

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Thirty-Sixth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
January 9, 2017
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda
(as amended)

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 12, 2016
3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University – A. Downs
 - b. Purdue University – M. Masters
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Malanson
6. Special business of the day
 - a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 16-14 – G. Hickey
 - b. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 16-17) – J. Nowak
 - c. (Senate Reference No. 16-15) – C. Drummond
7. Committee reports requiring action
8. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 16-16) – A. Schwab
9. New business
10. Committee reports “for information only”
 - Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 16-5) – K. Pollock
11. The general good and welfare of the University
 - Realignment Discussion
12. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: J. Malanson
Parliamentarian: M. Coussement
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen
Secretary: J. Petersen (for Sarah Mettert)

Attachments:

“Enrollment Management/Admissions Presentation” (SR No. 16-15)
“Memorial Resolution – Lowell Madden” (SR No. 16-17)

Senate Members Present:

T. Adkins, A. Argast, S. Carr, V. Carwein, C. Chen, D. Chen, B. Dattilo, Y. Deng, S. Ding, A. Downs, C. Drummond, B. Fife, Q. Hao, J. Hersberger, G. Hickey, R. Hile, P. Iadicola, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, S. LaVere, J. Leatherman, E. Link, M. Masters, D. Miller, Z. Nazarov, E. Norman, J. Nowak, A. Obergfell, K. Pollock, M. Qasim, B. Redman, N. Reimer, S. Rumsey, G. Schmidt, A. Schwab, R. Sutter, B. Valliere, R. Vandell, L. Vartanian, N. Virtue, G. Wang, D. Wesse, M. Wolf, L. Wright-Bower, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

A. Bales, P. Bingi, Q. Dixie, H. Luo, J. Niser, G. Petruska, A. Ushenko

Faculty Members Present: J. Burg, M. Gruys, B. Kingsbury

Visitors Present: L. Goodson

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Malanson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of December 12, 2016: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

K. Pollock moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

Motion made to amend agenda by adding memorial resolution under Special business of the day. Seconded.

Motion to approve, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

A. Downs: Welcome back and good luck during the semester.

- b. Purdue University:

M. Masters: Welcome Back and I wish you a good semester.

I went to the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday December 16 to watch the vote on the IU Purdue split of IPFW. Audrey Ushenko came with me. There were also three students in attendance. The Board gave the students an opportunity to say what they thought of the split. They were very articulate. The board also allowed Audrey and me to speak. The opportunity to speak was very much appreciated.

There were negative questions asked about the proposal given the lack of details; yet, in the end, only three board members voted against the proposal.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Malanson:

J. Malanson: Welcome back.

Bookstore: The bookstore's contract is up at the end of this year; and, in the fall, IPFW and Purdue Northwest jointly solicited bids for vendors to operate the bookstores at our three campuses. I have been involved in the process of reviewing the two submitted bids by Follett's and Barnes and Noble, asking follow-up questions of the vendors, and engaging in

dialogue with Follett's about their terms. As of right now it looks like we will be staying with Follett's; their financial package was significantly better than Barnes and Noble's, but we are still negotiating some details. Once we get to the end of the process, I will submit a report to the Senate. If you have questions in the meantime, please let me know.

Last semester Purchasing also created a Bookstore Advisory Team, with the aim of trying to create improved communication between the bookstore, faculty, and the various administrative units on campus that have dealings with the bookstore. The faculty members on the Team are me, representing the Senate and Doug Townsend from Math, representing departments that participate in the includedED program. We have had one meeting so far with another scheduled for next month. There were three big takeaways from the first meeting:

1. Early and on-time book adoptions help the bookstore get the best prices possible for students. Late adoptions limit the bookstore's options for where they get books and the prices they have to charge for them.
2. Textbooks in the bookstore are no longer organized by course, but instead are organized by author last name. Students can print out a customized shopping list for themselves at home or at a kiosk in the bookstore.
3. On the Bursar's website, under "Tuition and Fees," there is a link to "Course Material Fees" where you can find a spreadsheet that lists some really useful information about includedED program textbooks. <http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/bursar/tuition-fees/course-material-fees.html>. If you teach an includedED course, I would encourage you to look at the information, and to share it with your students.

Realignment: Last Thursday, as many of you already know, Vice Chancellor Drummond held a realignment planning meeting involving deans, associate deans, department chairs, a variety of administrators, the faculty leaders, and the members of the four standing Senate committees. We covered a lot of ground in two hours, but it was clear from the meeting, from my perspective at least, that there is a good faith effort being made to move forward with the realignment process in a way that empowers shared governance. This is a good thing.

As anyone who was at the meeting can attest, IPFW is operating on some fairly constrained timelines, not of our own choosing, that might necessitate the Executive Committee initiating some processes and then coming back for Senate approval at our next meeting, or the calling of a special meeting on relatively short notice. We will keep you updated as the situation develops.

We will have a realignment discussion later in today's meeting, and please remember that the Speakers have also called a Faculty Assembly for Monday, January 23, at noon in LA 159. The primary focus of that Assembly will be a discussion of realignment, with the goal of sharing as much information as we have at that point in time with as many faculty as possible. There will also be ample opportunity at the Assembly for questions and discussion. An email went out to all faculty this morning, but please encourage your constituents to attend the meeting.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 16-14) – G. Hickey:

G. Hickey read the memorial resolution for J. Randolph Kirby. A moment of silence was observed.

b. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 16-17) – J. Nowak:

J. Nowak read the memorial resolution for Dr. Lowell E. Madden. A moment of silence was observed.

c. (Senate Reference No. 16-15) – C. Drummond:

Parts of the recording are missing due to technical issues. The following is from the recorded section of the meeting:

...

C. Drummond: Those institutions that have experienced growth in performance measures get the money in proportion to their part of the pool.

The problem is that all of the institutions in our pool have experienced the same kind of enrollment declines that we have. They just have not been in the news lately. In fact, Purdue Northwest was down 10 percent in fall. So, those realities are setting in across the state, and right now the commission is reconsidering how it wants to play out the performance funding structure for this next biennium. The situation is one of the direst where you can have one institution across the state be the only one that achieved a positive head count gain in one of the areas. By this formula, they would get all of the money. I do not think it is going to be quite that dire, but what we are going to see is a fight for the way in which that formula is funded. As to where it goes, just like the rest of the general fund money, it goes into the general fund state allocation.

P. Iadicola: 1) This is regarding admission standards. Four or five years ago we changed the admissions standards which had an impact on reduction in admissions. It was anticipated that we would recoup that in higher retention rates. Has an analysis been done to show that has been cost effective?

C. Drummond: I think that was more than four or five years ago, but to some degree; but I have not done it recently.

P. Iadicola: 2) Peril of enrollment for the spring semester across the colleges. Has there been an assessment of the Pathways Program in terms of its impact on potential changes in majors?

C. Drummond: No. Not yet, but I can say that the one thing that we learned about the Pathways Program was that having that at the time the students came for A&R resulted in a significant number of students declaring their majors on the spot. So actually participation in the Pathways Majors Program was significantly less than what we anticipated. So many more students chose a formal major at that point than we expected.

7. Committee reports requiring action: There were no committee reports requiring action.
8. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 16-16) – A. Schwab:

Q: In the October Faculty Senate meeting, it was made abundantly clear that the Purdue President and Chair of the Purdue Board of Trustees viewed the USAP reports and the LSA report as linked together. Then, during the December “media event,” several questions about the USAP Closures were dismissed as not relevant to the focus of that event—the LSA Split.

Given that we have now been told fundamentally contradictory things about the relationship between the USAP Closures and the LSA Split, what is the Chancellor’s Office understanding of the relationship between the USAP Closures and the LSA Split? If the answer is they are not linked together, what led the Chancellor’s Office to wait until December to contradict/correct the link between LSA and USAP that was articulated in a public meeting in October?

Abe Schwab
Associate Professor of Philosophy

A: V. Carwein: As the question references the October 2016 senate meeting, and it appears to be based on the statements that Vice Chancellor Drummond made during that meeting, I would like to begin my answer by saying that I would not attempt to speak for Vice Chancellor Drummond relative to his statement or statements. Any questions about that statement should be appropriately asked of him.

About USAP and LSA: USAP began well before LSA and was an internal process developed to help us align our resources with the goals and the priorities of Plan 2020. That has been clearly stated throughout the entire process. That process was independent of the LSA study which came almost a year after we started the USAP process. USAP was going to continue regardless of any externally mandated study and continues even today. LSA was a legislatively mandated study of governance initiated by Senator Long. That study was going to go forward and did independently and regardless of USAP. I understand that some individuals may have confused and conflated the two processes and the outcomes of those two processes.

I will not speculate on what was or might have been in the minds of the Trustees and/or others relative to putting those two processes together. The bottom line is that I, the Vice chancellors, and others have repeatedly and consistently explained the separateness and the independence of the two processes. USAP was, and continues to be, an internal process intended to guide alignment of resources with the priorities of our strategic plan. Many of the resulting recommendations have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. LSA, externally mandated and driven, was a study of governance, and we all know the results of that process; that is, the Boards of Trustees’ approval of realignment of academic mission areas to Purdue and IU and a new governance model for the institution.

Any past, present, or ongoing confusion about the relatedness of the two processes is unfortunate. Nonetheless, USAP recommendations are being implemented demonstrating any number of what I believe are positive outcomes of our internal process, and the organizational structure for implementation of the LSA realignment decision has been initiated. Thank you.

9. New business:

J. Malanson: As George McClellan retired, Eric Norman has taken over as the Chief Student Affairs Officer at the university, so we should welcome Eric to the Senate. (applause)

10. Committee reports “for information only”:

Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 16-5) – K. Pollock:

Senate Reference No. 16-5 (Report on Designated Items) was presented for information only.

11. The general good and welfare of the University:

V. Carwein: As you know, the boards of trustees have approved the LSA recommendation for realignment of academic missions for IU and Purdue. The new governance model essentially establishes us as a Purdue university campus, with the three health sciences programs: nursing, imaging, and dental going to IU. IU will be focusing on specializing in health sciences. Purdue will be responsible for all other programming on our campus.

The realignment agreement that was approved by the two boards of trustees identifies a process of how to go forward in this realignment. In the agreement it speaks about a transition team. This is a question we began asking as soon as we saw the agreement: what does that mean and how are we going to go forward? So the structure that is being proposed or laid out at the system level (slides) shows that the transition team would remain as has been currently configured in terms of the legal entities at both the IU and Purdue systems. They have been the ones who have been negotiating relative to the realignment agreement that we have in place.

As a result of a number of discussions and input that we have provided, particularly on the Purdue side of things, a joint steering committee is going to be established that will include individuals from this campus as well as Purdue University and Indiana University. That joint steering committee will work with the transition team in terms of passing information to them. As I understand the discussions to date, the transition team will be developing the ancillary documents to be put into place that will actually lay out the specifics of how we are going to operate.

The next set of groups that will be established are working groups. Here is the list (on slides) of proposed working groups to be established which will actually be doing the nitty gritty of what it would take to have this realignment come into being. These are some of the things that were discussed way back when the LSA study group was appointed and began to work. Here is the list of the working groups (slides). The governance and legal group will mainly deal with developing the ancillary agreements that will detail with, for example, how much space IU will lease from Purdue, charges for the space, etc. The intent of the communication group will be mainly concerned with communicating “about the realignment process” externally, not internal (to IPFW) communications. As you think about the working groups please provide input as to things you see that are missing. We would very much appreciate that kind of input.

On the additional topics, athletics is one of those areas wherein the major issue is very specific and narrowly focused; i.e., can IU students going forward who are in the health sciences actually play for Purdue University on the athletic teams that we have? Our preliminary take from the conversations that our athletics department has had with NCAA is that that is not possible. If you are an IU student, you are an IU student, and you cannot play for Purdue University. But legal counsels, both at IU and Purdue, are also asking that question, so there is some conversation that will be ongoing within NCAA to see what might be possible. The expectation is that a waiver will be requested for all currently enrolled health sciences students to allow them to finish out their eligibility, but it is likely that new students being admitted to IU beginning fall 2018 would not be able to play.

A question that came up a couple of weeks ago with regard to student affairs is that, at the moment, the expectation is that Purdue University will supply student affairs and student services to Indiana University students, and IU will reimburse Purdue for those services. Those are the kinds of conversations that Vice Chancellors Drummond and Wesse have been involved in.

As for the name of the institution, this is a very important topic. It is very important, as you know, to the community as well, and it is also an emotional topic. Going forward, we will not be IPFW as we have known it. We will not have the integration, we will not have the seamless movement of students that we have currently; but the name, I believe, will likely change. I do not know what it will be. This is something that we certainly need to have a discussion about.

Presiding Officer Malanson and I had an opportunity to meet just briefly before the senate meeting. Faculty representation is welcome on these working groups. We want to make sure that we have faculty input in all of those groups that make sense for you to be involved in. I do not know the time frame for all of this. I was in West Lafayette on Thursday meeting with the president. He would like to have all of the ancillary agreements completed by March. I do not know whether that is realistic or not, but these working groups need to get established very, very quickly, and we need to begin the work. Keep in mind this is currently in draft form, so these are the initial thoughts and ideas.

J. Malanson: Before we open it up for questions, would the vice chancellors like to add anything?

C. Drummond: A few remarks about the timeline: The agreement goes into effect on July 1, 2018. By the agreement, the ancillary agreements have to be agreed to and passed by both boards of trustees by June 30, 2018. One of the ancillary agreements is something called the Program Realignment Agreement, which is actually embedded in the body of the agreement and listed as an ancillary agreement only. It has a required date of June 30, 2017. It is not clear exactly how that differs from some of the other parts of the other ancillary agreements, and I have raised the question of what exactly is expected by June 30. We await an answer on that.

In terms of students admitted to IPFW and pursuing degrees in their original home departments, students who come to us through fall of 2017 will be admitted to their traditional degree programs; so, if it is currently an IU mission, they will be admitted to an IU mission program, and Purdue likewise. After that time they will be admitted to the ultimate program where it is headed to be. The outcome of that is that the designated teach-

out period, by the agreement, is May 2021. That means freshmen admitted in the fall will only have four years to complete their degree in their current institutional affiliation. The same is true for currently enrolled students. They will have until May 2021. After that time, they will be awarded a degree in the new institution. I guess you could say it is a teach-out period that is not exceptionally long, but it is also not exceptionally short. It will be a very complicated four years for us. There is no question about that. That is what we know about the timeline right now.

D. Wesse: These will all be students on our campus. There will be significant changes in the academic area, but also in the financial area. One of the biggest changes is that all of the costs related to IU students will need to be reimbursed. All of the costs that we take on will be reimbursed in a different way, which is what we have spent several months working on.

R. Hile: which of the working groups would deal with the library changeover?

C. Drummond: It would be within academics.

M. Wolf: When federal grants come in for Indiana health system, will the overhead for that be kind of a big issue?

V. Carwein: There is a lot yet to be determined. That is one of the things on the list.

L. Vartanian: Is there a place where the charges or descriptions will be a little more specific as to what these working groups will be doing?

V. Carwein: This is hot off the press. I honestly just got this by e-mail this morning.

J. Malanson: Once this gets finalized, and once we get a bit more detail on what each group is responsible for, this will get broadly shared. The faculty participants will be more informed once we know more precisely what everyone will be doing.

D. Miller: Will there be separate senate representation for IU faculty on this campus? Where will the senators from the health sciences go?

C. Drummond: It is complicated because, in reality, they will be IUPUI faculty, and the students will be IUPUI students. But the agreement calls for the opportunity for full participation of those IU health sciences faculty in faculty activities at the Purdue campus. That simply can't be, in terms of governance; but, as I said the other day, we are happy to charge them for parking, and they are welcome to use the Gates Center. I do not know if it works from a governance standpoint; I do not think that can be. It may make sense that they have a nonvoting representative as part of this body going forward, that they are welcome to enter in discussions and know what is going on, but I do not see how they can vote as faculty of a different university.

J. Malanson: One of the big things the Executive Committee will need to deal with in the coming weeks is planning out and amending the Constitution and the Bylaws because, obviously, IU is ingrained through everything we are and that will have to change. Right now the Bylaws provide for affiliated faculty to have representation in the Senate. It could be that these IUPUI faculty would be denoted as affiliated faculty on campus that would

have a nonvoting voice, but that is all on the list of things that we will need to decide as a Senate.

V. Carwein: The health sciences programs that are going to IU as previously stated are all being run. My impression is that the health sciences programs transitioning to IU will be operated by IU as they do the medical school program. The dean of nursing was on campus a week ago from IUPUI and may have offered more insights, but, as you know, the IU School of Medicine is totally run from Indianapolis. The medical students who graduate from the IU School of Medicine here in Fort Wayne have been prohibited from participating in our graduation. They must go to IUPUI and graduate there. If the medical school model of operation is what will be utilized for the other health sciences programs offered here, I would anticipate a lot of separateness from us. Dean Obergfell, do you have any ideas or perceptions about that?

A. Obergfell: The dean of nursing was here. They did not really know anything about it, either. They really do not know how this is going to play out. They are speculating just like everybody else. I think the biggest problem is that these three departments are in three different colleges at IUPUI. Dental is, of course, in the School of Dentistry, Nursing is in the School of Nursing, and Medical Imaging right now is housed in a department in the School of Medicine. That is going to be a very interesting kind of thing to navigate down there. I would hope that we would argue that there needs to be some kind of system up here that can control that a little bit rather than it just being that my faculty have to talk to somebody in Indianapolis. I just do not think that is feasible.

D. Kaiser: The General Education will still be under Purdue, right? Are the IU students going to take them here or online, or at IUPUI or what?

V. Carwein: This discussion has been ongoing since June, when the realignment was actually approved by the trustees. That is something that both Vice Chancellors Drummond and Wesse have been working very closely with Purdue and IU on at some level.

C. Drummond: Within the structure of the agreement now, it begins with the statement that it is the intention that those students in those IU programs will continue to take their general education and other non-departmental courses with the Purdue campus. That is subject to the curricular needs of those departments. As we found, there are some interesting things: for instance, in nursing, rather than having separate courses in chemistry and some of the other sciences, IUPUI delivers that content through an integrated curriculum in the Nursing Department. That is probably an outcome of their activity-centered budget model at IUPUI.

At any rate, the current agreement says that, for a period of three years, those students will take their general education and other classes with us. Then, in June of that third year, they will have an opportunity to opt out. That opt-out has a two-year lag; so, in June of 2021, IU could say that they would like out of this or any of the other ancillary agreements. So that is the time schedule that we are looking at. What we can anticipate is a decrease in credit hours in those areas over time, and maybe an abrupt change at a later date.

Senator: I am just wondering about the working groups. Is this a fixed list, or might there be other working groups created?

V. Carwein: There might be additional groups as we get into the work and into the discussions. I would expect that issues will come up that we have not projected. These working groups might change in some way, or they might expand, or others might be established.

Senator: I would think that some kind of community engagement group would also be helpful, especially with the service learning.

J. Malanson: As the chancellor said, if there is something you think is missing from this list, please communicate that so we can talk about that.

Senator: We heard the expected state of the IU faculty relative to the Senate, but why would the Purdue faculty be any different?

V. Carwein: I do not know why that would be any different. One of the things that is interesting... what we have been able to do here is so seamless for students, but some of the back-office operations are pretty complex and complicated. Fundamentally, IU and Purdue, their beliefs, and the way they operate their campuses, is almost 180 degrees different. IU is very much thumbs on. At least initially the IU mission programs here are going to be run from Indianapolis. They are a part of IUPUI. They are not, in my view, really IU Fort Wayne. They are a part of IUPUI. On the Purdue side of things, the Purdue system administration has been very flexible and supportive, at least in what I have seen with this campus, determining its own organization as far as the senate and as far as the faculty organization is concerned. My sense is that it is up to us and to all of you to figure out how we best want to do that. How the IU faculty are going to integrate with this body and in a larger way within the campus remains a question to be worked out.

Senator: Thank you very much. I would like to see a kind of agreement. What does Purdue really want us to have because, if we do not have some kind of charge... it is always a pending issue how far a senate decisions can go.

C. Drummond: There are two current aspects of our organization that require that we have a local senate. There has been no indication that either of those two things will change in any way.

The first is that we have undergraduate curricular autonomy. While we use course numbers, they are our academic programs, and so we must have a senate that oversees that.

The second is that, as long as tenure and promotion is campus specific, then we have to have a campus program to run that, and that is one of the primary charges of the senate to oversee.

I think that, at a minimum, those are two core aspects of this campus now and in the future that will remain the same and will require the actions of Senate, and then there are all the other things that the senate does as well that add on to that.

J. Malanson: I will say that Purdue Northwest just went through their major restructuring, combining campuses, and they are in the process of restarting a combined senate for that

new campus. There is no reason to expect that we would not still be able to maintain our senate with some modifications.

S. Carr: I am wondering about the first working group: governance and legal. Is that working group actually going to focus more on the issue of management, or is it really going to look at issues of shared governance?

V. Carwein: It is the former.

S. Carr: That is one thing I would immediately point out now, in which ways governance gets used.

V. Carwein: That is a good point.

J. Malanson: Welcome back again. I hope everyone's semester is off to a good start.

12. The meeting adjourned.

Jacqueline J. Petersen (for Sarah Mettert)
Secretary of the Faculty