Senate Document SD 21-31
Approved, 4/18/2022

TO: Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: Assem Nasr, Chair, Executive Committee
Steve Carr (COM Faculty Member), Noor Borbieva (ANTH Faculty Member), and Mary Ann Cain (ENGL Senator)
RE: Maintaining Faculty Role in Advising
Date: 25 March 2022

WHEREAS the Office of Academic Affairs announced via email on 22 March a change in how faculty advising of students will occur; and,

WHEREAS this change will result in students entering directly to Purdue University Fort Wayne from high school being registered for classes before meeting with faculty advisors to discuss intended majors of study; and,

WHEREAS SR 18-25 noted that the Office of Academic Affairs had announced it would be making this change as early as Fall 2018, and that in response there had been a "wave of opposition to it"; and,

WHEREAS the Minutes of the 28 January 2019 meeting of the Fort Wayne Senate show that the Office of Academic Affairs was planning to make this change over the strenuous objections of Faculty and without meaningful input from the Fort Wayne Senate, the representative body of the Faculty; and,

WHEREAS a Memorandum from Faculty Leadership to All Faculty dated 18 May 2021 documented that the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, for Enrollment Management and the Student Experience, and the Executive Director for Academic Accountability and Success all would ensure "faculty advisors will have the option of advising students individually beforehand on course selection and sequencing," that faculty advisors would "be able to fill out a form, to be taken by the student to the registration session, showing exact course sections recommended by the faculty advisor," and that the first New Student Orientation session would makes these forms available to students"; and,

WHEREAS neither the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, for Enrollment Management and the Student Experience, nor the Executive Director for Academic Accountability and Success since have claimed the May 2021 Memorandum mischaracterized their agreement outlined in this document; and,

WHEREAS neither the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, for Enrollment Management and the Student Experience, nor the Executive Director for Academic Accountability and Success since have shared with Faculty a written proposal that would further develop and outline changes to how Faculty advise students as described in the May 2021 Memorandum; and,

WHEREAS the Office of Academic Affairs since then has made little if any effort to obtain meaningful input from the Senate, including but not limited to time to review a formal proposal, suggest improvements, and make additional recommendations in the form of a vote; and,

WHEREAS advisors with little if any oversight from or accountability to Faculty or Senate will register newly matriculated students for classes before those students can meet with a Faculty Advisor within their intended major; and,

WHEREAS the Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue Fort Wayne gives Faculty the power and responsibility "to recommend policies concerning the admission and academic placement of students"; and,

WHEREAS the Bylaws of the Senate constituted an Educational Policy Committee concerned with "standards for admission" and "academic placement"; and,

WHEREAS SD 21-1 just established an Advising Subcommittee of the Education Policy Committee in November; and,

WHEREAS the Advising Subcommittee already consists of the Chief Academic Officer (nonvoting) and two academic advisors from the Office of Academic Accountability and Student Success; and,

WHEREAS the Advising Subcommittee has received neither an invitation nor an opportunity to make a formal recommendation to Senate to implement a change to student advising; and,

WHEREAS Senate has had no meaningful input or the opportunity to vote upon this change before it went into effect,

RESOLUTION:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Fort Wayne Senate recommends the Office of Academic Affairs delay implementation of this change and return to a student-centered advising process that provides students with access to a Faculty Advisor within their intended major before registering the student for classes; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Office of Academic Affairs submit a formal proposal to change the advising process through the Advising Subcommittee, for Senate review during the 2022-23 academic year; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Office of Academic Affairs wait to implement any further changes to the advising process until it has sufficiently weighed and responded to Senate input on these changes.

Senate Reference No. 18-25

Question Time

The week before Fall Break VC Drummond announced there would be a big change in the way that academic advising would be handled on this campus. The proposal that was made public, among many other things, aimed to remove faculty from direct student advising until the students were “developmentally ready to benefit from that relationship” i.e. relationship with faculty in their major). The response to the initial wave of opposition was to depict those criticizing this “well-considered” proposal as just trying to defend their “silos.” No public announcements about the fate of this proposal have been made since October 12. What is the current status of the advising restructuring plan?

A. Livschiz

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the First Senate
Purdue University Fort Wayne
January 14 and 28, 2019
12:00 P.M., KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of December 10

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

7. Committee reports requiring action

8. Question Time
   a. (Senate Reference No. 18-18) – B. Buldt
   b. (Senate Reference No. 18-19) – B. Buldt
   c. (Senate Reference No. 18-21) – B. Buldt
   d. (Senate Reference No. 18-24) – B. Buldt
   e. (Senate Reference No. 18-25) – A. Livschiz
   f. (Senate Reference No. 18-28) – K. Pollock, Executive Committee

9. New business

10. Committee reports "for information only"
    a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 18-29) – C. Lawton

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:

"Question Time – re: Central Administration and Branding" (SR No. 18-18)
"Question Time – re: Administrator and Coach Salaries" (SR No. 18-19)
"Question Time – re: Chancellor Elsenbaumer Offer Letter Metrics" (SR No. 18-21)
"Question Time – re: Access to Purdue Fort Wayne Courses on Blackboard" (SR No. 18-24)
"Question Time – re: Advising Restructuring Plan Status" (SR No. 18-25)
"Question Time – re: Job Family Structure Classifications and Pay Bands" (SR No. 18-28)
"Actuarial Science Minor and Behavior Analysis & Techniques Certificate" (SR No. 18-29)
"Chancellor Performance Metrics" (SR No. 18-34)
"Current Classifications for all Non-faculty Employees in Academic Departments" (SR No. 18-35)

Session I
(January 14, 2019)

Senate Members Present:
J. Badia, T. Bassett, M. Bookout, B. Buldt, J. Burg, M. Cain, D. Chen, D. Cochran, K. Dehr, Y. Deng, S. Ding, C. Drummond, B. Dupen, C. Elsby, R. Elsenbaumer, R. Friedman, M. Gruys, R. Hile, J. Hill-Lauer, D. Holland, M. Johnson, D. Kaiser, J. Kaufeld, B. Kim, S. King, C. Lee, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, A. Marshall, A. Nasr, Z. Nazarov, E. Norman, J. Nowak, J. O'Connell, M. Parker, G. Petruska, K. Pollock, R. Rayburn, B. Redman, P. Reese, N. Reimer, G. Schmidt, S. Stevenson, R. Sutter, A. Ushenko, R. Vandell, N. Virtue, D. Wesse, K. White, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:
P. Bingi, K. Fineran, M. Jordan, D. Linn, A. Macklin, H. Odden, M. Zoghi

Guests Present:
S. Carr, K. Creager, A. Dircksen, M. Dixson, C. Erickson, C. Fox, B. Kingsbury, C. Lawton, J. Malanson, A. Seilheimer, D. Smith, K. Smith, K. Tolliver

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Clegg called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of December 10: 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:

C. Drummond: I didn't think it was totally fine, but I resisted it up until the point that I got a notice that said it will happen. The reality of that is, I can't speak to other university contracts, but for clarity, the contract that we all signed says that the university system has an equal share of ownership of the content of our classes. So, this is my simple non-lawyer way of saying that we and the university equally own the content. That means that if we leave the university we can take our course content with us and deliver it at some other place. Equally, if we were to leave the university and the university decided that it wanted to then it could utilize that content. It could also utilize that content in other contractual relationships for educational purposes. Former Deputy Presiding Schwab and I had a long conversation about what is an educational purpose. I share your concerns. The reality is that is part of the contract we signed. If we don't like that then I think we have to think about what it might look like to try to retroactively negotiate it. I wouldn't hold my breath on that.

J. O'Connell: I think perhaps we need to do a PR run or something because I too didn't know it was nine. There are faculty members who ardently believe that Purdue Global has assets of all of our online material. I have had personal friends of mine who really still are outraged by the thought that Purdue Global was given access to all of our online stuff and can use it as they see fit. If that is not the case, which, quite frankly, I thought it was too until just now, that should be clarified. We have a lot of faculty who thought their online material was turned over to Purdue Global and is being used as assets. So, I think that the fact that you just said that it was determined that the not useful would not be used is not in the faculty thought system. I think perhaps some clarification should be sent to faculty.

C. Drummond: Not only did that not occur, our courses and the way they are structured would not allow it to occur.

J. O'Connell: I think that communicated to the faculty by you or someone else would be helpful.

C. Drummond: I tried to in October.

J. Clegg: Our time has expired. We are going to have to recess until January 28.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 until noon, Monday, January 28, 2019.

Session II
(January 28, 2019)

e. (Senate Reference No. 18-25) – A. Livschiz

The week before Fall Break VC Drummond announced there would be a big change in the way that academic advising would be handled on this campus. The proposal that was made public, among many other things, aimed to remove faculty from direct student advising until the students were "developmentally ready to benefit from that relationship" i.e. relationship with faculty in their major). The response to the initial wave of opposition was to depict those criticizing this "well-considered" proposal as just trying to defend their "silos." No public announcements about the fate of this proposal have been made since October 12. What is the current status of the advising restructuring plan?

C. Drummond: A student's transition from high school to college is much more than choosing coursework, meeting professors and peers, buying books, and learning how to get to the classroom. Rather, it is an intricate, turbulent, and often very difficult season of life. The functional aspects of navigating a new environment have proven to be common retention pitfalls. University lingo, financial aid, time management, resilience, and social integration are all well researched threats to student success. These elements, to name a few, can be profound barriers to student learning, focus, and attention inside of the classroom. Certainly the students we serve are not immune from these challenges.

Retention and student success require a team. Ideally a highly-collaborative and integrated team of peers, student success coaches, faculty members, and primary role advisors all work seamlessly to transition a student from enrollment deposit through the first three semesters. Institutions across the country began implementing structures based on this integrated student success concept over a decade ago. Immediate increases in retention and long-term gains in graduation rate have resulted.

Such a relational and support structure shifts the way students are transitioned to the university. It requires both generalists and specialists working in full collaboration to positively impact retention and student success throughout the student's undergraduate experience. By engaging students immediately it is possible to minimize excessive credit hour completion, reduce the risk of loss of financial aid, decrease the amount of student debt, and dramatically improve student success. It solidifies the required foundation for success, reduces barriers to classroom engagement, and provides students in every major – as well as the significant percentages who change their major in the first and second semesters – with an integrated student support experience.

It is our goal to significantly improve student success at PFW by implementing the holistic, multi-connected, structure described above. As I said at the advising retreat last semester, it is not about doing one thing OR the other, it is about doing this thing AND that thing, and as many things as we can to connect students to resources and support services. There is no desire to displace or replace the role of the faculty or the role of embedded primary role advisors. Again, I made that clear at the retreat.

Specific milestones and processes that were followed:

Academic Deans have provided critical input to the reconceptualization of the initial draft of the support structure after discussing the College and School personnel.

Deans and Student Success personnel met with Chairs in order to communicate the intake model and further develop integrative relationships to assist students throughout their university transition. Utilizing this feedback the intake form continues to be a living document and faculty have until February 1st to submit specific major base questions for inclusion in the final version before it is populated into our CRN slate and released to students who have submitted their enrollment deposit.

Two of the three enrollment services counselor positions have been hired. Directors of Advising and Student Success from each college were part of those interviews and provided important feedback to inform the selection. The remaining position will be reposted as an internal search to secure the candidate.

Directors of Advising and Student Success in each College are serving on a team to formulate, develop, and inform all critical junctions of the intake process for incoming students beginning Fall 2019. They meet weekly to discuss all aspects of the intake and orientation process.

So far, over eighty applications have been received for our peer and student success coaches, who will serve as integral connectors, mentors, orientation leaders, and a support system for our first year students next year.

Application are due on Friday, so please encourage stand out students to apply.

Finally, I recommend interested individuals stay in touch with her or his Chair, Dean, and Director of Advising/Student Success for ongoing updates.

A. Livschiz: Thank you for answering this. Obviously, this question was submitted back in November and the answer is only being given now. I know you had to rewrite it and I know that there have been some developments since then. So, one of the things that concerns me, for example, is that in the proposed model that we were given, that we were not asked to provide feedback on, is that the departments are no longer going to have immediate access to incoming students whose high school GPAs are below 3.5. Based on the handout that was given out at the COAS Advising Committee meeting, for the history department for example, if that was applied last year, out of our twenty-five incoming freshmen we would have only had access to three. The rest would be not with us. This is something that I find very troubling because you made such an emphasis on that this is not an either/or, but that this is a collaborative thing. We don’t want to not have access to our students. One of the selling points is that they are able to have access to faculty from the very beginning and not later on, and not at some unspecified later date. Furthermore, we are very concerned that allocation of resources for departments is tied to retention and recruitment. So, we are now responsible for recruitment and retention. Yet, we are not going to be given access to these students and therefore if the retention is being done by somebody else then the consequences of that are ultimately going to be borne by us. So, why can’t we have those students?

C. Drummond: So, Krissy has speaking privileges, but I will start the answer. I am in complete agreement. We need the integration of faculty from the beginning with Student Success and with multiple points of contact. It is not our intention to pull them away from you and not allow you to speak with them. That is not our goal. I think that at the heart of the issue is the question regarding who is mechanically going to enter the classes in the orientation and registration period, not about the interactions, and opportunities for interactions, that faculty have with students throughout the orientation process and throughout the academic year. No one is going to take your students from you. The point of question has been, as far as I understand it, is "who is technically entering their course registration process?"

K. Creager: Agreed. I think the other piece I would add is that we made it very clear on the schedules of orientation that there will be two to two and a half hours with the college department however your college chooses to divide that time of orientation. So, two pronged. For instance, in COAS, Ron could talk for ten minutes, and then they go immediately, every single student, regardless of high school GPA, to the academic department for whatever conversation you want to have.

A. Livschiz: Are you talking about A&R or NSO?

K. Creager: They are together now. It is one day. There is no A&R and NSO. It is a one day experience for all students. So, regardless, you have that time before any advising or registration begins. How you want to structure that is completely and totally up to you and your department and college. One of the things that we had multiple conversations with the directors of advising is around the notion of the intentional use of primary and secondary advisors in the system, and to be able to tell students immediately how to use both of those people the right way, and who and where to go to get support. All of those things will then be purposefully put into the system and discussed.

C. Drummond: And if I understand the changes in the timeline correctly, there will be more time available for the colleges and departments.

K. Creager: That is correct. And students always retain their major. So, regardless of whom their primary or secondary advisor is in the system, they retain their major when they apply.

B. Buldt: Do you allow a question on behalf of an absent Senator?

J. Clegg: Just ask the question.

B. Buldt: So, the background is that a lot of colleagues in Mathematics are concerned because we have a highly successful major in actuarial sciences with a really high success rate and this relies on close mentoring from the get go. Faculty members should get involved in student advising as early as possible so that students can get clear guidance from the academic path that they will pursue. The most accurate and effective source of information is from faculty members, and the connection between faculty members and students turns out very beneficially for the students' future careers. For example, in our actuarial sciences program we always give students clear ideas about the requirements, courses, exams, internships, etc. early in the first year so that they can make educated decisions in the program if that is what they really want to do. We help students establish the connection with local insurance companies by organizing events, such as visiting local insurance companies, inviting actuaries to campus to meet students, etc. Getting faculty members in the advising process early will help students to get more customized attention. Faculty-student ratio is about one to six rather than maybe one to a few hundred.

C. Drummond: I think that is fantastic. That is exactly what we want to have happen. As outstanding as that technical and professional advising is it may not be well informed about the details of financial aid. It may not be well informed about other aspects of the student's academic career. So, we want to provide an opportunity for all students, particularly those that we know are more at risk. Those that have high school GPAs below 3.5 will have access to these additional coaching and support services. Not displacing and not saying that you can't take them to meet the insurance people. We want you to do all of those things from day zero. But, we also want to provide a secondary point of contact about other aspects of being a college student.

M. Parker: I understand that faculty are still going to be involved and important. I guess the only concern that I really have is that we are introducing more and more people into the structure and I kind of look at it like when I meet with these freshmen students they kind of in-print on you as you being the kind of person that they know they can go to. Now we are introducing more and more people into the situation where there is now another fuzzy area about who they would go to. That is the part that I am most concerned about.

K. Creager: Absolutely. I couldn't agree with you more. One of the areas that we have not done a good job at is really helping students understand exactly what that means. So, because of that wrap around support there are going to be moments when a faculty member is not available and that student needs something right now. They then always know that secondary person is there. That does not mean that if someone else is listed as the primary advisor with a student then they cannot talk to you. There is nothing that says a student can't come talk to you because you are not listed as the primary person. Again, illustrating that notion of the full wrap around. But, agreed, that is a concern that we will absolutely address in making sure we paint that picture for the student.

M. Cain: Can you say more about how 3.5 was determined to be the line? It seems a little high.

C. Drummond: It is actually low compared to our analysis of student success. Students that come to us with a high school GPA of 3.6 or above are highly successful. Once you get below that threshold, they start to fall off very rapidly. So, what we have done is pick a number that is a little below that because of low volume issues. We are going to start with 3.5 and adjust that as time goes on. Remember that any student, irrespective of high school GPA, has access to these services. It is just that we are going to purposefully connect the ones that are in this lower area.

M. Cain: Success meaning?

C. Drummond: Retention.

J. Burg: I just want to speak out in support of this concept. The concerns that are being raised, I certainly had the first time I was introduced to this. Particularly for my education students, which have probably the most technical pathway and zero electives throughout their career here. But, I will say that the moment that we interacted with Krissy and Corrie and when the answers came forward we saw this as more collaborative. Also, as we moved in the past couple years toward a college with a Student Success Center model, we realized that we don't have the capacity to do as much as we want to. So, we now see this as really a partnership where that extra capacity is particularly helpful for students that need more contact. We can now offer that.

A. Livschiz: I would like to deeply express my concerns about this. On one hand, it is great that students have multiple people who care about them. If students don't feel that way without this structure then that is a very sad indictment of how we do things up until now. But, the reality of our students is that they are not going to go and make multiple appointments. They are not going to go to this person for this question and then set up another appointment with another person to answer another question, and on and on. We are lucky that they just come once and then we can lock them into a room and not let them out until we are done talking about the things we need to talk about. So, I am very worried, especially with the example that was given, that faculty are not knowledgeable about all aspects of retention. With all due respect, I don't know who is knowledgeable on this campus about all aspects of financial aid. The difference is that when a student comes to me with financial aid problems, I know that I should not be advising them and I immediately try to contact somebody who actually knows what is going on there. There have been multiple students where we have to unravel advice that was given to them and misunderstandings and so on. Thank god they have an outside person who is going to do that because faculty advisors are not supremely confident that they know everything. They are more likely to go and get somebody who is an expert to try to help them. So, I am very worried about this and the primary-secondary. Are faculty primary or are faculty secondary in this particular setup? Whose name shows up? If a student comes into myipfw and clicks advisor then who does it go to? Does it go to the faculty or does it go to somebody else? If it doesn't immediately go to the faculty advisor then this is a system that is going to be deeply problematic and it is going to have profound consequences for many departments and their ability to retain students, for which we in turn are going to be punished repeatedly and chastised over and over again. So, who is going to be primary? Us? Faculty or whoever?

K. Creager: We just began the conversation, sorry, I am going to point to Marietta because she was the one in the room representing your college, as well as with the deans about where those should be and what that looks like. I will give you an example, take a student with a 3.5 that is majoring in history and knows they want to be in history, maybe that is you are primary and Marietta is secondary. That will be completely up to your department and your college to determine.

A. Livschiz: So, in this flexible system, each department is going to be able to say how they want this set up?

K. Creager: Correct. Obviously, within reason of those pieces. For instance, I don't know why you would want a faculty member as primary and secondary. You would want a primary role advisor because again the purpose being that every student, regardless of high school GPA, interacts with a primary role advisor at some point in time in that system early. The same with faculty. There is no desire or need to do one or the other. So, in that instance it might be you and Marietta. In the instance of a student with below a 3.5 GPA, again using Corrie as an example, maybe it is a Corrie and a Marietta or maybe it is a Corrie and a you. That is up to your department and your load. So, whatever of that structure makes sense and puts that wrap around service together is really what we are looking for.

C. Drummond: In some cases, we worked out arrangements with programs that are not GPA specific. So, there is some flexibility.

M. Gruys: I also want to speak in support of this. We have a very different model than a lot of other units in that we are giving all professional academic advising. Our faculty are very used to having not being taken away from the process and doing the career advising, such as what one will do if they major in finance and what kind of career they will do. I think that if you are doing that and calling these other offices then you are only able to do that if you have a load that is going to allow you to do that. I think there are a lot of faculty at this university that have a much bigger load of students that aren't able to do that. If you are acknowledging that you are not a financial aid expert, I don't even think our professional academic advisors would say that they are. They are sending them to another office, and that is really what these advisors and coaches are going to be doing. I don't think it is actually difficult for students to understand that they have these coaches for certain things, and where we don't have first year seminars they can help to implement having those. So, it is additional services. We have said that a few times, but I think that is how we view it in business. These are additional things that our students are not getting right now. I am sure others are doing a wonderful job and students are getting that, but I think at this institution there are a lot of them that are not. So, if you guys take it over right away then there is no loss to your students. There is just an additional person. I know our advisor said that there is stack of people on the desk and they know who could use another phone call for a follow up if there was time. They just don't have the time. This person would allow them to be able to have just another support system. That is how I feel.

B. Kim: I am also in general support of this. The reasoning is that every department has a different number of students. For some departments with a lot of students, this puts a heavy burden on faculty. We are not experts on financial aid. If we implement this new policy it can be helpful.

B. Buldt: I have the obvious concerns. I believe national data, if this is set up right, speak in favor of it. What I, as a faculty, would find extremely helpful would be a hotline that I can immediately call if I see that a student is falling behind. Maybe it is just my class. Maybe the student is struggling. If, for example, I see that a student has not attended class for two or three class periods then I could call a hotline and ask for them to follow up with the student to see what is going on. These advisors could make phone calls, text, or email. Whatever is necessary to find out what is going on.

C. Drummond: That is a brilliant idea and we are working on it. Last semester, during the second evening period, we did a very small pilot with classes that started and ran just for the evenings. These were primarily online and primarily serving students that already had some difficulty in the earlier part of the semester of dropping class and adding an additional class late in the game. But we had eight or nine sections that participated and we received forty-seven or forty-nine referrals over that period of time. This semester we are expanding the pilot with all COM 114 sections. What we have to figure out is what are the kinds of responses that we are getting? What are the pathways of service that we need to make sure are functional? Because if we set up a system and you call and there is no obvious outcome then you are not going to call a second time. What is our capacity to respond to these? If I have a hundred in the second week then how do we respond to that? We are starting to build some of these structures. It turns out that this has always been present as part of the behavioral care team form that you could fill out. You go through and there are pages about if the person is dangerous or what have you. There was an academic page, but it was never used for that purpose. We are building that kind of academic care team hotline response whether it is a web form or phone or whatever. So far we have done web forms. So, yes, we are working on that. We want to implement that more fully for academic year 19-20.

M. Parker: I think this approach is good and we have done something similar in ETCS for freshmen advising to provide that structure around it. But, another layer below that is, obviously, you said the faculty is primary or secondary. But, not all faculty are good advisors. We really thought about, I don't know how to say it, approving faculty to be advisors, as opposed to just saying that everybody is an advisor and figuring out those that are really good advisors. I have seen some students really get some crappy information from faculty advisors because they are just bad faculty advisors. Some students hit the lottery of getting a good faculty advisor and other students don't. I know it is an underlying layer of this whole thing, but it is kind of baseless.

C. Drummond: What we have not done is to fire people from advising. I think I am going to leave that as a local decision. We do have a series of professional development committees for faculty and primary role advisors that have some built-in expectations. These are the minimum expectations for the knowledge of the spectrum of things that come up in advising. That is a sort of curriculum that is available for people for review and to brush up on things.

G. Schmidt: I think this system sounds like it could certainly be helpful. One of the things that we get a lot of in our department is that students have no idea who their advisor is or they want to talk to some other faculty member. They want to find an advisor for five minutes at 7:00 PM. I get a little worried when we think that students are going to know who the different advisors are. I am worried if they will even know they have one. They should know it. I am not besmirching any way the way that we have done it. But, does this system help with some of that aspect? I am sure that even once we have this we will get calls that someone needs an advisor today and they won't know who their advisor is. I think to some degree, in the system, we need to make a judgement about which advisor they should talk to because a faculty person may not be the right one for that student. So, how are we going to help and inform them when they call the department confused? Should they talk to faculty? Should they talk to Krissy?

K. Creager: Start from the beginning and go backwards. I agree. We have referred to A&R as the McDonald's of orientation. It has been a drive through method. What we know from researching and looking at the way orientation programs are moving, they are going back to where they were fifteen to twenty years ago, which was extremely intensive, very hands-on, very early, and extended orientation. You will see that all over the place, meaning into the first eight weeks and into the first sixteen. Sometimes beyond and into a sophomore year experience. So, the course, the first year seminar for those that don't already have one, will have a lot of that. Put yourself back to where you were as a first year student. You don't know what your name is when you are here for orientation. It is scary. Your ability to digest everything that people are trying to throw at you is tough. You are not developmentally ready to do so. Pulling that out, the first time they need to register during priority registration for spring, hopefully one of the intentions is to be that bridge at that point.

Back to your first question about how we are going to help. We have never intentionally spent time at orientation talking about how to identify and use different advisors. We have said in general sessions, and colleges have said in college sessions, pull up your myPurdueFortWayne and you will see it there. There is our information. So, we will have them do it on their mobile devices. We will have them login to their app and see that. This should be a lot more hands-on and hopefully we will be able to paint that picture. In terms of who does someone talk to when they call, that is where all of us are going to have to work seamlessly together to make that decision. Yes, a secretary needs to be able to say what exactly they are looking for, to be able to know if that is Marietta, Corrie, or Ann. We all will need to do that, but I think if that wrap around team is utilized appropriately then it will work.

J. Clegg: I am sorry, Ann. You have already had two questions.

A. Livschiz: It is for information.

J. Clegg: Go ahead.

A. Livschiz: I just want to go on record as saying that I am so sick of the dichotomy that somehow faculty advisors consist of good faculty advisors and bad faculty advisors, but all professional advisors are great at their job. This is something that I have heard over and over again. There are really crappy professional advisors, some are no longer here. Faculty don't get fired for being bad advisors, but at least faculty have other responsibilities, and they have that somewhat as an excuse. Not a good excuse, but somewhat of an excuse. Every time that I hear it I just get really offended because I think it is profoundly insulting to the faculty who are doing their best. They do not have infinite time, but when a student shows up on their doorstep they have to learn to become an expert on what that student needs because sending the student to the sixth person is just not going to get it done.

My second point for information is that I didn't say anything in November when you announced that people could only speak twice in the Senate. But, since this interpretation of Robert's Rules breaks with all past IPFW Senate tradition, no other presiding officer and no other parliamentarian, that I am aware, has ever interpreted Robert's Rules this way, can you please explain why you have chosen to break with tradition and why you have chosen to interpret this rule in this particular way?

J. Clegg: I will not answer that question at this point in time. We can take that up later if you would like.

A. Livschiz: But I would like it answered because I have a question. This is a question that I have been waiting for an answer to since November.

J. Clegg: I am sorry. We are going to move on.

f. (Senate Reference No. 18-28) – K. Pollock, Executive Committee

There are a number of questions about the classifications of secretarial, clerical, and administrative professional positions in academic departments in the new job family structure. The Executive Committee requests a report documenting the current classifications for all non-faculty employees in academic departments and their proposed classifications in the new job family structure.

Memorandum

From: Faculty Leadership
To: All Faculty
Re: New System of Advising
Date: May 18, 2021

On May 12th, the three faculty leaders (Peter Dragnev, Jamie Toole, and Nash Younis) and the chair of the Senate Executive Committee (Bernd Buldt) met with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Carl Drummond), the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management and the Student Experience (Krissy Creager), and the Executive Director for Academic Accountability and Student Success (Kent Johnson) to discuss selected aspects of the practical implementation of the university's new advising system. Our primary goal was to clarify how faculty could play a genuine, substantive, and direct role in the advising of individual students during students' first thirty credit hours at Purdue Fort Wayne.

Hence, our approach was fully pragmatic. Recognizing that the university has already begun the launch of a new, more centralized advising system, we chose not to use this meeting to argue in broad terms over the system's advantages or disadvantages but instead to focus solely on the new system's immediate practical implementation.

By the end of the meeting, we all had reached agreement on several measures that will help interested faculty to play a genuine, substantive, and direct role in advising individual students on course selection during New Student Orientations (NSO) and throughout students' first thirty credit hours.

1. From the creation of a student's academic record at PFW, MyBluePrint will show as advisors both the student's professional advisor and the student's faculty advisor. Students will be free to choose whomever they deem best for the question or issue they are having. We were assured that the fact that professional advisors are called "primary" is not reflective of any priority role they have; the qualification "primary" merely indicates that advising is their primary job duty, while faculty do advising as part of their service load. (N.B. We also were asked to remind all those authorized to make changes in MyBluePrint not to change or remove an advisor without prior consultation.)

2. At least several days prior to each NSO session, departments will be sent full lists of all students scheduled to attend, and not just the number of students as first reported. Naturally, those lists are subject to change—as always, for example, there will be students who cancel at the last minute—but they will give faculty as much information as they have had in the past about the students who are expected to attend.

3. Professional advisors will handle the actual course registration, but faculty advisors will have the option of advising students individually beforehand on course selection and sequencing. Faculty advisors also will be able to fill out a form, to be taken by the student to the registration session, showing exact course sections recommended by the faculty advisor. This form will be made available before the first NSO session. In this context we emphasized that many four-year plans were deliberately designed to allow for flexibility (which then in turn requires more guidance from faculty).

4. We were also able to clarify several other issues that raised a fair amount of concern across our campus. While advising will see a more centralized approach overall, there are no plans to physically

move advisors out of the units they are currently in. No one has an interest in breaking up long-established and well-functioning working relationships between faculty and their in-house professional advisors. Likewise, it is perfectly fine if departments choose, or continue, to contact students ahead of NSO as long as departmental outreach is limited to information about academic matters (e.g., the department, its programs, or career prospects) but does not include what might be called "next steps in the process" (e.g., where to park, whom to call, etc.), which is information that is handled centrally to secure consistency.

We are more than aware that the measures listed here may strike some of our colleagues as insufficient. For any who may be disappointed, we would like to emphasize the importance of achieving practical, near-term results even though matters of a more philosophical nature may still be unresolved. None of what we agreed upon today precludes, or is meant to discourage, continued discussions about what academic advising should be like on our campus or about the role that shared governance should play in its development and implementation.

At the same time, we were very encouraged by the flexibility shown by Krissy, Carl, and Kent, who were willing to respect faculty concerns over the new advising system and to engage with us in good-faith problem solving. This honors the spirit of the Chancellor's June 2020 statement, which said that "[w]e all agree that any new model for advising on our campus must acknowledge, value, and preserve the essential input of faculty into student advising." Accordingly, we did not need to fight for any of the measures mentioned above. Rather, everyone one around the table agreed that faculty play an important role in academic advising and that it will always be possible to reach practical solutions to how it is implemented.