

Minutes of the
Eighth Regular Meeting of the Thirty-Seventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
April 9, 2018
12:00 P.M., KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of March 12
3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – A. Schwab
 - b. Indiana University – A. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Malanson
6. Special business of the day
 - a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 17-29) – K. McDonald
 - b. Library PFW Transition Status – A. Macklin
7. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 17-24) – Z. Nazarov
 - b. Education Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-25) – L. Wright-Bower
8. Question Time
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 17-30) – A. Schwab
9. New business
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 17-26) – K. Pollock
10. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 17-24) – J. Clegg
 - b. Mastodon Athletic Advisory Committee (Senate Reference No. 17-25) – J. Clegg
 - c. University Budget Committee Report and Recommendations (Senate Reference No. 17-26) – J. Malanson
 - d. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 17-27) – C. Gurgur
 - e. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 17-28) – C. Gurgur
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. Malanson
 Parliamentarian: W. Sirk
 Sergeant-at-arms: G. Steffen
 Secretary: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“Memorial Resolution-Joseph Maurice Chandler” (SR No. 17-29)
 “Revision of CPS P&T Document” (SD 17-24)
 “Military Students Transfer Credit” (SD 17-25)
 “Caps on Classes” (SR No. 17-30)
 “College of Professional Studies Procedures for Electing Senators” (SD 17-26)
 “Annual Report of FAR Activities” (SR No. 17-24)
 “MAAS Report on Student-Athlete Academics” (SR No. 17-25)
 “University Budget Committee Report and Recommendations” (SR No. 17-26)
 “BAS Findings and Recommendations on Consolidated Career Services and Office of Academic Internships, Cooperative Education and Service Learning (OACS)” (SR No. 17-27)
 “BAS Annual Report on Athletics Budget” (SR No. 17-28)

Senate Members Present:

A. Argast, A. Bales, A. Benito, P. Bingi, S. Bischoff, B. Boatright, A. Boehm, B. Buldt, S. Carr, D. Chen, D. Cochran, K. Dehr, S. Ding, A. Downs, R. Elsenbaumer, M. Gruys, G. Hickey, D. Holland, D. Kaiser, B. Kim, S. King, L. Kuznar, S. LaVere, J. Leatherman, E. Link, H. Luo, A. Macklin, J. Marshall, D. Miller, Z. Nazarov, J. Nowak, A. Obergfell, G. Petruska, K. Pollock, M., Qasim, B. Redman, P. Reese, S. Rumsey, B. Salmon, G. Schmidt, A. Schwab, S. Stevenson, R. Sutter, L. Vartanian, G. Wang, L. Wright-Bower, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

J. Burg, M. Cain, Y. Deng, C. Drummond, B. Fife, M. Jordan, A. Kreager, L. McAllister, P. Nachappa, E. Norman, J. O’Connell, M. Qasim, A. Ushenko, B. Valliere, R. Vandell, D. Wesse, M. Wolf, M. Zoghi

Guests Present:

J. Clegg, M. Dixon, L. Goodson, S. Hanke, C. Hine, B. Kingsbury, K. McDonald, K. Smith, L. Wark

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Malanson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of March 12: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:
 - K. Pollock moved to accept the agenda.
 - L. Wright-Bower moved to amend the agenda to remove SD 17-25.

Motion to amend the agenda passed by voice vote.

Agenda approved by voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Purdue University:

A. Schwab: Just a couple of things. The Intercampus Faculty Council will be meeting on our campus next week on Friday. This will be representatives from Purdue-Northwest, the Purdue section of IUPUI, ourselves, and Purdue-West Lafayette. There is nothing particularly significant about that for you all at this point, but moving forward the Intercampus Faculty Council may play a more significant role in how we think about faculty governance as the Purdue-Fort Wayne side of this campus within the Purdue system. So, as an organizing body it may be something to be attentive to.

I would also be remiss if I do not note the stellar fashion statements that are being made just to my left, which I believe are supposed to be retro mirror images or something like that. With that I will leave the rest of my time to my distinguished colleagues from Indiana and Massachusetts.

b. Indiana University:

A. Downs: Just two items for you this meeting.

First, I'm happy to report that our colleagues at IUFW are making good progress on their Constitution and Bylaws. It is likely they will vote on those documents later this month. I look forward to the future collaborations that our governance documents are designed to foster.

Second, the Brown Ink Society honors Steve Hollander. For those who do not know, Steve was a member of the Department of English and Linguistics for many years. He was an active participant in the governance of IPFW and known for editing papers and documents with brown ink. He was less well known for giving money to students to help them with financial emergencies that would significantly, but temporarily disrupt their studies. He did not seek attention for what he did. He just did it because he thought it was the right thing to do. The Brown Ink Society has continued Steve's generous work with grants up to \$250. I encourage you to become a member and to remember it when you learn that a student has encountered one of those financial emergencies that threatens the student's studies.

The Brown Ink Society annual fundraiser was Friday April 6th at the Alumni Center. One of the features this year was the unveiling of a painting by

Audrey Ushenko, one of the founders of the Brown Ink Society. The list of founders reads like a list of what I consider to be the founders of IPFW.

As of July 1, 2018, northeast Indiana will be served by Purdue University Fort Wayne and Indiana University Fort Wayne. We all have the opportunity to be the founders of these new institutions, but we need to do it in the framework of shared governance that has been discussed and re-established over the last couple of years. We also need to do it in a way that builds on the solid base that IPFW provides. In other words, we cannot forget about people like Steven Hollander who cared so deeply about the success of our students.

Ten years ago I was invited to be the Parliamentarian of the Senate. Many of the people in this room do not need to be invited to be active participants in our shared governance, but I am asking you to invite others to become active participants. This will be essential to our success.

Finally, this is my last senate meeting as the Speaker of the IU faculty. Thank you for the opportunity to serve. At times it has been frustrating. At other times it has been rewarding. It always has been meaningful work.

Thank you and good luck with the remainder of this semester.

I now yield the floor to Kathy Pollock for a moment.

K. Pollock presented a gavel and block to J. Malanson for his service as Presiding Officer.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Malanson: I want to start by thanking Lesa Vartanian and Josh Bacon for putting in a large amount of their time trying to populate next year's Senate and committees. The ballot went out at the end of last week to elect the Senate committees and subcommittees for next year, but some issues arose after that was sent out regarding how the College of Professional Studies was populating Senate representation and the implications that had for committees and subcommittees. We need to get that straightened out so the ballot has been closed. We will get those issues figured out and the ballot resubmitted to everyone as soon as possible.

I have been Presiding Officer of the Fort Wayne Senate for two years, and served as Parliamentarian for the four years before that. My involvement with the Senate started with Chancellor Carwein's first semester at IPFW. There are lots of words that we can use to describe the Senate—and IPFW more generally—over that time period, but I think that the most appropriate choice might be “chaotic.”

In the past six years, we have experienced continual enrollment declines; budget reductions; two rounds of early retirements; hiring freezes; significant faculty, staff, and

administrative turnover; the development and abandonment of a strategic plan; USAP and Action Plan 41; program closures; and, of course, Realignment.

After six years of chaos—six years of upheaval and fighting and low morale across campus—it seems that we might finally be reaching a point of stability. We have a new chancellor who, after only being here a few months, seems to care deeply about the well-being of the institution, and when we come back next Fall, Realignment will be behind us. We will be a new institution—two new institutions—we must not forget our colleagues and partners at IU Fort Wayne—with a new brand, and 21st-century strategies for enrollment management and marketing communications. We will be developing a forward-looking strategic plan with an eye toward reaccreditation in 2020 and rebuilding a productive relationship with the communities we serve. There will certainly still be challenges and changes—there always will be at a regional comprehensive university as heavily dependent on tuition revenue and state support as we are—but I believe that Purdue Fort Wayne is in a better position to face those challenges and changes now than it was six years ago.

While I am very optimistic about our future, I believe that we, as a Senate and as a faculty, face two related challenges that we should confront in the new year. First is continuing to build a culture of shared governance on this campus. From the conversations with faculty and administrators I have had over the past two years, I believe that most people in both groups believe in shared governance. I also believe that we are all still learning what that actually means and looks like. It is only in the past few years that we have started having systematic conversations about shared governance and what our expectations are for how faculty should participate in decision-making processes and how the administration should work with the faculty to make certain decisions. I believe that we have made significant progress in these areas, but we still have more work to do to develop a common understanding, to find common ground, and then to normalize the shared governance approach to our activities. It has been really easy to this point to default back to the way things used to be done—but moving forward we need to be more intentional about process and about understanding our expectations of each other if we are going to nurture a sustainable culture of shared governance at Purdue Fort Wayne.

Directly related to a culture of shared governance, we need to think carefully about faculty engagement with shared governance, and with the Senate in particular. We all know that morale is at a low point, and one of the unfortunate impacts of low morale has been low engagement and participation. We need to figure out ways of getting faculty to re-engage and to participate more actively in the work of the Senate and its committees. It is only through active faculty participation that we can sustain a system of shared governance. One of the challenges that we face is that the university—broadly understood—asks faculty to do too much, and this can make it harder for faculty to engage in meaningful service as a result. Figuring out how to incentivize and reward service has long been a challenge on this campus, but with increased expectations for course and program assessment; annual reporting; department, college, and university service; community engagement; student recruiting; etc., it has diffused our efforts. We

are asking a shrinking group of faculty (and staff) for ever more work without providing adequate compensation in the form of either merit pay or modest raises. There is probably a limit to what the Senate can tangibly do to address the broader problem here, but it would be worthwhile for us to at least reconsider our own structure, functions, and expectations. In the Fall, the Senate will have 22 committees and subcommittees, on which there are 163 seats filled by faculty; this doesn't include the Senate itself, with its approximately 53 faculty seats. Now, many faculty serve on more than one committee or subcommittee, thus reducing the overall number of faculty who serve, but that is still a massive number of service opportunities given that after Realignment, PFW will only have 270 Voting Faculty. It will be up to next year's Senate to decide if this is a challenge worth confronting, but I believe that some broader restructuring of the Senate—reducing the number of committees but more fully empowering those that remain to undertake meaningful and impactful work—represents a real opportunity to foster greater engagement.

For some reason, IPFW does not have an award recognizing faculty for their service to the university. We have a variety of research, teaching, and community engagement awards, but no service award. In COAS, we have the Downs-Hollander Service Award, named in part after Andy's dad, and of which Andy was the first recipient. While I can't give him an award, beyond his name on a plaque in the back of the room, I do want to take a moment to acknowledge everything Andy Downs has done for the Senate and the university. Today's meeting is Andy's last after ten years of continuous service in the Senate and on the Executive Committee: four as Parliamentarian—the Senate actually amended the constitution to put the Parliamentarian on the Executive Committee while Andy was in the role—four years as Presiding Officer, and the past two years as IU Speaker—the last IU Speaker. Before Andy became Presiding Officer, the position's primary responsibility was running the monthly Senate meetings—making the trains run on time, as Andy likes to say. Andy transformed the position of Presiding Officer into an active representative of the faculty's rights and interests—attempting to get us to think and act more as a single faculty in the process—efforts that have been desperately needed these past six years. In his various roles, Andy has given generously of his time, his expertise, and his patience, and he's helped to make IPFW a better place for all of us to teach and research. On a personal note, Andy was the one who recruited me to serve as Parliamentarian six years ago, for which I will never forgive him but for which I am also very grateful. I can't give Andy an award, and he's probably mad at me for acknowledging him at all, but I wanted to take a moment to thank Andy Downs for everything that he has done.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 17-29) – K. McDonald

K. McDonald read the memorial resolution for Joseph Maurice Chandler. A moment of silence was observed.

b. Library PFW Transition

A. Macklin: I have to say, we are struggling a little bit with Purdue. Not in a bad way. I think we are getting there, but Purdue has never been a system wide library and they are trying very hard to figure out what this means for us, including letting me co-chair a planning group with Purdue-Northwest to think through what this is going to be. The problem that we are facing right now is that they are without good leadership in their library. Their longtime dean just retired. They have two interim associate deans and nobody really knows what to do now. So, we are kind of swimming in mud right now and trying to figure out what is next.

The good news for all of us is that we are moving in a good direction as a standalone library for the moment and here is what it is going to mean for us. There will be no loss of any current databases or subscriptions that we currently use. We negotiated those with Purdue and we are going to be just fine with that. All of that content will be fine. So, our e-resources are in good shape. Where it is going to get a little sticky for us, and where we are still trying to feel out how we are going to move forward as a system, is in our integrated library system. We are moving to a different product. Now you have been able to systematically say I want to search all IU system libraries and I want this book delivered to Helmke Library. That has worked beautifully and IU has worked very hard to be a system in providing that. Purdue is not there with us yet.

So, here is what we are going to do. Half of the product we have in stock is ready to go. But, we are going to be a standalone library. Here is why that is going to work in our favor right now. There is a \$6 million endowment that my predecessor sat on because she didn't have to spend it because we had IU. We had the system of IU. We are going to buy books. In case you haven't noticed if you go upstairs to the second and third floor we have a lot of empty shelves. We are going to fill those shelves. We are going to start strategically by looking at what our patron driven requests are and what our needs are. All of you know that we have been doing this. We need to be proactive. All of the IU books that you guys have we have been buying. How many of you have been participating? Send them in and we are going to give you back a new title. We are going to make it a Purdue-Fort Wayne title. Right now, what I know from Purdue is that they are relying on us to build up our humanities. So, humanities folks, let me know what you need. We will use Purdue in an interlibrary loan capacity, which may restrict your loan times. But, if you have something you need critically then let me know and we are going to buy it. I am going to make sure that that money is well used. We can only use it for acquisitions, so I plan to spend it. We are going to build ourselves a great library, and when Purdue has the leadership team in place we are going to build a system wide library.

I know Purdue is going to work with us to do that and they are just not there yet. They are asking us to be patient with them too. I said, yes, of course I will be patient. It is not what I want to do. I want you to be ready to go right now. They are not there. When we are ready to get there we are going to have the books we need and have the

collections we need and we are going to be talking serious about what a system wide library includes. That is including an institutional repository.

Right now, we have been using Bepress, and Bepress has been used predominantly as a very expensive citation manager. We need other things. One of the things I want to negotiate with Purdue is if we can be part of their Bepress pitch. Can we have a repository with that? Which means I want to get smart with all of you about what open access means. I am going to put \$20,000-\$30,000 dollars of my collection budget aside to work with anybody who wants to work with open access journals. If you want to know more about open access journals and publishing in them then work with us. Figure out where you want to be working. Where you want to publish. Come to us with those needs because we will help you get there. I figure that if we are investing in open access publishing then that becomes part of our collection.

Jim Mullins, who was the outgoing dean of the library at Purdue-West Lafayette was the one who suggesting me working with you all in that capacity and that was an excellent suggestion. So, that is something we are going to do. We are going to start working in that direction so that we have stuff to put into an institutional repository, and Purdue's is very low cost. They just don't have the leadership yet. That doesn't mean we can't start building.

We are going to be relying predominantly on interlibrary loan, patron driven requests to purchase, and document delivery services for the moment. We are going to be taking a very strong look at what our actual uses are for all of the databases that we have so we can make better decisions about what we need, and West Lafayette is going to be part of that process. When we are ready to go system wide with our collection policies then we will be ready to go with good stats. We are going to be building just in time and not just in case libraries. Libraries are very expensive to run and we want to be very thoughtful about what we are providing and what we are giving to you because I would rather be putting money back into research than back into content if we can borrow that from other places. We don't have to own it, we just have to know where it is. I think that pretty much gets you up to speed.

It is going to be a little bit of a bumpy ride when you look at the new Xlibris package. It is not going to look exactly the same. It is going to look like Purdue-West Lafayette's page. So, if you want to get familiar with what our page is going to look like then go take a look at what Purdue's page looks like. We are going to be offering workshops on Primo and how to use Primo. We are going to be bringing workshops on WorldCat. If you haven't gotten to WorldCat yet then take a look at that. It is a great product. It also allows you to seamlessly work within the catalog to order things through interlibrary loan. So, that will be good for you. We are going to be offering these toward the end of summer and toward the start of the fall semester. So, be ready to go and hopefully they will be online. I am hoping that we can get some of these things already done. Purdue has some great ones that we can use and WorldCat has a few that we can just throw out there for you to get access to. I think those are the big things that I wanted to talk to you about. Any questions that you might have?

Bottom line is that when you go to use your databases you won't be missing anything in action. We have spent a lot of time. Nathan is my new director for technical services. He came in July from Yale. He is very well versed in complicated negotiations for journal packages. He has done an outstanding job of making sure that everything is ready to go for us in the fall. Thoughts or questions?

S. Carr: So, in the short term, when we want to request a title that is not currently in the collection do you still want us to use the document delivery service?

A. Macklin: So, here is what I would recommend. I want to buy books. If you know you are going to need this for teaching and you think that it should be in our library then don't waste time with interlibrary loan. Put that request to purchase in. If we are starting to hit a place of where I am saying, "We can't afford that." We are not there yet. So, send the titles. I will let you know if it comes to a place where we are going to be needing to think more about interlibrary loan and document delivery. But, right now, I don't want to say we are full of money because I don't want jinx myself. But, we have money to spend and right now I have bought every title requested and I didn't break the bank. So, that is good news.

B. Buldt: Quick question. Are we going to build a collection that supports primarily teaching or also research? If it is research then are there any plans to coordinate our purchasing goals with those of the other libraries in the system?

A. Macklin: Yes, yes, and yes. It is teaching and research. I would love to see us beef up our research opportunities here because we have some great research going on. So, if you need it for research or for teaching it doesn't matter. Give me the title. Let's start building a collection. I want to be very thoughtful about how we build a collection so I want them to go directly to the needs of our programs, but our programs are a reflection of our teaching and our research anyway. So, if you need it then let's buy it. That said, once we become part of the system with Purdue University we will be looking very strategically at what our needs are and that is why Purdue is looking at us to build out as a hub for humanities. They have a humanities program, obviously, that is internationally known, but they want us to help with that. So, we will be thinking strategically. Any other thoughts or questions. Please don't hesitate to email me and ask questions directly.

B. Salmon: How is that going to work with the IU-Fort Wayne and IU faculty here?

A. Macklin: IU faculty and IU-Fort Wayne. They will have access to every resource that we have. What we have decided with IUPUI is if books are needed then we are going to exchange using interlibrary loan. If there are things that are needed that are not in our collection then we will work that out with IUPUI. So, it will be okay.

B. Salmon: So, we will continue to work with Purdue-Fort Wayne?

A. Macklin: Yes. You will have access to everything that we will have access to on the regular campus. So, don't look at this as a bad thing. It is a really good thing and Purdue will get there eventually.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 17-24) – Z. Nazarov

Z. Nazarov moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-24 (Revision of CPS P&T Document).

A. Downs moved to amend SD 17-24 to insert a BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED line to read, "That the College of Professional Studies' promotion and tenure procedures approved in this document shall, as of July 1, 2018, supersede and replace all prior promotion and tenure procedures for the College of Education and Public Policy and the College of Health and Human Services at IPFW."

Motion to approve amendment passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve amended document SD 17-24 passed on a voice vote.

b. Education Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 17-25) – L. Wright-Bower

Removed from the agenda.

8. Question Time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 17-30) – A. Schwab

A number of classes have had their usual course caps split between PFW and IUFW. PFW students have already begun registering for classes and will continue to do so over the coming weeks and months. IUFW students are not expected to begin enrolling until mid-May and will continue enrolling throughout the summer. It is likely that some courses will have one side fill before the other side has filled. It is also likely that PFW and IUFW students will approach instructors with filled sections about getting into the class. A series of questions:

When instructors are approached by PFW students:

How should instructors respond when they are willing to raise the overall cap (i.e., from 30 to 31)?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap, but they know the IUFW side is not filled?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap and both sides are filled?

When instructors are approached by IUFW students:

How should instructors respond when they are willing to raise the overall cap (i.e., from 30 to 31)?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap, but they know the PFW side is not filled?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap and both sides are filled?

C. Hine: I just want to give credit to Kari for writing up answers to these questions, and I will ask you in a little bit to also give Ann Oberfell some speaking privilege to address the IU-Fort Wayne students. So, if instructors are approached by Purdue-Fort Wayne students and are thinking that they want to raise the overall cap, say for example, from 30 to 31 then you should be simply following your department's current procedure to raise that maximum enrollment for the section. Departments raising that enrollment will still need to be in compliance with fire code, with pedagogical need, and, in certain circumstances if it is a class with continuing studies then you want to contact continuing studies as well. Requesting to raise the overall maximum enrollment does not result in seats being exchanged between Purdue-Fort Wayne and IU-Fort Wayne sections if you are being approached by the Purdue-Fort Wayne student.

Next question was "how should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap but they know the IU-Fort Wayne cap is not filled?" There is an agreed upon date when we are going to be opening up registration for exchange, which will be sometime in June. Right now, we are going to give IU the ability to register. Once that date has passed, instructors should follow their department procedure and I know that might be to be determined yet in your own departments. Basically, submitting an online request to the Purdue-Fort Wayne Associate Registrar, Kari Smith, for seat exchange. This request will be reviewed by designated staff at Purdue-Fort Wayne, at IU-Fort Wayne, and also IUPUI Registrar's office for appropriate action. When a seat exchange is possible, the Purdue-Fort Wayne office will adjust the overall maximum enrollment in each of the sections. Once again, maintain fire code and pedagogical need. IUPUI will also update their side to the maximum enrollment for their student information system. More specific details on the process and procedures for requesting and changing maximum enrollments are still being developed. Referral to an academic advisor can be considered, as the advisor may be able to determine alternates or options for that student to help resolve the registration issue.

Another question was "how should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap and both sides are filled?" Instructors can maintain their current preferred response to a student about a closed section. When applicable the student

should be directed to the late list and we are going to try to be encouraging you to be using waitlists. As always, advisors can assist with helping the students to determine alternatives and options.

Abe also asked questions about when instructors are approached by IU-Fort Wayne students and I would like to allow Ann to address this.

A. Obergfell: What we are asking on that side of it, if an IU student approaches you would you please have them come to what is going to be known as Student Central. IU Student Central. It is in Neff Hall and we are going to be having a system where we work with that because we are preferring that they do not do that one off because that will confuse everybody. So, if an IU student wants to be in a class then refer them over to Student Central and we will work through that situation with the department, with the date changes, or whatever it is that needs to happen so it doesn't confuse people.

A. Schwab: So, if the Purdue-Fort Wayne section is filled and a student comes to you do we just say "wait until June?" It wasn't clear what the answer was there. So, if they come to me next week because my Medical Ethics section is full then what should I be telling them at that point. Do we just tell them to wait until June? Or do you have any suggestions there?

A. Obergfell: I would say the best thing at this point is a waitlist situation so that we know who is coming in and that if that switch needs to be made and that there are not any students that need those seats then we just need to make that switch and then that waitlist will fill.

C. Hine: That is why we are recommending waitlists to you.

A. Schwab: Do we need to actively ask for waitlists for classes?

C. Hine: Yes. At this point, yes.

J. Malanson: But, having the waitlist in place gives them the indication that there are Purdue students that want IU seats.

C. Hine: Right.

B. Buldt: Two questions. First, if a student comes to me then how do I know if it is an IU or Purdue student? I do not expect students to come with this type of information. Second question, if I look at my current classes in Blackboard for the fall the cap that I currently see, is it a combined cap or is it just the Purdue side of things?

C. Hine: I don't know what you are seeing on your side, but there is an overall cap, and then there is a Purdue-Fort Wayne section cap, and also an IU-Fort Wayne

section. So, there should be two CRNs. They are numbers and they are both under your class section that is being offered.

J. Malanson: Any recommendations on how to distinguish between them?

C. Hine: You could just ask them. I should also say there are only a certain number of courses that are being offered on both the IU-Fort Wayne side and the Purdue-Fort Wayne side of the house. If an IU-Fort Wayne student wants to take a business class that is not on the course list then they will have to be admitted to Purdue-Fort Wayne and register through our Banner system to take that class. You may have students who are both Purdue-Fort Wayne and IU-Fort Wayne at the same time.

L. Wright-Bower: About the waitlist, can students put themselves on the waitlist? And has that information about the waitlist been communicated to the students?

C. Hine: The wait listing has been ongoing for five or six years now. So, that information is out on myIPFW. There is a link for the students to read about how the waitlist works. Typically, I think the departments actually can put them in.

L. Wright-Bower: That is how it has been done, but I didn't know if students could put themselves.

C. Hine: Yes.

L. Wright-Bower: Okay.

G. Wang: I actually had a question on who is going to initiate the request? Is that going to be the instructor?

K. Smith: The departments need to determine their procedure. I recommend that it is something similar to what you are doing with the Form-200 process. The departments need to come up with their procedure.

J. Malanson: Just so we are clear on this, if Abe's Medical Ethics class has a waitlist of five Purdue students then the Registrar will not proactively go in and do a seat exchange? Abe or his department chair will need to make the request before it would happen.

K. Smith: I think I am going to be watching sections that need movement.

J. Malanson: And then you would initiate contact with the instructor or the department? Or you would just do it?

K. Smith: We are working on that. I can see both ways working. So, I have been asking for feedback.

J. Malanson: I mean I think it is important for faculty to know whether you are going to be going in and doing it or whether or not they need to ask.

K. Smith: Yes.

C. Hine: I think what is going to need to happen is that on when that date happens we are going to be looking at it from sides in all of those courses. Where are they? What is happening? I think it is going to be a communication between the Registrars in both places and then there will be communication with the faculty member more than likely. You know, "we have got this situation, and does that work for you?" Because we are going to have to continue to look at where we are in the A&R process. You know if we go "oh, on that day there are seven seats out of the ten, and we sent them back over." Then the next A&R day we have five students that show up that need the course. I mean we are going to have to work through all of those details, but I think it is really going to have to be made between the two Registrars and then with the faculty members.

G. Schmidt: My question is what data are we collecting related to this process? Because it seems like there could be a lot of unintended consequences because overall as caps go down then more students are on waitlists and I know from students I have I might have a student that needs five or six courses. So, if I am on five courses plus three waitlists and then when I get off the waitlist I will drop these and then that should exacerbate the problem because we will have people waiting until June for that. So, do we have a plan with data collecting? Or how is this going to work? Because it seems like that is going to be crucial for this team to be following appropriately.

K. Smith: Form now until June it is going to be fairly anecdotal. Abe brought to my attention that his Medical Ethics class was closed and we had a conversation. We don't have a crystal ball. We have to know what the situations are as they come up so that we can deal with them. Initially, it is anecdotal, but by doing the online form we should have data to look at what courses had the demand and when was the busy time for that to happen. We are doing it during a month break in A&R because that gives us time to make those moves.

G. Schmidt: I would want to have as a systematic process as possible. How well informed are students going to be in how this actually works? Because if I am a student and I can't sign up right now for my class do I actually sign up for the waitlist or do I say "Screw it. I will take it next year." Not knowing if some seats may open up in June.

K. Smith: They are going to see if there are other seats. They are just going to see it closed class on the Purdue-Fort Wayne side. So, they are not going to know. They are not going to come up to you unless they have been provided information. They are not going to be savvy enough to say "I know there are five seats over in IU. Give me one of those." They are not going to see that.

J. Malanson: We are going to allow a few more questions. But, I am going to say that I think the onus this time will be on faculty and advisors to be looking at students as much as possible. Faculty need to be communicating with the Registrar as much as possible. Everyone needs to be reflecting so we can have a more informed process. Whatever the process is this year there is going to be unintended consequences and problems. So, it is important that we deal with those as best we can and then make sure that we have a constructive conversation in the fall about how to find a better process for next year.

S. Bischoff: I was just curious. How do we know which courses are IU and PFW courses?

J. Malanson: Look in your myIPFW. You should see two course rosters.

S. Bischoff: Okay. Thank you.

D. Kaiser: This seems like we have unintentionally created a system that is going to drive enrollments down. Is there some way of getting IU students to enroll in a Purdue class? I mean, could somebody work on that?

J. Malanson: There are a variety of challenges that need to be confronted in figuring out a system that would work best to ensure that students didn't inadvertently overload the classes, to ensure that we weren't violating the fire code, to ensure that our technical systems were communicating correctly with each other. Again, it is the first process that is going to open up the next one.

A. Schwab: It is also that these IU students are first year students. So, they wouldn't register until May or June.

K. Smith: It will always be first year students. So, we are going to always have A&R days to kind of wait for.

S. Carr: Two questions. One is in terms of Blackboard. On the student end, is this two-section thing going to be seamless? In other words, is there going to be only one Blackboard course for students? Second part of that question. Looking on the other end, what happens when the class is cancelled because it hasn't met enrollments? Has there been any discussion about the process put in place in terms of cancellation of sections?

C. Hine: Yes, there has been discussion. When we hear on the Purdue-Fort Wayne side if a course is going to be cancelled Kari is our liaison to IU. She will be contacting the IU Student Central about that and they would be adjusting their side and then we would all be informing students and eventually dropping them if they did not withdraw themselves from the class section.

J. Malanson: Vice-Chancellor Drummond has indicated previously that there needs to be some additional flexibility in terms of the class caps and class enrollments because of the different needs of the Purdue students and the IU students. So, there shouldn't be just the automatic assumption when looking at those classes that serve both students that those classes with eight students will just get cancelled the way that a Purdue only class might.

S. Carr: So, just so I completely understand what you are saying here. In other words, a Purdue section could have a lower or minimum enrollment if there are IU students enrolled in the IU section in that class.

J. Malanson: There are different considerations involved in the decision-making.

B. Buldt: I cannot see the class list of the IU side of my classes. That would be important if I want to contact my students ahead of time.

J. Malanson: Are you sure you have IU students in your classes?

B. Buldt: Yes. It is not a link. The Purdue section has a link so I can click on the class list, but not the IU side.

J. Malanson: IU students haven't registered yet. That is why.

B. Buldt: Okay.

G. Wang: In our department, we have a lot of what is required by pre-nursing and pre-med, so we have a lot of IU and Purdue students. We have multiple sections with different CRNs. So, one section appears as purely IU. The other sections appear as Purdue sections. My question is can we have seats change between different sections? Because although they have different CRNs they are actually the same.

J. Malanson: That sounds like something you should have your department talk about with the Registrar.

G. Wang: Okay.

J. Malanson: Any further questions? Thank you Cheryl and Kari.

9. New business:

a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 17-26) – K. Pollock

A. Downs moved to approve Senate Document SD 17-26 (College of Professional Studies Procedures for Electing Senators).

Motion to approve SD 17-26 passed on a voice vote.

10. Committee reports “for information only”:

- a. (Senate Reference No. 17-24) – J. Clegg

Senate Reference No. 17-24 (Annual Report of FAR Activities) was presented for information only.

- b. Mastodon Athletic Advisory Committee (Senate Reference No. 17-25) – J. Clegg

Senate Reference No. 17-25 (MAAS Report on Student-Athlete Academics) was presented for information only.

- c. University Budget Committee (Senate Reference No. 17-26) – J. Malanson

Senate Reference No. 17-26 (University Budget Committee Report and Recommendations) was presented for information only.

- d. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 17-27) – C. Gurgur

Senate Reference No. 17-27 (BAS Findings and Recommendations on Consolidated Career Services and Office of Academic Internships, Cooperative Education and Service Learning (OACS) was presented for information only.

- e. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 17-28) – C. Gurgur

Senate Reference No. 17-28 (BAS Annual Report on Athletics Budget) was presented for information only.

11. The general good and welfare of the University:

A. Downs: Thank you, Jeff. First I would like to thank you for the kind words and you are right that I would rather have not had you done that. Secondly, I understand why Kathy dresses this way. It is quite comfortable. But, I would like to compliment her on her wonderful sweater vest. That is two months in a row that I get to talk about sweater vests.

J. Malanson: I would like to congratulate all of our Purdue colleagues whose cases for promotion and tenure were approved by the Board of Trustees. Also congratulations to our IU colleagues. Second, next Wednesday, April 18 at 7:00 pm in the Walb Classic Ballroom, Vice Chancellor Drummond, Assem Nasr from Communication, and myself will be having a panel discussion called “Beyond Charlottesville: What is the Role of the University in a Divided World?” I hope to see each and every one of you there.

J. Nowak: One note from back in February that wasn’t mentioned. I wanted to congratulate Shannon Bischoff and Connie Kracher. Science Central is the second most

visited public place here in Fort Wayne behind the Children's Zoo. We had IPFW rent the facility and we had well over a thousand people. There were fourteen hundred there. There was well over seventy of our students. They were actively engaged with the public doing activities and presentations. It was really a fantastic day, and it has been growing over the years. So, I wanted to throw some congratulations their way.

Then next Monday, I have the honor of representing us at the Purdue-West Lafayette Senate. I have been at the last couple of meetings. Next Monday, I have been asked to share about our transition and any concerns related to the transition. So, I have some logos from marketing. I am going to show our logos. I want to try to be as optimistic as I can be and share what we can impact. I can share about the registration, but they can't really do anything about it. That is an internal issue. If there are some other things where the Senate can impact us and assist us then please email me and let me know. I have met with Jeff, Andy, and Abe. I have also talked with others. Please let me know if there is anything you would like me to share. But, it is a good group and I look forward to representing us on Monday in West Lafayette.

S. LaVere: The Honors students from my Witchcraft and Witch-hunts class will be having a panel discussion next Monday at noon in the Honors Center. They will be talking about the history of witch-hunts in early modern Europe and some of the modern implications for today. There will be free pizza. It will be a very informative and interesting discussion.

R. Elsenbaumer: First off, I want to thank Jeff, Andy, and Abe for the tremendous work that they have been doing over the last several years and also since I have come to IPFW, soon to be Purdue-Fort Wayne. They have been an incredibly invaluable resource for me. We have had very frank and open discussions, and they have in turn providing significant guidance and background information and a tremendous amount of suggestions for opportunities for our institution as we move forward. I want to just stand here and say thank you. I thank Jeff, in particular, for some very good work over the last several years. I want to ask you to please give them a round of applause.

Also, in my discussions with Jeff, Andy, and Abe, I have also asked that during this moment in time in the Faculty Senate that when it is appropriate that I have an opportunity to come up and stand before you and start giving you some updates about our institution and things that you might not know about. In particular, updates that relate to what might be happening relative to us getting prepared for our next legislative session. Through that legislative session, I could provide you with some updates about what is going on relative to that session and things that might impact us over time. So, thank you for being willing to give me a little bit of time during those meetings for this particular session. Thank you.

12. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon

Secretary of the Faculty

In Memoriam
Joseph Maurice Chandler
August 25, 1931 – February 18, 2018

Our friend and former colleague, Joseph Chandler died in February 2018 at the age of 86.

Given his sense of humor, Joe would probably appreciate the image of a boomerang to explain that he started in Fort Wayne, left, and returned. A graduate of South Side High School, Joe enlisted in the United States Air Force and served in the Korean War. After his military service, he attended Ball State University, earning his bachelor's degree from the Teachers College in 1956 and his master's degree in 1962. He began his career as an educator teaching industrial arts and coaching JV basketball in New Castle, Indiana. In 1963, he came back to Fort Wayne as assistant industrial relations manager for International Harvester. However, his calling was teaching, so he joined the faculty at Indiana University's Division of General and Technical Studies, known as DGTS, in 1967 to teach supervision to college students. Eventually the DGTS faculty moved to IPFW's present location where Joe taught labor relations, interviewing, and human relations for the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision until his retirement in 1994.

Joe was passionate about teaching and helping students. His advisees and students in his classes appreciated his humor, his stories, and his ability to connect course content to their lives. Teaching and advising were fun to Joe and his enthusiasm was contagious. His effectiveness in the classroom was recognized in 1971 with the IPFW Distinguished Educator of the Year award and again in 1980 when he received the Friends of the University Outstanding Teacher Award. His excellence in advising was acknowledged with the Community Advisory Council Service to Students Award at the Honors Convocation in 1993.

Joe felt a particular affinity for our part-time students, who often were juggling full-time work, family responsibilities, and additional obligations outside the classroom. He and his wife put their concern for these students into action in 2017 when they established the Joseph and Marlene Chandler Scholarship Fund designated for an organizational leadership student who is attending school part-time while working. The department awarded the first scholarship last spring, and Joe and Marty were able to see their dream become reality when they met the recipient.

In addition to being an excellent teacher and advisor, Joe was a wonderful colleague. He was always ready with a joke, a smile, and engaging conversation. He also was generous with his time, offering valuable advice to department colleagues, and always providing a positive perspective.

After retirement Joe and Marty spent time traveling in their RV and enjoying time with family and friends. Even then, Joe would often stop by the office to say hello and catch up on departmental news. Over the years, he remained close to many of the DGTS faculty attending yearly reunions and the annual golf outing at Houston Woods in southwestern Ohio. He

delighted in his family, and he particularly enjoyed relating the exploits of his seven grandchildren. They survive him along with his wife, Marlene; and his three children, Tracy (spouse Kristen), Darci, and Scott (spouse Marien). We are grateful for the time our lives intersected with his.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate
FR: Faculty Affairs Committee
Zafar Nazarov, Chair
RE: Revision of CPS P & T document
Date: March 13th, 2018

DISPOSITION: To the Fort Wayne Senate for inclusion in the next senate meeting

WHEREAS, the College of Professional Studies has elected to adopt SD 14-35 as their college criteria for promotion and tenure, and has revised their promotion and tenure procedures document (attached) so as to be in compliance with SD 14-36; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Affairs Committee finds that the revised document is in fact in compliance with SD 14-36;

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate approve the most recently amended CPS document as their current promotion and tenure document.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the College of Professional Studies' promotion and tenure procedures approved in this document shall, as of July 1, 2018, supersede and replace all prior promotion and tenure procedures for the College of Education and Public Policy and the College of Health and Human Services at IPFW.

Purdue University Fort Wayne
College of Professional Studies
Proposed
Promotion and Tenure Procedures
Submitted by Governance Task Force
3/12/18

V. Promotion and Tenure

V.	Promotion and Tenure.....	1
A.	Policy and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure and Third Year Review.....	1
B.	Case Process.....	1
C.	The Department Committee.....	3
D.	The Chief Academic Officer of the Department.....	4
E.	The College Committee.....	5
F.	The Chief Academic Officer of the College.....	6
G.	Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	6
H.	Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty.....	6

A. Policy and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure and Third Year Review

Promotion and Tenure is a time-honored process in higher education designed to encourage the advancement and scholarship of teaching, research/creative endeavor, and service and through the professional development of faculty.

Preparation of the dossier and compilation of evidence to support an application for Tenure and Promotion or Promotion is the sole responsibility of the candidate.

Successful candidates for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate excellence in research or teaching with competence in service, research or teaching.

Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate excellence in research, teaching or service with competence in service, research or teaching.

The College of Professional Studies has adopted the following procedures to guide candidates, departments and the College through the process of Promotion and /or Tenure in compliance with the Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) SD 14-36 *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and Third Year Review*.

B. Case Process

Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion must identify the Department or School Promotion and Tenure Criteria document that should be used to evaluate the case. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Criteria used must have been in effect at some point during the six years preceding the submission of the case. The promotion and tenure criteria

for each department or school shall be approved by the voting faculty in the respective department or school and approved by the College of Professional Studies.

Candidate cases for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels in the following order:

1. Department committee
2. Chief academic officer of the department
3. College committee
4. Chief academic officer of the college
5. Purdue Fort Wayne (PFW) campus committee
6. Chief academic officer of PFW

The chief administrative officer at PFW shall forward recommendations to the President of Purdue University.

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

All cases for promotion and/or tenure shall pass sequentially through the decision levels above.

No information, other than updates to items in the case, can be added to the case after the vote and recommendation from the department level. The intent is that each level will be reviewing the same case. Each decision level is responsible for determining if items submitted after a case has cleared the department committee should be included in the case or considered to be new evidence that should be excluded.

1. Each decision level submits a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments or supplemental information.
2. The administrator or committee chair at each level shall inform the candidate in writing of the vote tally or recommendation on the nomination, with a clear and complete statement of the reasons therefor, at the time the case is sent forward to the next level. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may submit a written response to the statement to the administrator or the committee chair within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and the written response must proceed with the case. At the same time that the case is sent forward to the next level, the administrator or committee chair shall also send a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons, and the candidate's response, if any, to administrators and committee chairs at the lower level(s).
3. The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential, and only the chair may communicate a committee's decision to the candidate and to the next level. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No abstentions or proxies are allowed. Committee members must be present during deliberations in order to vote.

The following rules shall apply for participation in the review process at any level:

1. Only tenured faculty may serve as voting members of promotion and tenure committees at any level.
2. No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for promotion or tenure is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own promotion or tenure nomination.
3. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (college or campus).
4. The department level excepted, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before college committees.
5. The Faculty Governance Committee of the College shall identify those individuals who are eligible to serve on the campus committee based on tenure status and prior service on a department and/or college P&T committee. Individuals who meet the minimum requirements shall be asked if they would like to have their names placed into consideration for the campus committee. A slate of interested individuals shall be developed and the College of Professional Studies voting faculty shall select two nominees. The nominees selected by the faculty shall be forwarded to the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for consideration.
6. Voting members of committees and chief academic officers shall recuse themselves from considering cases of candidates with whom they share significant credit for research or creative endeavor or other work which is a major part of the candidate's case or if they have other conflicts of interest. The committee will decide if committee members who collaborate with the candidate need to recuse themselves. The next highest administrator will decide if a chief academic officer who collaborated with the candidate needs to recuse her/himself.
7. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.
8. Chief academic officers who have written a letter of recommendation as part of the case will recuse themselves from discussion or vote on that candidate's case at a higher level.

C. The Department Committee

Each department/school in the College of Professional Studies follows the guiding principles as established in IPFW Senate Document SD 14-35 Guiding principles of promotion and tenure at IPFW.

1. Establishing the department/school committee:
The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department or school and approved by the faculty of the college with a majority vote. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.
2. Composition of the department committee:

- i. The majority of the department or school committee shall be persons possessing the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires; if by established departmental criteria, fewer than three persons are eligible to serve on the department committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the college the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department committee. Persons outside of the department but within the college will be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the college. If persons outside of the college are selected to serve on the committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the Chief Academic Officer of the college. From this list, the chief academic officer of the college shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.
 - ii. Members of the department committee shall serve three-year staggered terms.
 - iii. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
 - iv. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.
 - v. Any faculty member subject to the procedures and guiding principles of promotion and tenure at IPFW shall have the opportunity to read and provide feedback on cases in their home department until such time as the department committee has made a recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion. Any document that is provided does not become part of the case and does not move forward with the case.
3. The Role of the Department Committee:
- i. Review the evidence presented in the case
 - ii. Evaluate the case in light of department criteria
 - iii. Make a recommendation to the chief academic officer of the department in the form of a letter

The letter of recommendation from the department committee shall be based on the case and department criteria and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee.

D. The Chief Academic Officer of the Department

The role of the chief academic officer of the department is to:

1. Review the case and compare to department criteria
2. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
3. Review the recommendation of the lower level.
4. Make a recommendation to the College Committee in the form of a letter.

The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the department shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the case in light of department criteria, the process to this point, and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decision of the lower level.

E. The College Committee

1. Establishing the college committee:

The college committee composition and functions shall be established by the college faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the college, and approved by the Senate. This procedure shall be periodically published, simultaneously with the Bylaws of the Senate, as and when the Bylaws of the Senate are distributed.

2. Composition of the college committee:

- i. The Faculty Governance Committee will initiate and manage the process for selection of college committee membership.
- ii. Each department/school will submit the name of one eligible faculty to be their representative on the college committee. Each department/school will submit the name of one eligible faculty to be considered for an at-large position on the committee. The voting college faculty will select by vote one at-large member. Total membership in the committee will be five.
- iii. There is no requirement that the majority of the college committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.
- iv. Members of the college committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the college committee.
- v. Members of the college committee may serve at the department/school level, but not at the campus level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the college committee.
- vi. Members of the college committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be for three years and must be staggered.
- vii. Members of the college committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
- viii. The chief academic officer of the college may not serve on the college committee or participate in the meetings.

3. Role of the College Committee

- i. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.
- ii. Review the recommendation of the lower levels. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
- iii. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.
- iv. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

The letter of recommendation from the college committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the

committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.

F. The Chief Academic Officer of the College

The Role of the Chief Academic Officer of the College is to:

1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels and may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a decision from a lower level is judged to be contrary to the evidence.
3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the college shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.

G. Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Faculty Governance Committee, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer of the College, will solicit eligible nominees for consideration by the voting faculty of the college. Faculty will vote for nominees and the two faculty names with the most votes will be sent to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for consideration for the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee.

H. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

It is in the best interest of PFW and College of Professional Studies to see its faculty succeed. One way to judge success for probationary faculty is to evaluate progress toward tenure and promotion at the midway point.

Each department of the College of Professional Studies will develop, approve, and implement its own Third Year Review Process based on guidance in accordance with SD 14-36. The following principles must be followed:

1. The procedure must make use of annual reviews (discussing performance in the previous year) and annual reappointments (discussing progress toward promotion and tenure).
2. Departments/programs must have a thorough formative review process that provides specific details about where improvement is needed and must be based on department criteria. The formative review must occur half way through the third year.
3. The third-year review must be evaluated by the department/school promotion and tenure committee, and submit their vote and recommendation to the chief academic officer of the department/school. Their vote and recommendation is also submitted to the tenure track faculty.

4. The chief academic officer of the department/school must comment on the case and the review from the committee.
5. The tenure track faculty member must have opportunities to respond during the reviews.
6. If, at any point during the probationary period, a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending the reappointment of a tenure track faculty, the input and vote of the promotion and tenure committee at the same level must be sought.

Date _____ – Approved by the College of Professional Studies

Date _____ – Approved by PFW Faculty Senate

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Linda Wright-Bower, Chair
Education Policy Committee

DATE: March 27, 2018

SUBJECT: Military Students Transfer Credit

DISPOSITION: To the Executive Committee for inclusion in the next senate meeting

WHEREAS, Our former policy regarding Military Students Transfer Credit aligned with Purdue and IU policies;

WHEREAS, Transfer Credit is a curricular decision and, therefore, within the charge of PFW faculty; and

WHEREAS, PFW faculty want to recognize the learning that our military students have experienced;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate endorse the following policy for Military Students Transfer Credit (In black is the current. In red is the additional policy.)

Military Credit: Credit is not granted for military training programs. Credit will be granted for military service according to the length of active service. Please submit a copy of your DD-214 (or an LES if still active duty).

Length of Active Service	Credit Granted
0-6 months	No credit awarded
6-12 months	Military Undistributed Credit (4 hours)
12+ months	Military Undistributed Credit (8 hours)

Additional credit may be granted for a Joint Services Transcript per recommendations by the American Council on Education. Credit will be transferred as Undistributed credit in appropriate disciplines. As with any transfer credit, application of military credit towards degree requirements remains at the discretion of the academic department.

In favor

Stacy Betz
Daren Kaiser
Gang Wang
Prasad Bingi
Jane Leatherman
Linda Wright-Bower

Against

Abstentions

Non-voting

Marcia Dixson
Cheryl Hine

Question (March 29, 2018)

A number of classes have had their usual course caps split between PFW and IUFW. PFW students have already begun registering for classes and will continue to do so over the coming weeks and months. IUFW students are not expected to begin enrolling until mid-May and will continue enrolling throughout the summer. It is likely that some courses will have one side fill before the other side has filled. It is also likely that PFW and IUFW students will approach instructors with filled sections about getting into the class. A series of questions:

When instructors are approached by PFW students:

How should instructors respond when they are willing to raise the overall cap (i.e., from 30 to 31)?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap, but they know the IUFW side is not filled?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap and both sides are filled?

When instructor are approached by IUFW students:

How should instructors respond when they are willing to raise the overall cap (i.e., from 30 to 31)?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap, but they know the PFW side is not filled?

How should instructors respond when they are not willing to raise the overall cap and both sides are filled?

Abe Schwab

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair
Executive Committee

DATE: April 2, 2018

SUBJ: College of Professional Studies Procedures for Electing Senators

WHEREAS, Article VII.A.5. of the Constitution of the Faculty states that “Methods of nomination and election [of Senators], and of filling seats vacated before the end of a term, shall be proposed and implemented by the Voting Faculty of those [major] units according to methods consistent with generally accepted principles of democratic representation. These methods must be defined in the documents which define the protocols of faculty governance within each unit; and the protocols must be approved by the Senate by simple majority vote”; and

WHEREAS, The faculty of the newly established College of Professional Studies are engaged in the process of creating their governance procedures, including the “methods for nomination and election” of Senators;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate approves the College of Professional Studies’ procedures for the nomination and election of Senators.

College of Professional Studies

College Senate Allocation

Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate allocation is determined by the ratio of 1 Senator for every 6 voting faculty (Continuing Lecturers do not count as voting faculty) within the College. In the College of Professional Studies each department/school is allotted one Senate representative to be selected by the departments/school, regardless of the number of voting faculty. If there are additional allotted senators then at-large Senate representatives would be elected from the voting faculty of the college in a process led by the Faculty Governance Committee.

Annual Report of FAR Activities

As set forth in the "Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne Faculty Athletics Representative Position Description" this is the annual report of the activities of the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) for the Academic year 2017-2018.

Conferences Attended:

Faculty Athletics Representative Association (FARA) Annual Conference. November 3-5, 2017. Atlanta, Georgia. This conference is an annual meeting of all Faculty Athletic Representatives. The meeting includes training, education, and information for FAR's.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Accelerating Academic Success Program Annual Conference. July 26-29, 2017. New Orleans, Louisiana. This meeting is for all FAR's as well as Athletic Directors, University Presidents, and other administrators connected to athletics. There is training and education as well as meetings.

Athletic Travel:

Summit League Basketball Championships 2018. March 2-6. Sioux Falls, South Dakota. This is the annual basketball tournament for our league. As part of the event there are administrative meetings that the FAR attends.

Committee Work:

The following are committees that I belong to or advise and attend the regular meetings of:

Student-Athlete Leadership Team (SALT). This meeting is held monthly. SALT has student-athlete representatives from each of the athletics teams. In the meeting they coordinate athletic and service events as well as matters of importance to student-athletes. They also discuss and seek advice on academic matters from the FAR.

Student Athlete Services (S-AS). This committee holds bi-weekly meetings to coordinate student-athlete issues and includes representatives from the Mastodon Academic Performance Center, The Registrar's Office, Financial Aid, and the Compliance office.

Compliance Committee. This committee is intended to meet monthly but has had limited meetings this academic year which I did attend. The committee is composed of representatives from different areas of campus that affect student athletes (registrar, bursar, compliance, athletics, student affairs, financial aid, etc). The group coordinates to make sure there are no compliance issues with student athletes.

Faculty Senate Mastodon Athletics Advisory Sub-Committee. I am the chair of this committee. The committee is a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Student Affairs Sub-Committee and meets monthly. Its purpose can be found in the Senate Bylaws section 5.3.4.3.2.

Work with Student Athletes:

There are several situations where I work directly with student-athletes. To protect their anonymity I will use generalities and avoid names.

Student-Athlete Missed Class Worksheets. These worksheets are given to student-athletes at the beginning of each semester. The worksheets have the days of class that the student will have to miss for athletic events that are officially sanctioned by the university. I send an email to professors with student athletes in their classes explaining how the worksheets work, encouraging the faculty to work with the student athletes, and inviting faculty to contact me with questions. The student-athletes then work with the faculty member to come to an agreement and the faculty member signs the form. On occasion there is a conflict between a faculty member and a student-athlete regarding what can and cannot be missed as well as how it can be made-up. When these conflicts occur I am asked to intervene and come up with a solution that is acceptable for both parties. In the Spring Semester there were 4 such instances and 3 more in the Fall 2017 semester. In each case I worked with both sides to help mediate the situation and come to a resolution. Overall the majority of faculty work with the student athletes and are willing to help them compete and do well academically.

Advising. The student athletes have academic advisors in athletics as well as in their major areas so I do not directly advise them for their majors and coursework. As the FAR they occasionally come to me for advice on interacting with faculty and for career advice.

Appeals. If a student-athlete has a conflict with a coach or someone in the athletic department and wishes to appeal a decision that has been made, a committee is formed with members from the Athletics Advisory Sub-committee. There were no appeals this academic year.

Work with the Compliance Department:

The compliance department serves to ensure that all NCAA and legal rules are followed by the athletics department and that student-athletes stay within the rules to stay academically eligible. If there are violations the compliance department reports them and works through any consequences. I work with compliance to review and comment on any legislative changes and to monitor athletic department processes and practices. In this capacity I meet regularly with the compliance director Wendy Wilson at the beginning of the academic year and now Rachel Newsted. We review the academic eligibility of student athletes and make sure that there are no violations, or that if there are violations they are properly reported. To my knowledge there have been no violations this semester.

Work with the Athletics Department:

I meet regularly (at least 1 time per month) with the Athletic Director, Kelley Hartley Hutton, to consult on academic issues and ensure that there is a faculty voice in athletics decisions. The Athletic Director is very open to input and actively seeks ways to improve communication between athletics and academics.

The Athletics Department also asked me to participate on the **Faculty Senate Athletics Working Group** on their behalf. In this capacity I attended all of the Working Group meetings, prepared reports, and read numerous reports including the final report submitted to the faculty senate.

I also have the opportunity to work with the coaches of the different teams. I have attended the Coaches Meetings and I have met with a many of the coaches. In these meetings we have discussed practice schedules, game schedules, and missed class worksheets. All of the coaches that I have met with actively promote academic excellence on their teams. I also began attending practices for the teams this spring semester. So far I have been to see the baseball team and the men's and women's basketball team.

As part of my duties I am made aware of any concussions. I am notified by the athletic trainers. I help ensure that faculty in the classes of the affected student-athlete are aware of the injury and of the status of the student. There have been several injuries and concussions that affected academic performance over the last academic year. In all cases all proper protocols were followed. The student was not allowed to compete until completely cleared by the proper medical professional.

I also work closely with the Mastodon Academic Performance Center (MAP). I am notified of any academic problems or challenges with student-athletes. We also meet regularly to review student eligibility and discuss future plans for students. As part of the process of monitoring eligibility, each day I (as well as the employees of the MAP) receive a report of the enrollment and status of student-athletes. Individually we review the report and compare it to the team rosters to make sure that all student-athletes remain eligible. As FAR I work to make sure that university academic policies are being followed and that advising policies are in the best academic interests of the students. The employees of the MAP are very open to my comments and actively seek my input for policies and procedures as well as day to day issues.

I also participate in the interview and hiring process for new coaches and athletic academic personnel. There were several replacement hires this academic year. In each case I participated in the interview process and gave feedback on the candidates.

Athletics Events:

As the FAR it is recommended that I attend a few athletics events each semester to make sure that the student-athlete experience is a positive one. I have attended numerous athletics events this academic year. Including events for Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball, Men's Volleyball, Women's Volleyball, Women's Softball, and Men's Baseball.

Chancellor:

Part of my duties are to meet with the chancellor to discuss the academic progress of student-athletes and give input into issues that affect athletics and academics. I have met with the past and present chancellor multiple times in the last academic year. I currently meet with chancellor Elsenbaumer once per month.

Mastodon Athletic Advisory Committee Report on Student-Athlete Academics 2016-2017

2016-2017 Academic Year Student-Athlete GPA

- 3.24
- 14th year 3.0 or better
- 2015-2016 all-time high Academic Year Student-Athlete GPA 3.25

Fall 2016 Semester

- 69% of student-athletes achieved GPA's of 3.0 or better
- 28 student-athletes earned All A's

Spring 2017 Semester

- 73% of student-athletes achieved GPA's of 3.0 or better
- 40 student-athletes earned All A's

Graduation Success Rate (GSR):

- Most recent 81% Fall 2016
- 8th Consecutive year of 80% or higher

Student-Athletes Included in IPFW's TOP 50

2016 - 9 Student-Athletes

Student-Athletes Included in IPFW's TOP 50

2017 - 9 Student-Athletes

NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) Public Recognition Awards May 3, 2017

- Men's Basketball*-
- Men's Volleyball**
- Women's Golf***

(A program must post multiyear APRs ranked in the top 10 percent of all Division I teams. Multiyear rates based on scores from 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years.)

*Men's Basketball for the 2nd season is the only men's basketball program in the Summit League to receive the honor from the NCAA. Fort Wayne and Valparaiso were the only men's basketball programs in the state of Indiana to receive the Public Recognition Award this year.

**Men's volleyball earned the honor for the first time. The Mastodons are one of only six men's volleyball teams in the nation to earn the award. They are the only Midwestern Intercollegiate Volleyball Association (MIVA) team to earn the accolade this year and only the fifth MIVA squad ever to be honored.

***The 'Dons are one of three Summit League women's golf teams to earn the honor this year. This is the fifth straight year, and sixth time overall, that Fort Wayne women's golf has been recognized.

NCAA Perfect Single-Year APR (Academic Progress Rate) Scores 9 Teams May 10, 2017

Perfect APR's were earned by the following 9 teams:

Baseball, Men's Cross Country, Men's Golf, Men's Volleyball, Women's Cross Country, Women's Golf, Women's Soccer, Women's Track & Field and Women's Volleyball

(A perfect single-year APR score is equal to 1,000, and is based on single year averages of academic success by looking at the academic progress of each student-athlete on scholarship. This year's APR scores include academics from 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-2016.)

Student-Athlete Academic Honors

January 2016

- Summit League Academic Honor Roll 62 student-athletes
(3.0 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility)
- Distinguished Scholars List 32 student-athletes
(3.6 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility)

June 2016

- Summit League Academic Honor Roll 73 student-athletes
(3.0 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility)
- Distinguished Scholars List 35 student-athletes
(3.6 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility)

July 2016

- Summit League Commissioner's List of Academic Excellence 85 student-athletes
(3.0 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility and previously completed one academic year at the nominating institution)

July 2017

- Summit League 2016-2017 Academic Honor Roll 125 student-athletes
(3.2 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility)
- Summit League Commissioner's List of Academic Excellence 48 student-athletes
(3.5 or better during a competition semester and use a year of eligibility and previously completed one academic year at the nominating institution)

Note changes in GPA requirements from 2016 to the 2017 Academic Honor Roll and Commissioner's List.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Jeffrey Malanson, Presiding Officer
Fort Wayne Senate

DATE: March 26, 2018

SUBJ: University Budget Committee Report and Recommendations

WHEREAS, The University Budget Committee (UBC) is annually charged by the Chancellor to make recommendations to the administration on budgeting priorities for the next fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, UBC is composed of representatives of each of the major academic units, each of the major administrative areas, the Indiana-Purdue Student Government Association (IPSGA), the Clerical & Service Staff Advisory Committee (CSSAC), the Administrative & Professional Staff Advisory Committee (APSAC), the Fort Wayne Senate, and the Senate's Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS); and

WHEREAS, The Presiding Officer of the Fort Wayne Senate represents the Senate as an ex officio member of UBC; and

WHEREAS, The members of UBC prepared a Report and Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2019 and endorsed that document by a vote of 14 in favor to 0 opposed; and

WHEREAS, UBC exists as a shared governance process at IPFW; and

WHEREAS, Senate Document SD 16-26 defines shared governance processes "focused on producing a discrete product" such as the UBC Report and Recommendations as being "limited-term [shared governance] processes"; and

WHEREAS, SD 16-26 states that "Whenever faculty participate in a limited-term shared governance process, the results of that process shall be submitted to the Senate for review";

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UBC Report and Recommendations is being submitted to the Senate by the Presiding Officer for review under the terms of SD 16-26.

University Budget Committee Report and Recommendations for FY 2019 Budget

Executive Summary

The University Budget Committee (UBC) submits the following Report and Recommendations to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors regarding Purdue University Fort Wayne's FY 2019 budget. In the Report that follows, UBC recommends:

- That in the event further budget reductions are necessary, they be made in a targeted manner rather than be imposed equally across administrative areas;
- That investments be made to maintain and restore existing university operations;
- That a Strategic Initiative Reserve be created to support strategic investments that will promote enrollment and revenue growth;
- That UBC's charge be expanded to include supporting the administration in (1) communicating relevant budgetary information to the campus, (2) developing budgetary priorities that will inform future decisions on budget reductions and investments, and (3) moving toward a strategically balanced budget model.

UBC Membership, 2017-18

Member	Representing
Walter Soptelean	Budget and Planning – Chair, non-voting
Josh Bacon	Clerical & Service Staff Advisory Committee
Cassandra Bracht	Administrative & Professional Staff Advisory Committee
Steven Carr	College of Arts and Sciences
Steve George	Financial and Administrative Affairs
Cigdem Gurgur	Senate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee
Aleshia Hayes	College of Engineering, Technology & Computer Science
James Hoppes	Student Government
Diana Jackson	Advancement
David Reynolds	Student Affairs
Nathan Rupp	Helmke Library
James (Wylie) Sirk	College of Education and Public Policy
Michael Slaubaugh	Richard T. Doermer School of Business
Hamilton Tescarollo	College of Visual and Performing Arts
Jeffrey Malanson	Fort Wayne Faculty Senate – Ex Officio

Introductory Note

In Fall 2017, the central administration established parameters for the Fiscal Year 2019 (hereinafter, FY 19) budget process, the most important of which was projecting a 3% decline in student credit hour enrollment for the 2018-19 academic year. A 3% decline in credit hour enrollment translates to a 1.4% reduction in the university budget and continues a long-term trend of declining enrollment at IPFW.

Purdue University Fort Wayne faces an unprecedented budgetary situation in FY 19. On top of ongoing enrollment declines, the Realignment of IPFW into PFW and IU Fort Wayne will be

implemented on July 1, 2018, which will mean the loss of students, faculty, and staff, and significant payments for tuition, fees, and services moving between universities. PFW will also move to banded tuition, which will result in the elimination of the online course fee and the transition of the Division of Continuing Studies into the General Fund budget. In addition to these changes to the university budget, the Purdue University system has been engaged in a major overhaul of its financial systems and budget development timeline. It has been a challenge keeping the university community fully informed on all of these changes, and it is critically important that the administration clearly communicate the impacts of these changes over the course of FY 19.

While there are a great many opportunities that accompany Realignment and Purdue Fort Wayne's new relationship with IU Fort Wayne, there is also a great deal of uncertainty. IU Fort Wayne's enrollments will directly impact PFW's revenues, and IU Fort Wayne can opt out of its course, service, and lease agreements with PFW starting in five years, which would have significant negative financial ramifications for PFW. Uncertainty surrounding future state appropriations and enrollments represent further challenges that must remain central to all discussions of short-term budgeting and long-term financial planning.

Since its creation, UBC has been charged with making recommendations to the administration about budgetary priorities for the following fiscal year based on available budgetary information and presentations made by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors. Given the projected revenue decline for next year, as well as the complexity and volatility of the current situation, UBC asked the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors to answer three questions in this year's presentations to the committee:

1. How did you adjust your FY 19 budget to address the currently projected revenue declines?
2. How would you further adjust your area's budget to address an additional decline of roughly 3% (for a total year-over-year decline of 6%)? (UBC expects a high-level discussion on this point, rather than a dollar-by-dollar analysis.) In discussing potential additional cuts, please help UBC understand your area's core functions, and what of those functions currently require new investments, and what cannot be cut without jeopardizing those functions.
3. If recruitment and enrollment initiatives are successful and there is a small surplus (e.g., enrollment is down, but by less than the currently projected 3%), what are some specific, targeted investments you would want made in your area? How would you prioritize these investments? If there is a larger surplus (e.g., enrollment is up year-over-year), what are some big picture priorities for investment in your area?

While the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors addressed each of these questions in their presentations, the level of detail and areas of emphasis varied greatly across administrative areas. While this makes it harder for UBC to make specific recommendations about how to prioritize proposed cuts or investments across areas, the variety of approaches outlined speaks to the state of the university and its budget after multiple years of significant budget reductions.

In the sections that follow, UBC has divided its recommendations into three areas:

- (1) Recommendations in the event that enrollment declines by more than 3%
- (2) Recommendations in the event that enrollment declines by less than 3% or increases
- (3) Overall Recommendations

Recommendations in the event that enrollment declines by more than 3%

The members of UBC strongly believe that it is neither feasible nor in the university's best interest to continue making across-the-board cuts in the event of further enrollment declines. (This belief would hold true in the face of future budget reductions as a result of declining state appropriations or changes in PFW's relationship with IU Fort Wayne as well.)

While uniform cuts across administrative areas (e.g., everyone reduces their budget by 3%) are often the most expeditious and the least friction-producing, many units on campus have already trimmed their margins to the greatest extent possible. Reductions of this nature—especially when made in the middle of an academic or fiscal year—extend the unfortunate pattern of making cuts of convenience or opportunity rather than making intentional cuts informed by an understanding of the university's mission, values, and priorities.

Moving forward, UBC recommends that further budget reductions (if they are necessary) be targeted to minimize the impact on students and academic programming. Student Affairs in particular seems to be in a position where any further cuts would significantly impair the unit's ability to deliver the services and programming our students need.

The implementation of targeted, intentional cuts will require decision-makers at the university—hopefully as part of a broader, transparent decision-making process—to evaluate potential cuts and service reductions in relation to the university's core academic and student success missions, the requirements of accreditation, and our ability to recruit and retain successful students. These decisions would not be easy, but it is imperative that we engage in strategic decision-making rather than continuing to accept the negative consequences of blanket budget reductions.

Recommendations in the event that enrollment declines by less than 3% or increases

The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors proposed a variety of specific, potential, and conceptual investments that could be considered in the event that PFW's enrollments and revenues grow. All of these proposals have merit.

UBC saw these proposed investments as generally falling into two categories: (1) investments to maintain and restore existing university operations, and (2) strategic investments to promote enrollment and revenue growth. In determining how to best invest new resources, the administration must be attentive to both categories, developing lists of priorities for both and implementing as resources allow.

In the area of investments to maintain and restore existing university operations, Student Affairs proposed multiple relatively low-cost but high-impact investments to restore Career Services and expand other services that are effective for our students but are in need of additional resources. The Vice Chancellor for Financial and Administrative Affairs proposed a 2% raise for university employees, assuming revenue growth is sufficient to support a recurring investment of this

magnitude. This kind of investment would send a positive message to the campus community about administrative priorities and the value the university places on its personnel and would help with campus morale and employee retention. These are two high-impact examples, but UBC is certain that there are other maintenance investments that could be made to improve the operations of the campus.

In the area of strategic investments to promote enrollment and revenue growth, UBC strongly endorses the proposal made by the Vice Chancellor for Financial and Administrative Affairs for the creation of a Strategic Initiative Reserve for the university. *Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education*—the industry guide that establishes and explains the Composite Financial Index (CFI) that is utilized to assess the financial health of universities across the country—advocates that universities strive to establish institutional budgets that are “strategically balanced.”¹ This means developing an annual budget with sufficient resources to both cover annual operating expenses and fund strategic initiatives and investments. These strategic initiatives could be one-time investments or require recurring funds, but they should be made with an eye toward advancing the strategic priorities of the university. Some models of a strategically balanced budget utilize the funds set aside for strategic initiatives like seed money, with the expectation that investments will pay for themselves over time and lead to the creation of new programs and services that will generate sufficient recurring revenues to support their ongoing operations. While this model of a strategically balanced budget would not need to be the one implemented at PFW, encouraging units to think about how strategic investments will promote enrollment and revenue growth is important for the long-term financial health of the university. Moving toward a budget model that features a Strategic Initiative Reserve should be an integral part of the development and implementation of PFW’s next strategic plan.²

In both categories of investment, decisions on what to invest in and how much to invest should be made using a transparent decision-making process.

Overall Recommendations

The primary general recommendation UBC is making in this year’s report relates to UBC itself. UBC has faculty, staff, and student representation from across campus; has been modified in recent years to better reflect the university’s system of shared governance; and has a membership that invests a significant amount of time each year learning about the operation of the university’s budget. UBC believes that the committee can be of greater service to the university if its charge is expanded to include (1) assisting the administration with communicating relevant budget information to the university community, (2) participating in the development of both annual budgetary priorities (UBC’s traditional charge) and the kinds of institutional priorities

¹ See *Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education*, sixth edition (2005), pp. 14-15, available at <http://www.prager.com/Public/raihe6.pdf>.

² *Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education* proposes a variety of approaches to strategic budgeting that the administration should consider implementing at PFW as part of the strategic planning process. Perhaps most relevant given what the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP) attempted to accomplish and in light of the recommendations made in the Fort Wayne Senate’s [Report on Administrative Staffing and Budgeting](#) is the chapter on “Allocating Resources to Achieve Mission” and the Resource Allocation Map that it proposes. The Resource Allocation Map provides a framework in which potential investments or reallocations can be evaluated based on four factors: mission/strategic plan, financial performance, internal competencies, and market trends. See *Strategic and Financial Analysis for Higher Education* (2005), pp. 24-33.

discussed in the previous sections of this report related to future cuts and investments, and (3) assisting in the development of a strategically balanced budget model.

The best way to ensure transparency and fairness in any decision-making process is to rely on established representative bodies. While final decisions obviously rest with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, UBC can be an invaluable resource in helping the administration make decisions regarding future cuts and investments and in communicating those decisions to the campus community.

If the committee's charge is expanded, further thought should be put into the timing of the committee's formation and the terms of membership in order to minimize turnover each year.

UBC approved the Report and Recommendations by a vote of 14-0.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Cigdem Z. Gurgur, Chair
Budget Affairs Subcommittee (BAS)

DATE: March 12, 2018

SUBJ: BAS Findings and Recommendations on Consolidated Career Services and Office of Academic Internships, Cooperative Education and Service Learning (OACS)

In Fall 2017, the BAS began an inquiry as to the whether a greater impact of university resources could be achieved by re-examining the current structure of maintaining two separate units for Career Services and OACS. Specifically, there was an interest in improving the experience of stakeholders (students and employers) by consolidating the Career Services and OACS units and hence their budgets. This goal was deemed to be germane to our committee given its focus on the effectiveness and impact of the budget.

BAS investigated the matter by taking input from Deb Barrick, Director of OACS; Ashley Calderon, Director of Career Services; Marcia Dixon, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Teaching and Learning; Carl Drummond, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management; Eric Norman, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Dean of Students; as well as David Wesse, Vice Chancellor for Financial and Administrative Affairs.

During the final drafting of this memorandum, we were pleased to learn that the Chancellor Elsenbaumer and the upper-administration have expressed support for consolidating the two units. We have included a summary of the current status of this developing situation at the end of the memorandum.

The investigation yielded the following results.

IPFW currently maintains two separate units that both connect students with employers: Career Services and OACS.

- Career Services focuses on preparing students for interviews as well as developing relationships with employers to place students in full-time positions after graduation.
- OACS develops relationships with employers for academic credit internships and administers non-academic credit internships.

BAS identified the following reasons why the current separation of Career Services and OACS may not be serving an optimal use of resources:

- Both units act as channels for the university between students and employers. As such, there are inherent duplicate efforts between the two units in regards to the cultivation and maintaining of relationships with employers.
- Both units facilitate on-campus interviews by employers but only Career Services have a physical space designed for and dedicated to interviewing.
- Resources need to be allocated to communicate to students and employers the distinction between the two units. These resources and hence costs include:
 - Time of the two unit's personnel (speaking to classes regarding each unit's scope of responsibilities, attending campus events, etc.),
 - Updating electronic materials (e.g., separate web pages), and
 - Printed promotional brochures.

In regards to why Career Services and OACS have remained separated:

- The primary rationale initially provided by IPFW administration is that OACS is responsible for academic credit internships and hence are an academic support unit while Career Services is closer to a student support unit.
- However, it is the position of the BAS that the similarities between Career Services and OACS are greater than their differences. This is likely a contributing factor in other universities having a singular unit rather than two departments; e.g. University of Wisconsin-Whitewater's Career & Leadership Development, Purdue University-Northwest's Career Center.

BAS believes that the potential benefits of combining the two units include:

- Personnel within both Career Services and OACS currently need to develop leads with and then maintain relationships with employers. Combining the two units would reduce the amount of duplicate efforts in these endeavors. The saved time and effort could be then redirected at other means of adding value to the students.
- Simplify students' experience by providing them a "one-stop" destination where they can get pre-interview assistance (e.g., resume review, mock interviews) and sign-up for job search engines (i.e., Handshake) for either internships or full-time positions. This would improve students experience by reducing confusion.

- Create a one-point of contact for employers interested in listing both academic credit internships and full-time positions. Resulting benefits would include reducing the likelihood of potential leads falling through the cracks when they try to contact the university and provide employers with a more simplified and streamlined process.
- Having all on-campus interviews performed at the physical space designed for such purposes within current Career Services location in Kettler Hall.

During BAS discussions regarding a possible merger of the two units, the point was raised that there is currently not a large enough physical space to house a combined single-unit. Specifically, there is not enough space within Career Services area in Kettler Hall for the OACS personnel. A potential remedy to this is as follows:

- The Career Services area in Kettler Hall should be used for:
 - All on-campus interviews.
 - The location of personnel who regularly meet with students and/or employers.
- Personnel of Career Services and/or OACS with less frequent face-to-face interactions can have office space in alternative locations (e.g., current OACS space in the Neff Hall).

On February 28, 2018, the BAS received an email from Vice Chancellor Norman that stated the Chancellor Elsenbaumer was supportive of consolidating OACS and Career Services. The current plan is:

- Formation of an Internship Manager that would be the primary clearinghouse and point person for all types of internships.
- Pulling all of the functionalities of Career Services and OACS to see the best alignment of responsibilities. The manager will then funnel students and stakeholders to the respective landing area.
- Ensuring that the companies will not be referred to a web page, so that the level of engagement and customer service is enhanced. This will potentially entail a change in responsibilities and duties.
- Having the consolidation be budget neutral.
- While the consolidated unit is being created, have all “for-credit” internships sent to OACS and all “non-credit” internships sent to Career Services.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Cigdem Z. Gurgur, Chair
Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee

DATE: March 23, 2018

SUBJ: Annual Report on Athletics Budget

WHEREAS, On 17 October 2016, the Fort Wayne Senate amended the Senate Bylaws for the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS) to include the charge to “Review and comment on the annual athletics budget”; and

WHEREAS, The Athletics budget has come under increasing scrutiny in recent years as a result of University’s enrollment declines and the resulting loss of revenues; and

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate accept this report from BAS, which provides a comparative summary of FY 2017 and FY 2018 Athletics budget data.

Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee Report on Athletics Budget

All data referenced in this report was provided to the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee by Walter Soptelean, Director of Budget and Planning.

Foremost collective data is included. More drilled-down data has been available at BAS.

Revenues

From FY 2017 to FY 2018 there has been an overall decrease in the total revenue of approximately 2.4% (\$199,100). The decrease in revenue is not equally distributed across the different sources.

From the four different sources of revenue, three experienced a decrease and one an increase from FY 2017 to FY 2018 (Table 1). The source of revenue with the greatest percent decrease is the Athletic Scholarships with a total of 12.4% decrease (\$272,300).

The Athletic Operations as an allocation from the General Fund was the only revenue source that increased between the two fiscal years, 10.35%; \$263,030.

Table 1. Summary of athletics budget revenues from FY 2017 to FY 2018

Revenue	FY 2017	FY 2018	Change
Student Athletics Fee Revenue, Designated Fees	\$1,914,351	\$1,825,228	\$(89,123)
General Fund Allocation, Athletic Operations	\$2,541,156	\$2,804,186	\$263,030
General Fund Allocation, Athletic Scholarships	\$2,188,500	\$1,916,200	\$(272,300)
All Other Income	\$1,614,329	\$1,513,622	\$(100,707)

Expenditures

From FY 2017 budget to FY 2018 budget there is an overall decrease in the total expenditures of Athletics by approximately 1.68% (\$137,650). This decrease is not equally distributed across the department or its activities.

The below analysis and comparison of budget data is from total expenditures for each activity (e.g. Baseball Recruiting Total). Individual budget lines (e.g. Graduate Staff, Employee Benefits, Travel, etc.) were then analyzed to identify the major contributors to the total value changes for the top-5 ranked increasing and decreasing expenditures between FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Twenty budget line expenditure activities increased, accounting for a \$216,357 increase between the two fiscal years (Table 2). Conversely, 27 expenditure activities decreased, accounting for a \$354,007 decrease (Table 3).

Four activities had no change between budget years, all related to recruiting: Men’s Golf, Women’s Golf, Women’s Outdoor Track, and Women’s Soccer Recruiting. Additionally, Men’s and Women’s Tennis were removed as budget expenditures with discontinuation of those sports at the University.

Changes between FY 2017 and FY 2018 for Women’s Basketball, Athletic Department, and Mastodon Academic Performance were driven, in largest part, by increases in both Administrative S & W and Employee Benefits. Alternatively, increases in Men’s Soccer were in part driven by increases in Undergraduate Scholarships. Changes for Coed Indoor Track and Field was driven, in largest part, by decreases in Administrative S & W and Employee Benefits.

While there was a small decrease in Undergraduate Scholarships in Men’s Basketball, it does not explain the amount decrease between the two fiscal years. It appears that Coed Outdoor Track and Field decreases were driven by decreases in Undergraduate Scholarships.

Table 2. Top-5 rank order list of summary athletics budget expenditures with increased values from FY 2017 to FY 2018.

Expenditure	FY 2017	FY 2018	Change	Rank
Women’s Basketball Total	\$754,510	\$823,322	\$68,812	1
Women’s Basketball Team Travel Total	\$163,116	\$201,216	\$38,100	2
Athletic Department Total	\$1,174,231	\$1,197,850	\$23,619	3
Men’s Soccer Total	\$400,478	\$421,484	\$21,006	4
Mastodon Academic Performance Total	\$181,967	\$198,383	\$16,416	5

Table 3. Top-5 rank order list of summary athletics budget expenditures with decreased values from FY 2017 to FY 2018.

Expenditure	FY 2017	FY 2018	Change	Rank
Coed Indoor Track and Field Total	\$134,594	\$44,029	\$(90,565)	1
Softball Team Travel Total	\$138,844	\$99,500	\$(39,344)	2
Women’s Soccer Team Travel Total	\$92,364	\$58,348	\$(34,016)	3
Men’s Basketball Total	\$1,122,323	\$1,098,287	\$(24,036)	4
Coed Outdoor Track and Field Total	\$183,903	\$160,728	\$(23,175)	5

		IPFW	
		Athletic Budget	
		FY 2018	
Revenue			
	Student Athletics Fee Revenue	Designated Fees	(1,825,228)
	General Fund Allocation	Athletic Operations	(2,804,186)
	General Fund Allocation	Athletic Scholarships	(1,916,200)
	Other Income	All Other Income	(1,513,622)
	Total Income from All Sources		(8,059,236)
Expenditures			
	Athletic Department Total		1,197,850
	Athletic Marketing & Promotions Total		153,039
	Athletic Training Total		49,013
	Baseball Recruiting Total		5,730
	Baseball Team Travel Total		135,370
	Cheerleaders Total		27,900
	Coed Indoor Track And Field Total		44,029
	Coed Outdoor Track And Field Total		160,728
	Intercolleg. Women's Basketball Total		823,322
	Intercolleg. Women's Volleyball Total		427,957
	Intercollegiate Baseball Total		404,494
	Intercollegiate Basketball Total		1,098,287
	Intercollegiate Men's Volleyball Total		301,236
	Intercollegiate Soccer Total		421,484
	Intercollegiate Women's Cross Country Total		18,322
	Mastodon Academic Performance Total		198,383
	Men's Basketball Recruiting Total		56,050
	Men's Basketball Team Travel Total		293,572
	Men's Cross Country Recruiting Total		350
	Men's Cross Country Team Travel Total		19,761
	Mens Cross Country Total		62,548
	Men's Golf Recruiting Total		1,000
	Men's Golf Team Travel Total		53,052
	Men's Golf Total		118,733
	Men's Soccer Recruiting Total		6,400
	Men's Soccer Team Travel Total		67,488
	Men's Volleyball Recruiting Total		8,400
	Men's Volleyball Team Travel Total		65,934
	Pep Band Total		60,650
	Softball Recruiting Total		6,590
	Softball Team Travel Total		99,500
	Sports Information And Promotion Total		229,409
	Women's Basketball Recruiting Total		35,000
	Women's Basketball Team Travel Total		201,216
	Women's Cross Country Recruiting Total		1,620
	Women's Cross Country Team Travel Total		19,611
	Women's Golf Operations Total		114,894
	Women's Golf Recruiting Total		3,000
	Women's Golf Team Travel Total		46,936
	Women's Indoor Track Team Travel Total		23,310
	Women's Outdoor Track Recruiting Total		600
	Women's Outdoor Track Team Travel Total		41,646
	Women's Soccer Recruiting Total		11,000
	Women's Soccer Team Travel Total		58,348
	Women's Soccer Total		383,855
	Women's Softball Total		387,179
	Women's Volleyball Recruiting Total		10,000
	Women's Volleyball Team Travel Total		104,440
	Grand Total of all Expenditures		8,059,236
	(Surplus) Deficit		0

	IPFW	
	Athletic Budget	
	FY 2017	
Revenue		
Student Athletics Fee Revenue	Designated Fees	(1,914,351)
General Fund Allocation	Athletic Operations	(2,541,156)
General Fund Allocation	Athletic Scholarships	(2,188,500)
Other Income	All Other Income	(1,614,329)
Total Income from All Sources		(8,258,336)
Expenditures		
Athletic Department Total		1,174,231
Athletic Marketing & Promotions Total		150,390
Athletic Training Total		48,656
Baseball Recruiting Total		5,900
Baseball Team Travel Total		140,550
Cheerleaders Total		27,343
Coed Indoor Track And Field Total		134,594
Coed Outdoor Track And Field Total		183,903
Intercolleg. Women's Basketball Total		754,510
Intercolleg. Women's Volleybl. Total		429,637
Intercollegiate Baseball Total		408,093
Intercollegiate Basketball Total		1,122,323
Intercollegiate Men's Volleyball Total		288,663
Intercollegiate Soccer Total		400,478
Intercollegiate Women's Cross Country Total		16,283
Mastodon Academic Performance Total		181,967
Men's Basketball Recruiting Total		54,400
Men's Basketball Team Travel Total		281,064
Men's Cross Country Recruiting Total		600
Men's Cross Country Team Travel Total		16,614
Mens Cross Country Total		59,408
Men's Golf Recruiting Total		1,000
Men's Golf Team Travel Total		51,106
Men's Golf Total		127,674
Men's Soccer Recruiting Total		7,200
Men's Soccer Team Travel Total		72,764
Men's Tennis		10,000
Men's Volleyball Recruiting Total		13,800
Men's Volleyball Team Travel Total		76,970
Pep Band Total		83,483
Softball Recruiting Total		6,680
Softball Team Travel Total		138,844
Sports Information And Promotion Total		239,381
Women's Basketball Recruiting Total		34,850
Women's Basketball Team Travel Total		163,116
Women's Cross Country Recruiting Total		940
Women's Cross Country Team Travel Total		17,662
Women's Golf Operations Total		127,038
Women's Golf Recruiting Total		3,000
Women's Golf Team Travel Total		47,669
Women's Indoor Track Recruiting Total		660
Women's Indoor Track Team Travel Total		19,652
Women's Outdoor Track Recruiting Total		600
Women's Outdoor Track Team Travel Total		43,066
Women's Soccer Recruiting Total		11,000
Women's Soccer Team Travel Total		92,364
Women's Soccer Total		382,454
Women's Softball Total		394,893
Women's Tennis		20,000
Women's Volleyball Recruiting Total		11,300
Women's Volleyball Team Travel Total		118,112
Grand Total of all Expenditures		8,196,886
(Surplus) Deficit		(61,450)