

November 16, 2016

VIA ELECTRONIC AND SURFACE MAIL

Dr. Vicky L. Carwein
Chancellor
Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne
2101 East Coliseum Boulevard
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805-1499

Dear Chancellor Carwein:

The Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne chapter of the American Association of University Professors has sought the advice and assistance of the Association's Washington office as the result of an October 28, 2016, announcement by Dr. Carl N. Drummond, vice chancellor for academic affairs and enrollment management, that the Purdue University board of trustees had ordered the administration to suspend, eliminate, and merge some thirty programs, majors, and departments. The chapter has expressed its concern that these actions, which the Fort Wayne faculty senate apparently did not even consider, much less approve, are fundamentally inconsistent with normative standards of academic governance. The AAUP shares this concern.

Our Association's interest in these matters stems from its longstanding commitment to principles of academic governance, as enunciated in the enclosed *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, jointly formulated in 1966 by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. The *Statement on Government*, which embodies standards widely observed in American higher education, rests on the premise of appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the governing board, the administration, and the faculty in determining educational policy and in resolving educational problems. It refers to "an inescapable interdependence" in this relationship that requires "adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort." It further asserts that "the interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict."

The *Statement on Government* defines the role of the faculty in institutional government, stating in pertinent part:

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have

opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.

The authority and primary responsibility of the faculty in decision-making processes in these areas derive from its special competence in the educational sphere. It follows from this proposition that the faculty should play an active and meaningful role in the development as well as in the revision of institutional policy in those areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility. Also implicit in the foregoing passage is the expectation that the faculty will play a primary role in the establishment, as well as in any subsequent revision or modification, of the institution's academic policies and structure.

Chapter members have reported to us that the programmatic decisions followed a "university strategic alignment process" (USAP) that culminated in a report issued on May 6 by a task force consisting of faculty members, staff, and administrators. It is our understanding that the faculty representatives to this task force were appointed by the administration and not elected by the faculty, a method of selection at odds with the *Statement on Government's* provision that "[f]aculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty." The USAP report identifies a number of programs for "restructuring," but it observes that the identification of these programs is not "intended to indicate [that] these departments are unworthy of support." A report entitled "Review and Recommendations for Academic Programs and Departments in Response to USAP Recommendations 2.2 and 2.3," authored by Vice Chancellor Drummond, was released in September. It proposes detailed programmatic restructuring throughout the university, including the suspension of some programs and benchmarks for future review of other programs, but does not propose the immediate elimination of any programs or departments. In closing, it states that

[c]omments, criticism, and alternatives to these recommendations are welcome. Final decisions regarding programs and departments will be reached by December 1, 2016. As such, input through the standard academic channels of department chairs and deans will be welcome through November 15, 2016. All input from the Fort Wayne Senate and other representative bodies will also be welcome through that date.

Following the presentation of his recommended changes to the Purdue University board of trustees in October, however, Vice Chancellor Drummond informed the Fort Wayne Senate that the trustees were "not interested in a phased, multi-year approach, further study, or analysis" and had accordingly directed him to make "additional programmatic contractions as well as additional organizational changes" immediately.

Existing policies at the institution that address "[r]eorganization, merger, reduction, and/or elimination of a program" are set forth in Senate Document (SD) 15–26. They provide that such actions "shall proceed according to procedures established by the Fort Wayne Senate . . . and the faculty of each major unit affected." Instead, these programmatic decisions bypassed the senate, a failure that the senate's executive committee, in a memorandum dated October 31, 2016, characterized as a "breach of shared governance." The senate as a whole recently adopted a resolution urging the "reinstatement, effective immediately, of all undergraduate and graduate

Dr. Vicky L. Carwein

November 16, 2016

Page 3

degree programs or majors suspended or eliminated beginning in 1 July 2016 and forward where faculty did not initiate a recommendation, or did not assume a prominent role in decisions leading to these suspensions and eliminations.” The resolution goes on to state that “any subsequent action initiated by an academic administrator or the Presidents and Boards of Trustees of Indiana University and Purdue University to suspend, merge, reduce, or eliminate a degree program must occur in accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in SD 15-26.”

We concur in the conclusion of the senate executive committee and in the request of the senate to rescind the imposed programmatic changes and to process any further changes in accordance with SD 15-26.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,



Hans-Joerg Tiede, PhD

Associate Secretary

Department of Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Governance

Enclosures (by electronic mail only)

Cc: Mr. Michael R. Berghoff, Chair, Purdue University Board of Trustees
Mr. James T. Morris, Chair, Indiana University Board of Trustees
Mr. Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr., President, Purdue University
Dr. Michael McRobbie, President, Indiana University
Dr. Carl N. Drummond, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Enrollment
Management, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
Professor Jeffrey Malanson, Presiding Officer, Fort Wayne Senate
Professor David Sanders, Chair, Purdue University Senate
Professor Rebecca Spang, President, Indiana University Faculty Council
Professor Steven Carr, President, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
AAUP Chapter
Professor Daniel Murphy, President, Indiana University Conference of the AAUP