldt: Thank you. I believe I fully understand the position of West Lafayette. This is based on national recognition of these things, as you yourself have explained. Sometimes we play different roles. For example, we hire someone and it can be their fourth or fifth appointment for the institution. I see a discrepancy between what we have written in our P&T documents in that the only standard is the department criteria and it is evaluated at the department. If you perceive that there is a mismatch between practice and what we have written then I believe we need to address it on our campus and I believe we need to be very clear on what the conversation is about. From my point of view, this is a clear violation of our own policy. If West Lafayette has a problem with it then they should address it head on and have an open conversation with us about our criteria, and then we can talk about whether we need extra criteria for going up early or something. But, right now, I believe it is what is written in our criteria and this is what we have to defend and what we have to stand by even if people in West Lafayette are not happy with it.

A. Nasr: I wanted to add to what Gordon and Bernd said, and I totally agree with what they are saying. While primarily it is about the candidate going up for promotion and tenure, it is also symptomatic of a larger scale in terms of the relationship between this campus and West Lafayette. The campus spirit is at a low because of all of the changes that we have had. At least for me, subjectively speaking, I don't think we have as much control over our institution. Maybe others don't agree

as much. But, why is it that the academic work, the scholarship, the efforts that are put forward from individuals that are very capable and very talented, are not at the same level as those in West Lafayette? We have the imposition of this exemplary, as elusive as the term is, seems to fall on us but not on their faculty. If I am understanding correctly, this is not quite across the board, is it?

C. Drummond: I think there is a misunderstanding here because what I tried to describe is the practices at West Lafayette, and that is largely driven by the faculty themselves in terms of not putting forward cases early because of this national reputation. What my experience has been with Provost Akridge and Provost Dutta before was that the recognitions that come from this campus are treated with great respect and that if there are questions that are within the case, so maybe there are some mixed votes or other kinds of issues, then there are discussions about those. But we haven't had any specific questions about a specific case being early. That is why I started with the first part about IU, who explicitly said that we should not do that anymore. That has not been Purdue's position. They believe that there is a standard set by the department and when faculty members achieve that or exceed that then the case moves forward.

C. Elsby: I was told by your office that there are cases that might have been approved of last year but might not be approved this year due to a specific change in policy. Can you confirm?

C. Drummond: The conversations that I had with the provost after last year are the ones that are reflected in terms of what occurs in West Lafayette and what is considered normative within the Purdue system as we become aligned.

C. Elsby: Where is this change coming from?

C. Drummond: The origin of this question has helped me clarify some of the processes and expectations at Purdue as well. That is what I have heard.

A. Nasr: Just to clarify, you said something about there might be some questions and longer discussions taking place over a particular case, but isn't that for all cases that go forward? Why do we have to be more attentive to early promotion and tenure cases?

C. Drummond: I said that there is greater attention paid to those cases that have split numbers.

A. Nasr: Okay. Doesn't that happen across? Couldn't it be any case that is put forward?

C. Drummond: Yes. Irrespective of duration.

B. Buldt: We are all in it together, right? I mean, we as faculty are. Would it be helpful if the Senate would take a vote on this and say that we believe that even West Lafayette should to a great extent respect our P&T criteria? If we take a vote on this, do you believe this would be easier for you then if you have cases to discuss with the provost over there?

C. Drummond: Our current documents clearly state that primacy resides with the departmental decision and departmental criteria. In my experience, that has been respected on the Purdue side in ways that it hasn't on the IU side.

B. Buldt: Okay.

b. (Senate Reference No. 18-39) – A. Livschiz

In January, Cynthia Springer came to senate and answered questions about the new Job Family Structure. Since then, we have been told that 183 requests were submitted and 107 of them were recommended to be changed.

To get a better sense of how the review process affected employees on this campus, I think it would be good for senate to see the following data--breakdown by department and level of how many people submitted appeals and how many people had their appeals approved

For example,
 Department X
 3 people requested to be moved from S1 to S2
 1/3 approved
 2 people requested to be moved from S2 to S3
 0/2 approved

Department Y
 5 people requested to be moved from S1 to S2
 5/5 approved
 3 people requested to be moved from S2 to S3
 0/3 approved

ETC.

Rationale for the question: there is a strong sense that some units were treated less generously than others during the reevaluation process and seeing this distribution would allow us to see if there was any correlation between success of appeals and the department/area of the employee.

I would also like to note that EC made the request for data from HR about the job family structure in December, and it was only received in mid-February, and only after a reminder from the EC. I hope that this data will be sent to senate in time for

the March 11th meeting, especially since we only have 2 senate meetings left this year.

C. Springer (written response): To clarify why the December data was received in mid-February was due to the university's commitment to evaluate and process the many Job Family position review requests. The most current data was shared with Senate once the reviews were processed.

The additional report below, as requested in Senate Reference No. 18-39, reflects a total of 183 reviews, representing 127 requests (69%) that were approved and 56 requests with no change. The report is organized by Departments.

Please see Senate Reference No. 18-39a for the report:

<https://www.pfw.edu/committees/senate/documents/references.html>

A. Livschiz: The reason I asked for this in March is because we only have April left as far as dealing with this. So, I was hoping that we could ask follow up questions from representatives from HR. Once we can see this better, I am sure we are going to have questions. Do I have to submit another question for April to make sure that someone from HR is here to answer questions? Do we just have an outstanding invitation to HR to be here to address this? What is the best way of handling it?

R. Hile: If you are asking my opinion, I would recommend a follow-up question. That would be a way of trying to get HR here.

c. (Senate Reference No. 18-40) – Executive Committee

Over the last ten to twelve years raises have been either forgone or based only on merit. The very small merit raise pool (never more than 1 to 2 percent on years given) over those twelve years has resulted in an approximate loss of purchasing power of 20 to 25 percent for faculty and staff.

How does the current administration plan to address this egregious situation?

R. Elsenbaumer (written response): It is essential that we be committed to fair, equitable, and market-driven compensation for our faculty and staff. These are the primary elements taken into consideration for recruiting and retaining highly qualified, talented, and motivated individuals. Universities — especially public universities — grapple with compensation in light of equity issues and market-driven forces on a daily basis.

Compensation at Purdue Fort Wayne has been directly affected in recent years by declining enrollment and the associated decline in available recurring revenue. Thus, both merit and equity adjustments have not been realized at the levels needed and at the frequency needed to keep our employee compensation at desired market (purchasing power) levels. This year, as the university achieved increases in fall

2018 new-student enrollment, we were able to provide a one-time service recognition payment of \$1,200 for each faculty and staff member. While I would have much preferred providing an increase to base salaries, that was simply not possible this year. As such, this one-time recognition payment did not help to improve the long-term purchasing power of our employee wages.

To address this issue for our campus, there are two essential components that must be realized. We are not there yet, but we need to get there. The first is ensuring we have sufficient available financial resources for meaningful and sustainable adjustments to our employees' salaries over many years. The second is developing a strategy for awarding not only earned merit adjustments, but also a mechanism that takes into account equity and market adjustments (if justified), as well.

As we continue to work toward increased enrollment at Purdue Fort Wayne — as well as increased philanthropy, corporate and community partnerships, external research funding, and other potential revenue streams — the university is expected to achieve stronger financial stability and be able to more confidently and aggressively address a number of issues, including compensation. It would be my hope that the creation of future compensation adjustment pools would be used to positively impact employees' base salaries.

R. Hile: Any questions?

N. Younis: From what I read here, there is no money, basically. There were some questions in here in October and we found out there was some money for administrators and athletics. Administrator salaries rose by an average of 26.5% and head coach salaries rose by an average of 57%. People in human resources got raises. So, there is money for everybody else except for the faculty and staff? You asked for a question, so that is my question.

R. Hile: It is going in the minutes.

G. Schmidt: Building on what Nash said, part of the issue is that salaries don't go up, so people leave. Then we have to hire someone from the marketplace that is not going to accept that. I see a lot of this stuff going up because no one would accept the salary of the person who left. That is sort of a hidden problem. Here, we keep losing people, and then in some areas we can go out and hire people, but for staff, mostly we are not. We lose somebody at a rate that is not high enough and then we can't find anybody to replace them at that wage. So, I think there is some disparity as well in how we are doing that. It is part of the problem. I think our costs are actually significantly more because we lose people and then we have to hire somebody at market rate, and then we lose those people again. That is a problem.

M. Parker: I think something else that plays into this, especially going off of what Gordon was saying, that we have to hire somebody else at market value, those of us that have been here for several years and have contributed, there are new people

being hired in higher than what we are getting paid ourselves. There is this huge market discrepancy for those of us that have served a long period of time versus someone who is newly coming in. What I have seen is that it really develops a lot of negative behavior, as far as faculty go. People question why they have to put out anything more because someone is getting hired in for more and so they feel disrespected. I think that is a bad thing and kind of grows in people. People question why they should put out much effort if they don't get paid as much as that new person. I think that is something that we really need to address to not only make sure that we have market rates, but also looking at that level of where new people are coming in versus those people that have been here for ten or twelve years and even have tenure. I think that is something else that needs to be addressed.

C. Erickson: This is just a comment. When I was at the West Lafayette campus for the last Senate meeting, President Mitch Daniels had a little speech about how well West Lafayette treats its faculty. On the screen, there were merit increases. About five years ago, I think it was 3.5, and then every year it has been 2.5. Certainly, they are not losing numbers and enrollment, but I can't believe their enrollment has gone straight up drastically either to justify those kinds of raises. This is a nice comparison. Every year they get raises.

A. Livschiz: I just want to go back to Gordon's point. I think that the faculty raises are very important and near and dear to my heart, but I do think that the staff retention is a serious problem. There is a lot of talk about how we need to pay market value for athletic directors or whoever else, but there is not the same conversation for staff. I think that we are hemorrhaging staff people in many areas and the replacement wages are well below market value. It is as if the labor of staff is not valued and therefore it is not seen as something that you have to pay a premium for. I really hope that this is something that is going to be looked at, whether it is David Wesse or whatever unit of this campus. I think that staff retention is something that we really need to consider before we are overrun with fruit flies.

J. Malanson: This has come up a lot in strategic planning recently. This is present in the data from focus groups. This is present in the discovery reports.

9. New business:

a. (Senate Document SD 18-13) – C. Erickson

A. Nasr moved to approve Senate Document SD 18-13 (Purdue Online).

A. Livschiz moved to table Senate Document SD 18-13 until the April agenda.

Motion to table Senate Document SD 18-13 until the April meeting passed on a voice vote.

b. (Senate Document SD 18-14) – C. Erickson

Senate Document SD 18-14 (Orderly Process for Course Cancellations Based on Enrollment Minimums) will be addressed at the April meeting.

10. Committee reports “for information only”: There were no committee reports “for information only.”

11. The general good and welfare of the University:

A. Livschiz: On Monday, March 18 at 12:20, the Brown Ink Society will host the unveiling of Audrey Ushenko’s portrait of the founders of Brown Ink. There will be free cake and coffee. There is going to be an announcement about it in InsidePFW.

A. Nasr: The Faculty Affairs Committee from the College of Arts and Sciences has nominated Doctor Janet Badia to be our Distinguished Lecturer. Please join us on Wednesday, March 27 at 7:00 pm. Her subject will be “Rethinking Stories in the #MeToo Era.” It will be in the Walb Student Union Classic Ballroom. We will have refreshments.

12. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon
Assistant to the Faculty

Faculty Senate Question Time

The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate set forth that there is a specific section of the agenda for question time:

Bylaws 2.4.9. "Question time. At this time the university administration will respond to written questions submitted in advance through the Executive Committee."

The process for submitting those questions is through the Executive Committee as stated in the bylaw below:

Bylaws 5.2.1.2.2. "Receive written questions, for response by the campus administration, from any member of the Voting Faculty and continuing lecturers. The Executive Committee shall ensure that these questions are routed to the appropriate university office, and shall place the text of each question on the agenda of the following meeting of the Senate or the next Faculty Assembly or Convocation, whichever is first."

In the process of receiving the questions the Executive Committee uses several criteria to determine if questions should be placed on the next senate agenda or returned to the submitter for re-writing or later re-submission. If a question is returned to the submitter a clear explanation for that return will be given.

Reasons that a question may be returned for re-writing or resubmission:

Tone. According to Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised (11th edition): "Speakers must address their remarks to the chair, maintain a courteous tone, and—especially in reference to any divergence of opinion—should avoid injecting a personal note into debate. To this end, they must never attack or make any allusion to the motives of members. (Section II The Conduct of Business in a Deliberative Assembly, Sub-Section Part 4 the Handling of a Motion, Sub Section Debate on the Question p. 43)

By that standard, questions that do not maintain a courteous tone, are personal, or attack the motives of members of the senate will be returned to the submitter to be edited and may be resubmitted for inclusion in a future senate meeting.

Grouping of questions. If the Executive Committee feels that a question is substantially similar to another question they may group the questions, including the full text of both questions, and send them to the administration to answer as one question.

Timing. At times a question may be sent back to the submitter because the information needed to answer the question is not available yet or because more time is needed to evaluate the potential answer. In this case the explanation given will ask the submitter to re-submit at a later date.

Questions not governed by 2.4.9. As stated in the bylaws, questions should be for the campus administration. Questions directed to any other body would need to be introduced in the new business portion of the agenda in the form of a motion or resolution, or in general good and welfare.

Any question that has been returned to the submitter may be re-submitted at any time and will be considered again.

Presiding Officer's Response on the 2 Question Rule

As set forth in the Bylaws of the Senate Point 1 "Rules of Order" states that: "1.1. Except as otherwise provided herein, *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* shall govern the conduct of meetings of the Senate, assemblies and convocations of the Faculty, and proceedings of committees and subcommittees established by the Senate or by Senate committees.

This makes clear that Roberts Rules of Order governs all aspects of senate meeting unless an exception has been specifically set forth in the bylaws. As there are no exceptions currently in the senate bylaws all provisions of Roberts Rules are in effect.

Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised (11th edition) states that: "In the debate, each member has the right to speak twice on the same question on the same day, but cannot make a second speech on the same question so long as any member who has not spoken on that question desires the floor. A member who has spoken twice on a particular question on the same day has exhausted his right to debate that question for the day." (Section II The Conduct of Business in a Deliberative Assembly, Sub-Section Part 4 the Handling of a Motion, Sub Section Debate on the Question p. 43).

This statement makes clear that each senator is only allowed two questions/comments per topic per day. It is clearly one of the rules of order and as such should be applied to senate deliberations. Its purpose is to ensure orderly and efficient discussion that gives the minority the right to make its voice heard and the majority its right to continue with the business of the day.

Roberts Rules of Order states that: "The application of parliamentary law (rules of order) is the best method yet devised to enable assemblies of any size, with due regard for every member's opinion, to arrive at the general will on the maximum number of questions of varying complexity in a minimum amount of time and under all kinds of internal climate ranging from total harmony to hardened or impassioned division of opinion". (Principles Underlying Parliamentary Law p. XLVIII).

If a senator feels that there has not been enough debate on a topic or is unsatisfied with answers to the questions. They should introduce a motion or resolution to address the issue. Creating motions and resolution are more likely to address an issue or bring about change than long periods of questioning. The goal of the two question rule is not to limit debate but to focus debate and encourage the use of motions and resolutions to achieve outcomes.

In response to the issues discussed in Senate, Senators are encouraged introduce a resolution addressing the issue or to use any of the following motions:

- Move to charge a standing committee with evaluating, considering, investigating, etc. (Requires two thirds majority to carry).
- Move to create an ad hoc committee or working group to investigate or discuss the issue. (Requires two thirds majority to carry).
- Move to have a Town Hall Meeting to let all faculty and staff have a discussion about an issue. (Requires two thirds majority to carry).
- Move to call a special meeting of the senate. Must be approved by 40% of the senators. Subject to rule restricting senate meetings to no more than 2 per month.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair
Executive Committee

DATE: February 22, 2019

SUBJ: Resolution to Re-establish PFW Senate Right of Advisement in the Development of the University Strategic Plan

WHEREAS, the Purdue Fort Wayne community is currently reviewing its strategic plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Plan Steering Committee, consisting of faculty, staff, students, staff, and university leadership, was charged with “governance, guidance, oversight, and active leadership of the strategy planning process;” and,

WHEREAS, the University has recently gone through drastic restructuring and changes with USAP, the Realignment Process, and the separation of IU from Purdue; and,

WHEREAS, Senate Document SD 13-21, “Resolution to Establish IPFW Senate Right of Advisement in the development of the University Strategic Plan,” sets a precedent that “the final draft of the strategic plan will be sent to the senate upon completion for review and comment before implementation of the plan,”

WHEREAS, in accordance with SD 13-21 and SD 17-7, the Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue University Fort Wayne, the Purdue Fort Wayne Senate has the right to review and recommend changes to the outcomes of the Strategic Plan that would involve or potentially involve any changes to academic organization, determination and management of the budget, planning of physical facilities, increases and decreases in staff, and any other alterations bearing on the faculty’s right to protect the interests of Purdue;

BE IT RESOLVED, that; the Purdue Fort Wayne Senate will review and recommend changes during the April 15, 2019 senate special session – and subsequent meetings, if need be – to respond to the outcomes of the Strategic Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate have adequate opportunity to consider, weigh in, make recommendations, and vote on a final version of the plan before its implementation.

To: Chancellor Elsenbaumer

From: Faculty Senate

Date: February 27, 2019

Re: Disclosure of Pay Scales for Staff

WHEREAS, the faculty community is concerned about pay for its devoted and hard working staff, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate requested Pay Scale information be presented at the January meeting but it was not,

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate requests that this information should be made available immediately to the campus community without further delay.

Question Time

Has West Lafayette instructed, either formally or informally, the PFW Office of Academic Affairs on whether early promotion and tenure cases will receive treatment different from other cases for promotion and tenure once they have left this campus? If so, what is the basis for that differential treatment, and what criteria will West Lafayette use in its decisions, once early cases leave this campus with a favorable recommendation?

A. Nasr (on behalf of the COAS Faculty Affairs Committee)

Question Time

In January, Cynthia Springer came to senate and answered questions about the new Job Family Structure. Since then, we have been told that 183 requests were submitted and 107 of them were recommended to be changed.

To get a better sense of how the review process affected employees on this campus, I think it would be good for senate to see the following data--breakdown by department and level of how many people submitted appeals and how many people had their appeals approved

For example,

Department X

3 people requested to be moved from S1 to S2

1/3 approved

2 people requested to be moved from S2 to S3

0/2 approved

Department Y

5 people requested to be moved from S1 to S2

5/5 approved

3 people requested to be moved from S2 to S3

0/3 approved

ETC.

Rationale for the question: there is a strong sense that some units were treated less generously than others during the reevaluation process and seeing this distribution would allow us to see if there was any correlation between success of appeals and the department/area of the employee.

I would also like to note that EC made the request for data from HR about the job family structure in December, and it was only received in mid-February, and only after a reminder from the EC. I hope that this data will be sent to senate in time for the March 11th meeting, especially since we only have 2 senate meetings left this year.

A. Livschiz

Question Time

Over the last ten to twelve years raises have been either forgone or based only on merit. The very small merit raise pool (never more than 1 to 2 percent on years given) over those twelve years has resulted in an approximate loss of purchasing power of 20 to 25 percent for faculty and staff.

How does the current administration plan to address this egregious situation?

Executive Committee

To: The Fort Wayne Senate
From: The College of Arts and Sciences Council
Subject: Purdue Online
Date: February 20, 2019

WHEREAS, the College of Arts and Sciences Council, noting that Purdue Online has gained access to all online courses taught at Purdue Fort Wayne without prior faculty knowledge or consent, passed a resolution on February 4, 2019 asking the Purdue Faculty Senate to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee with creating a campus-wide policy to oversee the orderly and equitable transfer of teaching materials to Purdue Online,

WHEREAS, the COAS Council also noted that the relationship between Purdue Online and Purdue University Global is unclear and that faculty are concerned about the possibility of losing oversight and control over their intellectual property from both online courses and courses taught in classes with online components, such as seeing that content funneled into Purdue University Global and taught by other instructors, and;

WHEREAS, the COAS Council further noted that there is currently no policy in place that allows input from PFW faculty as to what teaching materials are transferred to Purdue Online, how those materials will be used, and who those materials will be used by,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Purdue Fort Wayne Faculty Senate charge the PFW Faculty Affairs Committee with creating a campus-wide policy overseeing the orderly and equitable transfer of teaching materials to Purdue Online, which would include ensuring faculty giving prior and informed consent before any use of their intellectual property by Purdue Online or any other entity within the Purdue System, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purdue Fort Wayne Faculty Senate uses any and all available channels of shared governance to advocate for compliance with this policy at all campus and system levels.

DATE: February 4, 2019

TO: College of Arts and Sciences Council

FROM: COAS Executive Committee

SUBJECT: Purdue Online

WHEREAS, Purdue Online has obtained access without prior faculty consent to any and all online courses, including instructional materials that are the intellectual property of Purdue University Fort Wayne (PFW) faculty “for possible use to corporate clients,”¹ and;

WHEREAS, Purdue Online has instigated this action without any meaningful attempt to go through existing shared governance structures or attempt to get input directly from the PFW faculty, and;

WHEREAS, the Deputy General Counsel of Purdue has stated that “Purdue Online’s request for access is entirely within the institution’s rights and we need not wait for instructor permission to grant access,”² and;

WHEREAS, this action by Purdue Online represents a direct conflict between faculty’s contractual obligations to Purdue, and faculty rights to their own intellectual property, and;

WHEREAS, Purdue Online is a new entity and Purdue University Global is a new acquisition, and the relationship between the two remains unclear, and;

WHEREAS, COAS faculty are concerned about the possibility that they will lose oversight and control over their intellectual property from both online courses and courses taught in classes with online components, such as seeing that content funneled into Purdue University Global and taught by other instructors, and;

WHEREAS, there is currently no policy in place that allows input from PFW faculty as to what teaching materials are transferred to Purdue Online, how those materials will be used, and who those materials will be used by, and;

WHEREAS, the 2013 AAUP Statement on Intellectual Property states that unless “specifically and voluntarily created as works made for hire,” all faculty lectures and original instructional materials constitute faculty intellectual property that “cannot be revised, edited, supplemented, or incorporated into courses taught by others without the consent of the original creator,” nor can these materials “as a

¹ See Karen VanGorder’s email October 3, 2018 (attached).

² Ibid.

whole be assigned to another instructor without the consent of the faculty member who created the course, and;

WHEREAS, a bedrock standard of shared governance gives faculty control over the curriculum, including control over how, when, where, and in what modality faculty deliver that curriculum,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council calls upon the PFW Faculty Senate to charge the PFW Faculty Affairs Committee with creating a campus-wide policy overseeing the orderly and equitable transfer of teaching materials to Purdue Online, which would include ensuring faculty giving prior and informed consent before any use of their intellectual property by Purdue Online or any other entity within the Purdue System, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council urges development of campus-wide policy that will address faculty concerns about an orderly and equitable transfer of teaching materials to Purdue Online or any other entity within the Purdue System, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council urges Senate to use any and all available channels of shared governance to advocate for compliance with this policy at all campus and system levels.

Karen Van Gorder

Wed 10/3/2018 12:08 PM

To:

Angela Williams

Cc:

Julie Yoder;

Manoochehr Zoghi;

Melissa Gruys;

Eric Link;

James Burg;

John O'Connell

Inbox

Good morning all:

Purdue Online (system level) has asked for access to all of Purdue Fort Wayne's courses in Blackboard for possible use to corporate clients. I asked some questions and here is the response I received from Trent Klingerman, Deputy General Counsel:

"It is my limited understanding that there was a concern voiced at PFW over permitting Purdue Online personnel access to syllabi, etc. for purposes of a necessary and urgent readiness assessment. The concern was relayed to me as whether such access was consistent with the principle of faculty ownership of their instructional works.

I am happy to discuss this with you and answer any questions; but, in a nutshell, the university has a right (by virtue of a non-exclusive, royalty-free license) to these materials for all research and educational purposes. In my judgment, Purdue Online's request for access is entirely within the institution's rights and we need not wait for instructor permission to grant access."

Access is being granted this morning. Please direct any questions to Dr. Drummond.

Karen L. VanGorder, CPA, MBA
Executive Director, Division of Continuing Studies
Purdue University Fort Wayne (PFW)



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

To: The Purdue Fort Wayne Senate
From: The College of Arts and Sciences Council
Subject: Orderly Process for Course Cancellations Based on Enrollment Minimums
Date: February 20, 2019

WHEREAS, the College of Arts and Sciences Council, noting the confusion that has occurred when terminating courses based on enrollment minimums, passed a resolution on February 4, 2019, urging the Purdue Fort Wayne Senate to create an orderly process for course cancellations, and;

WHEREAS, the COAS Council also noted that the lack of an orderly process for terminating courses based on enrollment minimums, which has negatively impacted some academic units and faculty's ability to control the curriculum as outlined in the Constitution,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Purdue Fort Wayne Faculty Senate develop a consistent, predictable, and orderly process for determining and communicating to the Voting Faculty both a stable number for enrollment minimums and well-defined procedures for canceling class that do not meet those minimums, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purdue Fort Wayne Faculty Senate establish in this process a reasonable timeline and deadline for when in a semester, or between semester, course cancellations based on enrollment minimums will occur, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purdue Fort Wayne Faculty Senate establish in this process an allowance for reasonable exceptions and appeals processes based on whether a class has one or more graduating seniors; whether a decision to cancel one or more classes would harm student success and progress within an academic program; or any other factor based on educational considerations, or any factor that would impinge upon faculty control over the curriculum as outlined in the Constitution of the Faculty, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purdue Fort Wayne Faculty Senate ensures that this process abide by established principles and practices of shared governance involving collaboration and cooperation between faculty, administration, and other constituencies who share mutual interests in ensuring that the university meet minimum enrollment targets, and that these targets treat both individual units and faculty fairly, regardless of faculty employment status or academic unit size.

To: College of Arts and Sciences Council
From: COAS Executive Committee
Re: Orderly Process for Course Cancellations Based on Enrollment Minimums
Date: 4 January 2019

WHEREAS, Purdue University Fort Wayne as a whole has faced declining enrollments, and;

WHEREAS, university administration has attempted to address those declines through imposing continuously variable minimum enrollments that escalate from semester to semester, and;

WHEREAS, the imposition of these minimums has occurred largely without clear or orderly communication; and outside a collaborative and cooperative process of shared governance, and;

WHEREAS, the rigid and frequently last-minute impositions of these minimums have resulted in confusion and disruptions to academic units and their ability to administer the educational mission of the institution, and;

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue University Fort Wayne grants Voting Faculty the exclusive right to “determine the policies for class scheduling” (VI.A.3.b of <https://www.pfw.edu/committees/senate/documents/documents/2017-18/Constitution.3.12.2018.pdf>), and;

WHEREAS, poorly conceived and executed policies regarding the use of enrollment minimums to justify course cancellations, often occurring without meaningful collaboration and cooperation with faculty, ultimately undermine faculty control over the curriculum as outlined in the Constitution, and;

WHEREAS, decisions to terminate classes run the risk of terminating non-tenured faculty appointments, and;

WHEREAS, the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) 2018 revision of “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure” noted that decisions involving termination of faculty should “be based essentially upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole or an appropriate committee thereof,” (<https://www.aaup.org/report/recommended-institutional-regulations-academic-freedom-and-tenure>), and;

WHEREAS, the AAUP’s “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure” specifically defined “educational considerations” as exclusive of “cyclical or temporary variations in enrollment,”

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council recommend Senate as the most appropriate body to take up and consider developing a consistent, predictable, and orderly process for determining and communicating widely to the Voting Faculty both a stable number for enrollment minimums; and well-defined procedures for canceling classes that do not meet those minimums, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this process establish a reasonable timeline and deadline for when in a semester, or between semesters, course cancellations based on enrollment minimums will occur, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this process allow for reasonable exceptions and appeals processes based on whether a class has one or more graduating seniors; whether a decision to cancel one or more classes would harm student success and progress within an academic program; or any other factor based on educational considerations, or any factor that would impinge upon faculty control over the curriculum as outlined in the Constitution of the Faculty, and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this process abide by established principles and practices of shared governance involving collaboration and cooperation between faculty, administration, and other constituencies who share mutual interests in ensuring that the university meet minimum enrollment targets, and that these targets treat both individual units and faculty fairly, regardless of faculty employment status or academic unit size.