Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Fifth Senate
Purdue University Fort Wayne
February 13, 2023
Via Webex

Agenda

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of January 9

3. Acceptance of the agenda – A. Nasr

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
   a. Deputy Presiding Officer – N. Younis
   b. IFC Representative – A. Livschiz

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – H. Strevel

6. Special business of the day
   a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 22-16) – G. Wang
   b. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 22-18) – K. O'Connor
   c. Civics Literacy Requirements Update – S. Betz

7. Unfinished business

8. Committee reports requiring action
   a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-17) – W. Sirk
   b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 22-18) – S. Hanke
   c. International Education Advisory Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 22-19) – A. Nasr

9. New business

10. Question time
    a. (Senate Reference No. 22-19) – J. Mbuba
    b. (Senate Reference No. 22-20) – S. Buttes and S. Carr

11. Committee reports "for information only"
    a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 22-21) – S. Johnson

12. The general good and welfare of the University

13. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: H. Strevel
Parliamentarian: C. Ortsey
Sergeant-at-arms: S. Carr
Assistant: J. Bacon

Attachments:
"Memorial Resolution-Richard E. Miers" (SR No. 22-16)
"Memorial Resolution-Max Montesino" (SR No. 22-18)
"Approval of School of Education Procedures for the Promotion of Clinical Faculty" (SD 22-17)
"Approval of Replacement Member of the Educational Policy Committee" (SD 22-18)
"Approval of Filling Vacancy on the International Education Advisory Subcommittee" (SD 22-19)
"Question Time – re: Car Charging Electric Outlets" (SR No. 22-19)
"Question Time – re: Catalog Production Process" (SR No. 22-20)
"Information Technology Concentration" (SR No. 22-21)

Senate Members Present:
J. Badia, K. Barker, S. Betz, S. Bischoff, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, B. Chen, Z. Chen, S. Cody, B. Dattilo, Y. Deng, C. Drummond, B. Elahi, R. Elsenbaumer, R. Friedman, M. Gruys, K. Gyi, M. Hammonds, S. Hanke, V. Inukollu, P. Jing, J. Johns, S. Johnson, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, C. Lawton, J. Leatherman, J. Lewis, A. Livschiz, H. Luo, E. Mann, J. Mbuba, J. McHann, A. Montenegro, A. Nasr, K. O'Connor, E. Ohlander, M. Perkins Coppola, P. Saha, R. Shoquist, W. Sirk, G. Steffen, S. Steiner, K. Stultz-Dessent, K. Surface, D. Tembras, N. Virtue, N. Welsh, L. Whalen, M. Wolf, N. Younis, Y. Zhang

Senate Members Absent:
D. Bauer, T. Foley, D. Maloney, G. Nakata, I. Nunez, J. O'Connell, H. Park, A. Pinan-Llamas

Guests Present:
M. Ball, A. Blackmon, K. Burtnette, J. Cashdollar, R. Clark, F. Combs, P. Eber, M. Helmsing, D. Hoile, C. Huang, C. Kuznar, T. Luce, J. Malanson, C. Marcuccilli, T. Swim, K. Wagner, G. Wang

<u>Acta</u>

1. <u>Call to order</u>: H. Strevel called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. <u>Approval of the minutes of January 9</u>: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. <u>Acceptance of the agenda</u>:

    A. Nasr moved to accept the agenda.

    Motion to accept the agenda passed on a voice vote.

4. <u>Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties</u>:

    a. <u>Deputy Presiding Officer</u>:

N. Younis: Good afternoon colleagues,

The topic of my report is the state funding to our university.

In my January report, I stated the following "We begin 2023 much where we started the past few years, dealing with declining enrollments, weakening support from the state, increasing executive positions and spending, and therefore the financial stress."

After the meeting, our campus legislative liaison (Kim Wagner) reached out to me in regard to the state funding. Later we met and discussed this issue in more details and it is quite interesting to look at the data. I was wrong, our state support has actually increased and not declined.

I have suggested to the chair of the senate executive committee (Assem Nasr) to include state funding on the agenda for the next committee's meeting as Kim Wagner is willing to discuss this issue with PFW constituents.

In conclusion, PFW state funds has increased. I would like to take this opportunity to thank our legislative liaison (Kim Wagner), the PFW team working on this issue, and many thanks to our state legislators for their support.

Happy Monday!

b. IFC Representative:

A. Livschiz: One of the topics that was discussed at the Intercampus Faculty Committee were the now infamous racist remarks by the chancellor of Purdue Northwest, which the Purdue BOT chose to do nothing about. IFC is working on ways that we can support the efforts of PNW faculty and various community organizations to demand accountability for those actions. IFC has a meeting later this week to discuss possible next steps. If anyone is interested in helping draft a resolution on this matter, please let me know.

Everyone should have received an invitation to meet with representatives from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to discuss their experiences with the university's pathways to conflict resolution processes. We would like to encourage you to participate.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

H. Strevel: I have nothing to report at this time.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 22-16) – G. Wang

 G. Wang read the memorial resolution for Richard E. Miers.

b. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 22-18) – K. O'Connor

 K. O'Connor read the memorial resolution for Max Montesino.

c. Civics Literacy Requirement Update – S. Betz

 S. Betz: Thanks for giving me this time. I just wanted to present a quick update on what is going on with Civics Literacy because for those of you that have been around for more than a year know that this was a new requirement starting this fall. It is a requirement for any new undergraduate student who is completing a bachelor degree here starting in fall 2020 or later, or any student who previously attended PFW but was gone long enough to be a reentry student and started in fall 2020 or later, counting their time back at PFW.

 I am going to do this quick. If anybody has any questions and wants some more information, I am happy to direct you to either resources online or to set up a time later to chat.

 I am going to start with a brief overview of what the requirements for this Civics Literacy are. For those of you who aren't aware, students have to pass a fifty questions civics knowledge test. This test was developed by Purdue West Lafayette. They have to pass with an 80% or higher. They can take the test as many times as needed to pass. They take that test through Brightspace.

 In addition to passing the test, they need to choose one of two approved pathways that lead to more interaction with civics related content. One pathway a student can choose is to take an approved course and pass that course with a C- or higher. Currently we have seven classes approved on our campus from the departments of Communication, History, and Political Science. Or a student can choose to compete the events and recordings pathway. That involves students attending events on campus or watching recordings of civics related lectures or discussions that are posted on the Brightspace website. All of those events and recordings are approved by the Civics Literacy Subcommittee before we tell students that they can engage in them for credit. Those are the requirements. They have to complete a test and then they have to do one of the pathways, either take a course or do events and recordings.

 In terms of how many students have completed the requirements so far, 64 students have completed all of the requirements. This includes 5 students who graduated in fall of 2022. They needed to and they all did. Of those 64 students, 24 chose to do the events and recordings pathway, 39 did the course pathway, and 1 did both. I don't know why but they did. That is fine.

Of the students who have completed some but not all of the Civics Literacy Requirements, 18 have passed the knowledge test, 450 have completed an approved course. That is a really high number, but of those, 330 took that course before being at PFW. It was a transfer course. 34 additional students have completed all 4 events and recordings but not done the test. 104 students have completed 1 event and recording but nothing else so far.

We have not at the system level talked about how many completions we have at different campuses but I think ours is probably somewhat comparable to other campuses, which is extremely low. I think we are comparable just based on little comments that people from other campuses make here or there.

In terms of the passing rate for the exam, very early in the process, I have not heard an update from Purdue West Lafayette in about at least six months, but prior to that Purdue West Lafayette said that their first-time passing rate for the exam was about 80%. Our first-time passing rate is around 47%. Of our students who have taken the exam, about 47% percent pass the first time. An additional 47% pass the second time they take the test. 64% more pass on the third or later attempt. That does mean there are a number of students who have taken it three or more times and still have not passed and have sort of taken a break from trying to pass again.

An update on where we are moving from here, as I mentioned, all campuses have kind of low completion rates, especially for the civics knowledge test. That is something that we are definitely working on. The test requires students to record themselves while taking the test. That is a requirement of the Board of Trustees. We know that some students either might be uncomfortable doing that or unfamiliar with how to do that, so we are having a few in person tests this semester. The first one is on February 22. The students will be made aware of those and if they would prefer to come to take the test in person then they can do that.

We are also working with New Student Orientation to get information about the civics knowledge test out to students before they start classes and possibly complete the test during an NSO or during the welcome back events that are the day before the classes start. It really does seem to be the knowledge test is what students are sort of not moving forward with completing. That is our target.

Finally, if anybody is interested in submitting an event to be considered by the Civics Literacy Subcommittee to be an approved civics literacy event for students, we do have a Qualtrics form for anyone to fill out with information about the event. We do have a Civics Literacy website. It is just one or two pages, but it is the basic information. We are having trouble getting that page linked to existing webpages or to be searchable once you are on the PFW website. We will send the link to submit an event via Inside PFW hopefully next week.

N. Younis: Have the students been informed that they need to take the test, and is it on myBLUEprint?

S. Betz: Yes, to both. It is in myBLUEprint. The way it shows up in myBLUEprint is very detailed, so students can see if they have to complete civics literacy. It shows up as a block of requirements. The test is in there as one item, so it shows as not complete until they complete the test, and then it is checked off as complete. And then there is a place for either the approved course to be checked off or events. The four events are each checked off individually, so if they have completed one event then it will show that they have to complete one, two, three, four, not just at the end.

Yes, all of this is done through Brightspace. All of these students are enrolled in a civics literacy Brightspace course. There is a very detailed introduction to what the requirements are for them to go through.

N. Younis: Have the students been informed through email or another means that they need to do this one? Not all students check their myBLUEprint.

S. Betz: Yes, through announcements in Brightspace. The Brightspace is like a course, so announcements through Brightspace, as well as emails.

N. Younis: Thank you.

S. Betz: Yeah, and hopefully also from their advisors. We met with a lot of advisors early in fall semester to go over the requirements.

H. Strevel: Any other questions for Stacy? Stacy, if people have questions after now, can they just email you with those questions? Is that alright?

S. Betz: That is absolutely okay.

7. Unfinished business: There was no unfinished business.

8. Committee reports requiring action:

   a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-17) – W. Sirk

      W. Sirk moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-17 (Approval of School of Education Procedures for the Promotion of Clinical Faculty).

      S. Buttes moved to recommit Senate Document SD 22-17 back to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

      Motion to recommit failed due to lack of a second.

      S. Buttes moved to recommit Senate Document SD 22-17 back to the Faculty Affairs Committee for further discussion and revision.

Motion to recommit passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 22-18) – S. Hanke

S. Hanke moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-18 (Approval of Replacement Member of the Educational Policy Committee).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

c. International Education Advisory Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 22-19) – A. Nasr

A. Nasr moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-19 (Approval of Filling Vacancy on the International Education Advisory Subcommittee).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

9. New business: There was no new business.

10. Question time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 22-19) – J. Mbuba

The use of battery-powered, plug-in hybrid, and pure electric vehicles is rising on our campus. Some of these vehicles need to be plugged overnight into regular 120-volt electric outlets, the same as household electric sockets, while higher voltage outlets may be needed for faster charging. Some of the users of these vehicles live in apartments with no access to electric outlets for overnight charging. This creates the need to charge during the day while they work or attend classes. The need is evident in Parking Garages 1 and 2, where a spot-check confirmed a few such vehicles plugged into the few power outlets located next to the emergency blue light posts. This need for plug in outlets on campus will only keep rising in keeping with the growing incentives for car owners to consider going electric. Thus, providing reliable car-charging outlets on campus would be a step in the direction of the future, not to mention that it would also encourage students and employees to come to campus. The question is, what steps is the university taking to address the rising need for car charging electric outlets on campus?

R. Elsenbaumer: We have looked at this over the course of the last several years. There was an initial impediment to implementation due to the provisions in our contracts with AEP/Indiana Michigan power that would not allow us to "resale" electricity at a charging station. That restriction has been removed as of July 1, 2022.

We are planning a pilot project to install a dual, Level II, J1772 charging station at the Kettler dock by July 1, 2023. If successful, the intention is to install a similar dual station in each of the 3 parking garages. The exact station hardware has not been

determined yet, but we are working in conjunction with an effort at Purdue (West Lafayette), and the probable hardware for the stations would be similar to the ChargePoint CT4000. Implementation timeline for the parking garages is to be determined.

The largest challenge at this time is the infrastructure cost, as getting the power required to the station locations is expected to cost approx.. $25K-$30K each.

b. (Senate Reference No. 22-20) – S. Buttes and S. Carr

As Catalog production continues to proceed through its processes, it would be helpful if a representative from OAA could give a brief but clear presentation to Senate laying out in as simple terms as possible what role OAA plays in the overall process for the following scenarios, and how that role changes at different stages of the process:

- Changes to an existing course - undergrad and grad
- Changes to an existing program - undergrad and grad
- Proposal for a new course - undergrad and grad
- Proposal for a new program - undergrad and grad

R. Elsenbaumer: All of the information requested by this question is available on the OAA SharePoint site or on the OAA Academic Programs website:

https://ind657.sharepoint.com/sites/collaboration/AcademicCurriculum/SitePages/Home.aspx

https://www.pfw.edu/offices/academic-programs/index.html

A brief summary of that information will constitute the remainder of the response to this question.

Courses:

Change to an existing course or proposing a new course: Faculty need to follow department and college governance documents for getting a change approved by colleagues at both levels (as appropriate). Then, a proposal should be entered in Curriculog by departmental faculty. It must then be approved by chairs, deans, director of graduate programs (graduate programs only), registrar's office staff, OAA, and necessary offices at Purdue West Lafayette (registrar's office, corresponding department heads/deans/Graduate School). The approvals at the West Lafayette campus are more numerous and take more time if the course is a graduate course. Kayla Oyler (PFW Registrar's Office) is the person who edits courses in the catalog.

Programs:

Changes to an existing undergraduate program: Faculty need to follow department and college governance documents for getting a change approved by colleagues at both levels (as appropriate). Submit changes via Qualtrics survey on the OAA SharePoint site. Then you can make necessary changes to the catalog during the open editing process or communicate with Associate Vice Chancellor Terri Swim if a change is approved after that deadline.

Changes to an existing graduate program: Faculty need to follow department and college governance documents for getting a change approved by colleagues (as appropriate). Once changes have been approved, contact Director of Graduate Studies Abe Schwab and Associate Vice Chancellor Terri Swim to determine what steps need to be taken at the Graduate School level. Once those steps have been taken, submit changes via Qualtrics survey on OAA SharePoint site. Make necessary changes to the catalog during the open editing process or communicate with AVC Swim if change approved after that deadline.

Proposal for a new program: Prior to launching a new degree program proposal, robust conversations should occur between the faculty champions, chair, dean, and vice chancellor for academic affairs. The program approval process is a long and challenging one. Every proposal starts with a pre-approval form sent to OAA. If approved, the department should complete the required forms (varies by program seeking approval) and submit them for approval by departmental and college colleagues following department and college governance documents (as appropriate). Then, the forms are returned to OAA for review before sending out for remonstrance. Once approved by Faculty Senate curriculum committees and Faculty Senate, Associate Vice Chancellor Terri Swim puts the proposal into Curriculog and submits for those new levels of approvals.

Helpful Hints:
- Review directions/documents on SharePoint and OAA website.
- Ask Terri Swim, Abe Schwab, Tara Lewis, and/or Kayla Oyler for assistance, depending on question. Wanda Johnson is a great resource for course proposals.
- Follow advice given.
- Contact Terri Swim if you ever want to make changes to five or more courses at one time. It might be possible, depending upon the nature of the changes, to complete one proposal instead of multiple proposals.
- Understand that not every desire, (e.g. complex pre- and co-requisite structures) can be implemented due to system limitations. OAA will work with proposers to achieve goals, as possible.
- We are constantly learning how to do our work better. In practice this means that processes change over time. OAA will implement better practices as they are developed. This means that previous decisions/ approaches may no longer be used, even if those previous practices are evident in the catalog for already-approved programs.

- Be respectful of everyone involved in the process; the goal is to continue to add outstanding academic programs characterized by the most modern curricula and pedagogy to meet the demands of our students.
- Recognize that we work within a university system, and some decisions taken at the system level can and do impact our ability to offer specific programs.

Beyond these specifics, the question asks more generally what role the Office of Academic Affairs plays in these various processes. There is no single answer to this question because the role of OAA changes from process to process, and throughout each process of approval of courses and programs.

First, through its various subunits, OAA serves as a resource as faculty contemplate changes to courses and programs, specifically in the areas of course development, pedagogical innovation, and the assessment of student learning at the course and programmatic levels. Second, because Purdue Fort Wayne sits within a university system, OAA has a significant role in guiding changes through the system-level approval process, up to and including the Board of Trustees and Commission for Higher Education. There are system and state level expectations for proposals that rise to those levels and OAA, through the associate vice chancellor for academic programs, guides and facilitates that process. Third, OAA has responsibility for the programmatic mix offered by our institution and is constantly advocating for a nimbler approval process at the system and state levels, so far to no avail. In this capacity, and as required by both the State of Indiana and the Higher Learning Commission, OAA has responsibility for ensuring the quality of all university offerings and coordinating with system-level organizations, specifically Purdue Online, regarding instructional modality.

The processes outlined above have a set of procedures, rules, and norms. Challenges arise when those proposing changes do not fully attend to those expectations and are resistant to guidance and instructions offered. Finally, OAA has the responsibility for ensuring student learning is meaningfully assessed and that the outcomes of those assessments are well utilized to improve curricula. The goal is, and always will be, to have academic programs of the highest quality that are rigorous, relevant, and fully resourced for student success.

N. Virtue: Thank you, chancellor, for addressing the question. I think I will do the question about whether the processes you discussed square with our constitution's assertion that curriculum and control of curriculum and creation of curriculum lies in the hands of the faculty. I will leave that question to other people, but I just wanted to add to the various helpful hints that you offered up, which I don't disagree with, and I do find reasonable.

Maybe my comments are coming out of the experience of recently having been part of a committee that had a proposal for a new program rejected through the preapproval process. I just wanted to offer the helpful hint to those involved in the preapproval process, like Vice Chancellor Carl Drummond and Associate Vice

Chancellor Teri Swim, that it would be really helpful and respectful if when a preapproval proposal is submitted, if there is going to be long delays, as there were in the case of our proposal, that there is some communication in the months where we are waiting to hear back, literally months, with no response to our proposal. If you could just reach out and let us know that you received the preapproval proposal and that you are considering it seriously. That is one hint.

Also, when preapprovals are not accepted or are rejected, some kind of explanation, and not just a very curt and dismissive email saying "your preapproval was rejected." Something along the lines of some kind of explanation for why once we worked closely with Teri Swim and followed her advice and modeled our proposal after a separate successful proposal that she asked us to model it on, why we received no explanation for why our proposal was rejected. I am genuinely offering this as a helpful hint because on the side of the faculty members that are working hard to try to better the curriculum and come up with creative ideas to advance the strategic mission of the university and put a lot of work and thought into a proposal, to have it just summarily rejected with no explanation, that doesn't feel right. If on your end, that similar respect could be offered, I would appreciate it. I am sure others would as well. Thank you. I will take those other helpful hints seriously and respectfully as well. Thanks.

S. Buttes: I appreciate the explanation and the care with which it was prepared, and certainly also appreciate the helpful hints, and will be sure that I am making full use of each and every one of them as we engage in seeking to improve the quality of our programs, when I say our I mean every program on this campus.

The one follow up question that I wanted to ask after listening to the explanation is one that posits what seems to be a fundamental tension in the explanation that was offered. This is between approval and quality. The question I have is, the factors that go into what gets approved and what doesn't, and then the question of quality.

While those things should go together, sometimes, or at least experientially I will say, that doesn't always take place. Whether a change is really concrete, specific changes that need to be made to ensure that the quality of the programs to ensure student success to ensure student progress toward graduation, those don't always find a streamline pathway through the processes even when following most or all of the helpful hints that were shared.

The follow up question is, how do those two facets of the process relate to each other? Ensuring the quality, and then streamlining approval. Is approval utilized as a tool to achieve certain ends or is it a tool that is seeking to facilitate quality? That is the general question. Thank you.

R. Elsenbaumer: First off, I want to say that I think both comments by Nancy and Steve are well taken. I think that they are very constructive. I think they are related. I think that from Nancy's viewpoint and from Steve's further comments, that one other

helpful process or helpful hint here that might help is how would one or how should an appeal process be put together. If you are not getting the right responses or if you are not getting adequate responses then obviously there needs to be some sort of secondary way of revising or looking at your proposal and trying to strengthen that proposal by addressing any gaps or weaknesses that might have been identified, but in order to do so you do need to get some feedback. I really think your comments are well taken and I think these are good points to have a conversation with in terms of looking at the overall process. Thank you.

S. Betz: I have a very sincere question about the comment that was made that the processes that are set up don't leave the process of curriculum to be determined by faculty. My question is if anyone has specific examples of this that they can think of. For example, at the last Senate meeting I know education sort of alluded to an example where at the graduate level a program was denied an administrative level very high up but that was on another campus within the individual course process because we have had things bounce back to our department but they are always from another faculty committee, so I am just honestly asking for some examples as I am trying to figure out exactly where the current process is going wrong. Thank you.

H. Strevel: Steve, do you have an answer to that question?

S. Buttes: I do. I have very specific examples that I would be happy to discuss in more detail off the Senate floor.

H. Strevel: Is that okay with you, Stacy? For that to be discussed off the Senate floor?

S. Betz: Yes. I respect that choice. Yes. Thank you.

R. Elsenbaumer: I just wanted to say thank you to Ann and to Nash for their opening comments. I did want to stress again that we have on campus this week members of the federal mediation conciliation group that we take advantage of this opportunity. As Ann mentioned in her opening comments, we can't fix problems that we don't know about. Even when we do know about them sometimes they are difficult to fix, but if we need some guidance sometimes we need some guidance. This is an opportunity to get that. I appreciate that very much. Hopefully you will take advantage of it. At the end of the day, hopefully it will make some improvements on how we do things on our campus. Thank you. Ann, thank you. Nash, thank you.

S. Carr: I just wanted to say that I very much appreciated the dialogue that took place around this question. I think this is an important first step towards clearing up the confusion that does seem to exist over the curriculum development process. I don't think that it is specific to OAA. I also don't think anyone is disputing that OAA should play a role in the process. I don't think anyone is claiming that faculty should have exclusive control of the curriculum. I think the helpful hints are important, but I think there is a larger question here about where and when OAA should step into this process given that there will be different points in each one of these scenarios. I think

there is also a question of wait and timing of its voice compared to the wait and timing of faculty voices.

As Nancy Virtue had alluded to, the Senate Constitution delegates faculty powers and responsibilities over curriculum to faculty within academic units. I think this question is really trying to seek confirmation from OAA whether it recognizes those powers over the curriculum as they are outlined in our constitution, and if so, how and where OAA coordinates its role and responsibility alongside that of the prominent role that faculty play in this process.

I think one big question that I have after listening to this exchange is if faculty champion either a change or a new program and OAA opposes it, does OAA have veto power over a faculty-initiated change? I guess I am just wondering, again, scenarios where there might be a difference of opinion between a faculty led process and an OAA determination about the viability of that proposal.

H. Strevel: Thank you, Steve, for that question. We have about four minutes left. Three, actually. Carl, if you can answer that question really quickly, that would be great.

C. Drummond: No, I can't answer that question really quickly, but I will give a little feedback.

I very much respect the faculty role in curriculum development and course development, and really as the starting point of this process, but I think we have also seen that units above the faculty, and even above the campus, have the capacity to make changes to our curriculum, or at least to our degree requirements, in terms of the civics literacy requirement.

I think that a good way to think about this is that in addition to the supporting and nurturing aspects of course and curriculum development that OAA should play in collaboration with the faculty, at the end of the day we have to take these things to the trustees and to the commission, and it doesn't do us any good. In fact, it damages our campus if we advance proposals, particularly programmatic proposals that ultimately are not supported at that level. We do have a function to make sure that when a proposal goes to those levels that it has as a complete chance of success as possible.

That being said, I can imagine a scenario where a faculty member or group of faculty members propose a new academic program that for any number of reasons, either because of cost or because of projected demand or because of redundancy within the system or within the state, that we couldn't support that proposal. I would say that these processes begin with the faculty, but they don't end there. The Office of Academic Affairs, the Provost Office in West Lafayette, really can't propose programs that don't have faculty support. When it works well it is a very collaborative process. Over the nine years that I have been in this role we have

launched some very successful new academic programs, and I hope we will continue to do so in the future in collaboration with the faculty's role in this process.

11. <u>Committee reports "for information only"</u>:

    a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 22-21) – S. Johnson

        Senate Reference No. 22-21 (Information Technology Concentration) was presented for information only.

12. <u>The general good and welfare of the University</u>:

    J. Malanson: Just picking up on Ann's comments at the beginning, and Chancellor Elsenbaumer's comments a moment ago, please do make sure to sign up for the FMCS focus groups. I posted the links to sign up either for the Senate focus group or for another faculty focus group at the top of the Webex chat for the Senate meeting. We want to see as much engagement as possible. If you have colleagues or if you know staff who have been through these processes and have had good experiences or not so good experiences, please encourage them to sign up as well. The first focus groups and interviews start tomorrow. The commissioners are out on campus this afternoon, so there is not much time to sign up, but please do take a moment to sign up. Thank you.

    S. Buttes: Just wanted to give kudos to the Division of Enrollment Management and Student Experience and Vice Chancellor Surface for the shuttle service that is being offered to students.

13. <u>Adjournment</u>: The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon
Assistant to the Faculty

Memorial resolution

In memoriam

Professor emeritus Richard E. Miers

October 29, 1932 – October 20, 2022

The PFW physics community lost a long-time beloved member, Professor of physics Richard Ernest Miers, on October 20, 2022. Born on October 29, 1932, Richard demonstrated talent from a very young age – for example he started reading at age four. His college career was interrupted by three years of service in the Army for the Korean War and later in the National Guard. Richard completed his bachelor's degree at Wisconsin State College in 1957. Then he devoted his whole life to a teaching career. He started teaching at a high school in Cadott Wisconsin for two years before he earned his master's degrees in physics and education from the University of Wisconsin in Madison in 1961. He then joined the department of physics at Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne. After three years of teaching here, he returned to the University of Wisconsin in Madison for his PhD in theoretical atomic physics in 1964. He came back to Purdue Fort Wayne in 1969 after his PhD and taught a broad spectrum of physics courses until he retired in 2003. Richard had research interests and made contributions in the fields of lasers, optical fiber amplifiers and digital circuity. His enthusiasm for physics and teaching did not stop at retirement. As professor emeritus, he continued teaching and doing research at PFW part time until 2011.

 Outside the classroom, his enjoyment of physics extended to his love of building remote control model airplanes as a member of the Flying Circuits Club in Fort Wayne. He designed, constructed, and flew some award-winning model airplanes. Dick also loved music and taught himself to play guitar and banjo. He spent his leisure time attending bluegrass festivals and fly fishing. He was also a member of American Legion Post 47.

With the combined 45 years of teaching and research at PFW, his experience influenced many students as well as several junior faculty members he mentored. Richard Miers was loved, respected and honored by family, friends, colleagues and students.   His service and dedication are truly staying with the physics community and he is with us in our hearts.

Dr. Max Montesino

February 10, 1956 – December 5, 2022

Max Montesino, a beloved faculty member in the Organizational Leadership department for the past 27 years, passed away unexpectedly on December 5, 2022. He was planning on retiring from PFW on December 31, 2022. Born in the Dominican Republic, Max immigrated to the United States and earned his doctorate in Education from Western Michigan University in 1995. He authored two books, "Before Anything … After Everything", a collection of short stories and "Portrait of the Dominican in the Organization", an analysis of organizational behavior in the Dominican Republic. Max also served as Graduate Programs Director for the OL Master's program and enjoyed volunteering and mentoring students and faculty. He was active in the Hispanic Leadership Coalition of Northeast Indiana, having been a founding member and past President, as well as many other important causes that impact the Latino community of greater Fort Wayne. He often spoke to the media about immigration issues and enjoyed discussing American politics. He proudly became an American citizen in 2016.

Students will remember Dr. Montesino for his courses in gender and diversity, organizational culture, and human resource development, among others. Colleagues will remember him for his kindness, collegiality, and quick wit. Max had such a positive impact on the OL Department, our students, and the PFW campus. He will forever hold a special place in our hearts.

Max is survived by his wife Mercedes and children Max Jr. and Paola.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Wylie Sirk, Chair
       Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: 12/12/2022

SUBJ: Approval of School of Education Procedures for the Promotion of Clinical Faculty

WHEREAS, Fort Wayne Senate Document 14-36 states "College procedures and guiding principles must be reviewed and approved at the campus level first by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and then by the Senate";

WHEREAS, School of Education has created procedures for the promotion of Clinical faculty and added them to SD 21-25;

WHEREAS, Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed these procedures and find them in compliance with SD 14-36;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate approve the changes in Part IV Clinical Promotion of SD 21-25 School of Education promotion and tenure document.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

Approved on 3.31.2021

Final Revisions on 11.14.2022

Table of Contents

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

I. Governance

A. FACULTY
The members of the faculty include all tenure-track and tenured professors, clinical faculty (visiting or otherwise), as well as full-time instructors and/or continuing lecturers, but does not include limited term lecturers. Members of the faculty are hired within their respective departments.

B. DEPARTMENTS
Policy matters that impact the internal operations of departments will be resolved according to departmental policies and procedures.

C. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
The responsibilities and duties for department chairs are delineated in Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum 05-3: *Authority and Responsibilities of the Department Chair.* The chair will be reviewed annually by the Director of the SOE and by the faculty in her/his department. The Director of SOE will coordinate the review.

D. ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
The Associate/Assistant Director of the SOE is appointed by the Director and reports to the Director. The responsibilities of the Associate/Assistant Director will be articulated by the Director in consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Associate/Assistant Director will be reviewed annually by the Faculty in the SOE through university level procedures.

E. DIRECTOR
The responsibilities and duties for the Director are delineated in Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum 05-2: *Authority and Responsibilities of the Academic Dean*. The Director will be reviewed annually by SOE faculty through university level procedures.

F. SOE COMMITTEES
As adapted from SD 15-22 section 5.1, the SOE has established three types of committees: a policy committee, which shall be a standing committee charged with advising the School on substantive matters, and which may establish subcommittees to assist in their efforts; service committees, which shall be standing committees charged with assisting in routine operations of the School; and ad hoc committees, which shall

be established by the School for special purposes. All voting faculty are eligible to serve on SOE standing committees.

1. **Standing Policy Committee:**
    i. The Faculty Governance Committee shall consist of one voting faculty representative elected from each department to serve a two-year term. If a member is unable to attend, they may send a proxy, with voting privileges, from the voting members of their respective department. Members of the committee will elect a committee chair. Department chairs will serve as ex officio, non-voting members. The members of the Faculty Governance Committee will be charged with the execution of the general policies of the SOE as adopted by the faculty, including soliciting nominations and holding elections for elected positions on campus committees and subcommittees; ensuring that standing service committees within the School are staggered with equitable departmental representation; and communicating results of such elections to the Purdue Fort Wayne Senate.

2. **Standing Service Committees:**
    i. Assessment of Student Academic Achievement Committee (see section V)
    ii. Curriculum Committee (see section VI)
    iii. Appeals Committee (see section VII)

3. **Ad Hoc Committees:**
    i. Ad hoc committees are temporary committees created from time to time by the Director or the Faculty Governance Committee to address specific tasks in the SOE. Ad hoc committees will not supplant the duties of the Faculty Governance Committee or the service committees.

II. Faculty

A. VOTING FACULTY

Voting faculty members, as defined in the [Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue Fort Wayne](), include tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as all those who hold the rank of assistant, associate, or full clinical professor. Whereas visiting faculty do not have voting rights at the university-level or for university-level decisions, the School of Education maintains that our visiting faculty have voting rights for School-level decisions.

B. EVALUATION OF TENURED & NON-TENURED FACULTY

Each faculty member is required to submit an annual report to their department chair as well as the Director. Guidelines and timelines are established by each department. Third-year reviews are required for all tenure-track faculty members in the SOE in conjunction with applicable department and senate guidelines and timelines.

C. SOE FACULTY MEETINGS

The Director will schedule School-level faculty meetings as needed. In addition, the chair of the Faculty Governance Committee can schedule meetings at the request of a simple majority of the members.

D. AMENDMENTS TO THE SOE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

The SOE Governance Document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the SOE voting faculty. Voting shall be done electronically.

E. VOTING CLARIFICATION

Voting shall be done either electronically or face-to-face.

F. SENATE APPORTIONMENT, ELECTION, & REPLACEMENT

Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate allocation is determined by the ratio of one (1) Senator for every six (6) voting faculty within the School. In the School of Education each department is allotted at least one (1) Senate representative to be selected by the department, 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 School in a process led by the Faculty Governance Committee.

A representative for each of the three (3) subcommittees for the Senate will be filled at the School level: Curriculum Review Subcommittee, Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee, and Graduate Subcommittee. The Faculty Governance Committee will coordinate the election of the members on the

three (3) subcommittees when vacancies occur.

All voting faculty may serve in the Senate or on Senate Subcommittees, with the exception of visiting faculty regardless of their rank as assistant, associate, or full clinical professor, per the [Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue Fort Wayne](#).

III. Promotion and Tenure

A. POLICY & PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

Promotion and tenure involves an evaluation of the evidence for faculty engagement across three main categories: teaching, research, and service. Candidates for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate excellence in either teaching or research, with competence in the remaining two categories. Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate excellence in either teaching, research, or service, with competence in the remaining two categories. The School of Education has adopted the following procedures to guide candidates, departments, and the School through the process of Promotion and/or Tenure in compliance with the Purdue University Fort Wayne SD 14-36: *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and Third Year Review*.

B. PROMOTION & TENURE CASE PROCESS

Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion must identify the Department 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 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. The promotion and tenure criteria for each department shall be approved by the voting faculty in the respective department and approved by the School of Education, per SD 14-36. All cases for promotion and/or tenure shall pass sequentially through the decision levels below.

1. **Candidate cases for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels in the following order** (adapted from SD 14-36):

    i.   Department committee
    ii. Chief academic officer of the department (i.e., Department Chair)
    iii. School committee
    iv. Chief academic officer of the School (i.e., Director)
    v.   Purdue Fort Wayne (Purdue FW) campus committee
    vi. Chief academic officer of Purdue FW
    vii. The chief administrative officer at Purdue FW shall forward recommendations to the President of Purdue University

2. 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 (adapted from SD 14-36).

   i. Each decision level submits a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments/supplemental information.

   ii. 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.

      1. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included.
      2. 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.
      3. 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).

   iii. 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, either in-person or virtually, during deliberations in order to vote.

3. **The following rules shall apply for participation in the review process at any level** (adapted from SD 14-36):

   i. Only tenured faculty may serve as voting members of promotion and tenure committees for tenure-track candidates at any level.

ii. Clinical professors and associate professors may serve as voting members for clinical candidates.

iii. 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.

iv. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (i.e., either School or campus).

v. 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 School committees.

vi. The Faculty Governance Committee of the School shall identify those individuals who are eligible to serve on the campus committee based on tenure status and prior service on a department 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 School of Education 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.

vii. 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.

viii. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.

ix. 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. DEPARTMENT P&T COMMITTEE

Each department in the School of Education follows the guiding principles as established in Purdue FW Senate Document SD 14-36: Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure and Third Year Review.

1. **Establishing the department committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.1):

The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the School 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 School or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

2. **Composition of the department committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.2):

    i. The majority of the department committee shall be persons possessing the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires.

    ii. 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 School the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department committee.

        1. Persons outside of the department but within the School shall be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the School.
        2. If persons outside of the School are selected to serve on the committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the chief academic officer of the School.
        3. From this list, the chief academic officer of the School shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.

    iii. Members of the department committee shall serve three-year staggered terms.

    iv. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

    v. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.

<blockquote>vi. Any faculty member subject to the procedures and guiding principles of promotion at Purdue FW 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.</blockquote>

3. The Role of the Department Committee (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.3. & 2.1.4):

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

D. CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.2):

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 School 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. SCHOOL P&T COMMITTEE

1. Establishing the School committee (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.1):

The School committee composition and functions shall be established by the School faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the School, 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 School committee ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.2](#)):

i. The Faculty Governance Committee will initiate and manage the process for selection of School committee membership.

ii. Each department will submit the name of one eligible faculty to be its representative on the School committee. Total membership in the committee will be three. If after following established procedures, there are no faculty from a department to serve on the School committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the School the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the School committee. Persons outside of the department but within the School will be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the School. If persons outside of the School are selected to serve on the School level committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the Chief Academic Officer of the School. From this list, the chief academic officer of the School shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.

iii. There is no requirement that the majority of the School committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.

iv. Members of the School committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the School committee.

v. Members of the School committee may serve at the department level, but not at the campus level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the School committee.

vi. Members of the School committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be for three years and must be staggered.

vii. Members of the School committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

viii. The chief academic officer of the School may not serve on the School committee or participate in the meetings.

3. Role of the School Committee ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.3 & 2.3.4](#)):

   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.

      1. The "basis of the decisions" is understood to specifically mean departmental criteria, as it is the responsibility of the School committee to ensure that the decision made at the lower level accurately reflects those criteria.

         a. Due to the diversity of fields within our School, it is vital that the School Committee follows the criteria of each department.

   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.

      1. In the circumstance that the School committee believes that a decision has been rendered at a lower level due to a misreading of departmental criteria, then the School Committee will identify those procedural discrepancies.

         a. The purpose of this policy is to ensure due process for a candidate, as the School Committee is tasked with ensuring that the process has adhered to documented procedures.

   iv. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter. The letter of recommendation from the School 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.

4. The Chief Academic Officer of the School ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.4](#))

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

   i. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.

ii.   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 evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a lower-level decision is judged to be contrary to the evidence.

iii.   Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the School 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.

5. **Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.5)
The Faculty Governance Committee, in consultation with the chief academic officer of the School, will solicit eligible nominees for consideration by the voting faculty of the School. 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.

6. **Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty**
It is in the best interest of PFW and the School of Education to see 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 School of Education will develop, approve, and implement its own Third Year Review Process based on guidance in accordance with SD 14-36. Procedures must be explained in each department's policy document and approved by the School of Education. The following principles must be followed (adapted from SD 14-36: 5.1-5.6):

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 halfway through the third year.

3.   The third-year review must be evaluated by the department promotion and tenure committee, who will submit their vote and recommendation to the chief academic officer of the department. Their vote and recommendation is also submitted to the tenure track faculty.

4. The chief academic officer of the department 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.

IV. Clinical Promotion

A. POLICY & PROCEDURES FOR CLINICAL PROMOTION

Candidates for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching with competence in one other category, either service or scholarship and/or creative endeavors. Candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching or service, with competence in one other category, either teaching, service, or scholarship and/or creative endeavors. The School of Education has adopted the following procedures to guide candidates, departments and the School through the process of Clinical Promotion in compliance with the Purdue University Fort Wayne SD 14-36 and SD19-22.

B. CLINICAL PROMOTION CASE PROCESS

Candidates seeking clinical promotion must identify the Department Clinical Promotion Criteria document that should be used to evaluate the case. The Departmental Clinical Promotion Criteria used must have been in effect at some point during the time period preceding the submission of the case. The appointment letter of a faculty member to more than one academic unit shall identify that department whose clinical promotion process shall apply to the appointee. The clinical promotion criteria for each department shall be approved by the voting faculty in the respective department and approved by the School of Education, per SD 14-36. All cases for clinical promotion shall pass sequentially through the decision levels below.

1. **Candidate cases for clinical promotion shall be considered at several levels in the following order** (adapted from SD 14-36):

      viii.   Department committee
        ix.   Chief academic officer of the department (i.e., Department Chair)
         x.   School committee
        xi.   Chief academic officer of the School (i.e., Director)
       xii.   Purdue Fort Wayne (Purdue FW) campus committee
      xiii.   Chief academic officer of Purdue FW
         ii.   The chief administrative officer at Purdue FW shall forward recommendations to the President of Purdue University

2. **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 (adapted from SD 14-36).

      x. Each decision level submits a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments/supplemental information.

     xi. 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 therefore, at the time the case is sent forward to the next level.

          1. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included.
          2. 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.
          3. 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).

    xii. 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, either in-person or virtually, during deliberations in order to vote.

3. The following rules shall apply for participation in the review process at any level (adapted from SD 14-36):

     i. Just as tenured faculty vote on promotion and tenure cases, clinical faculty should serve as voting members of department and school clinical promotion committees for clinical candidates when possible.

     ii. No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an

academic year in which his or her nomination for clinical promotion is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own clinical promotion nomination.

iii. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (i.e., either School or campus).

iv. Beyond the department level, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one additional decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before School committees.

v. The Faculty Governance Committee of the School shall identify those individuals who are eligible to serve on the campus committee based on prior service on a department clinical promotion 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 School of Education 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.

vi. 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.

vii. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.

viii. 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. DEPARTMENT CLINICAL PROMOTION COMMITTEE
Each department in the School of Education follows the guiding principles as established in Purdue FW Senate Document SD 14-36.

4. Establishing the department committee (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.1):

The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the School 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 School or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

5. **Composition of the department committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.2):

     i. The majority of the department committee members must be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.

     ii. 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 School the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department committee.

          1. Persons outside of the department but within the School shall be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the School.
          2. If persons outside of the School are selected to serve on the committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the chief academic officer of the School.
          3. From this list, the chief academic officer of the School shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.

     iii. Members of the department committee shall serve three-year staggered terms.

     iv. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

     v. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.

     vi. Any faculty member subject to the procedures and guiding principles of promotion at Purdue FW 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 clinical promotion. Any document that is provided does not become part of the case and does not move forward with the case.

6. The Role of the Department Committee ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.3. & 2.1.4](#)):

   iv. Review the evidence presented in the case.

   v. Evaluate the case in light of department criteria.

   vi. Make a recommendation to the chief academic officer of the department in the form of a letter. The letter from the department committee shall be based on the case and department criteria and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee.

D. CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT [(adapted from SD 14-36: 2.2)](#):

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

5. Review the case and compare to department criteria.
6. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
7. Review the recommendation of the lower level.
8. Make a recommendation to the School 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. SCHOOL CLINICAL PROMOTION COMMITTEE

7. Establishing the School committee ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.1](#)):

   The School committee composition and functions shall be established by the School faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the School, 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.

8. Composition of the School committee ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.2](#)):

   i. The Faculty Governance Committee will initiate and manage the process for selection of School committee membership.

   ii. Each department will submit the name of one eligible faculty to be its

representative on the School committee. Total membership in the committee will be three. If after following established procedures, there are no faculty from a department to serve on the School committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the School the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the School committee. Persons outside of the department but within the School will be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the School. If persons outside of the School are selected to serve on the School level committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the Chief Academic Officer of the School. From this list, the chief academic officer of the School shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.

iii. There is no requirement that the majority of the School committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.

iv. Members of the School committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the School committee.

v. Members of the School committee may serve at the department level, but not at the campus level in the clinical promotion process while serving on the School committee.

vi. Members of the School committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be for three years and must be staggered.

vii. Members of the School committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

viii. The chief academic officer of the School may not serve on the School committee or participate in the meetings.

9. Role of the School Committee (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.3 & 2.3.4):

v. 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.

vi. Review the recommendation of the lower levels. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.

2. The "basis of the decisions" is understood to specifically mean departmental criteria, as it is the responsibility of the School

committee to ensure that the decision made at the lower level accurately reflects those criteria.

   a. Due to the diversity of fields within our School, it is vital that the School Committee follows the criteria of each department.

vii. 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.

   2. In the circumstance that the School committee believes that a decision has been rendered at a lower level due to a misreading of departmental criteria, then the School Committee will identify those procedural discrepancies.

      a. The purpose of this policy is to ensure due process for a candidate, as the School Committee is tasked with ensuring that the process has adhered to documented procedures.

viii. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter. The letter of recommendation from the School 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.

10. The Chief Academic Officer of the School (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.4)

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

i. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.

ii. 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 evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a lower-level decision is judged to be contrary to the evidence.

iii. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the School 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.

11. Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee ([adapted from SD 14-36: 2.5](#))
The Faculty Governance Committee, in consultation with the chief academic officer of the School, will solicit eligible nominees who have served at the department or school level for consideration by the voting faculty of the School. 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.

F. POLICY & PROCEDURES FOR CLINICAL PROMOTION

Candidates for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching with competence in one other category, either service or scholarship and/or creative endeavors. Candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching or service, with competence in one other category, either teaching, service, or scholarship and/or creative endeavors. The School of Education has adopted the following procedures to guide candidates, departments and the School through the process of Clinical Promotion in compliance with the Purdue University Fort Wayne [SD 14-36](#) and [SD19-22](#).

G. CLINICAL PROMOTION CASE PROCESS

Candidates seeking clinical promotion must identify the Department Clinical Promotion Criteria document that should be used to evaluate the case. The Departmental Clinical Promotion Criteria used must have been in effect at some point during the time period preceding the submission of the case. The appointment letter of a faculty member to more than one academic unit shall identify that department whose clinical promotion process shall apply to the appointee. The clinical promotion criteria for each department shall be approved by the voting faculty in the respective department and approved by the School of Education, per [SD 14-36](#). All cases for clinical promotion shall pass sequentially through the decision levels below.

4. **Candidate cases for clinical promotion shall be considered at several levels in the following order** (adapted from [SD 14-36](#)):

      i.   Department committee
      ii. Chief academic officer of the department (i.e., Department Chair)

iii. School committee

iv. Chief academic officer of the School (i.e., Director)

v. Purdue Fort Wayne (Purdue FW) campus committee

vi. Chief academic officer of Purdue FW

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

5. **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** (adapted from SD 14-36).

xiii. Each decision level submits a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments/supplemental information.

xiv. 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 therefore, at the time the case is sent forward to the next level.

1. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included.
2. 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.
3. 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).

xv. 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, either in-person or virtually, during

deliberations in order to vote.

6. **The following rules shall apply for participation in the review process at any level** (adapted from SD 14-36)**:**

ix. Just as tenure-track faculty may only vote on promotion and tenure cases, only clinical faculty may serve as voting members of clinical promotion committees for clinical candidates at any level.

x. No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for clinical promotion is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own clinical promotion nomination.

xi. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (i.e., either School or campus).

xii. Beyond the department level, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one additional decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before School committees.

xiii. The Faculty Governance Committee of the School shall identify those individuals who are eligible to serve on the campus committee based on prior service on a department clinical promotion 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 School of Education 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.

xiv. 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.

xv. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.

xvi. 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.

H. DEPARTMENT CLINICAL PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Each department in the School of Education follows the guiding principles as established in Purdue FW Senate Document SD 14-36.

1. **Establishing the Department Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.1):

   The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the School 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 School or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

2. **Composition of the Department Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.2):

   i. There is no requirement that the majority of the department committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.

   vii. 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 School the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department committee.

      4. Persons outside of the department but within the School shall be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the School.
      5. If persons outside of the School are selected to serve on the committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the chief academic officer of the School.
      6. From this list, the chief academic officer of the School shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.

   viii. Members of the department committee shall serve three-year staggered terms.

   ix. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

   x. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the

department committee or participate in meetings.

xi. Any faculty member subject to the procedures and guiding principles of promotion at Purdue FW 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 clinical 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** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.1.3. & 2.1.4):

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

I. CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.2):

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 School 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.

J. SCHOOL CLINICAL PROMOTION COMMITTEE

1. **Establishing the School Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.1):

   The School committee composition and functions shall be established by the School faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the School, 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 School Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.2):

    i. The Faculty Governance Committee will initiate and manage the process for selection of School committee membership.

    ii. Each department will submit the name of one eligible faculty to be its representative on the School committee. Total membership in the committee will be three. If after following established procedures, there are no faculty from a department to serve on the School committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the School the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the School committee. Persons outside of the department but within the School will be considered for membership on the committee prior to persons outside of the School. If persons outside of the School are selected to serve on the School level committee, rationale for their participation must be documented by the Chief Academic Officer of the School. From this list, the chief academic officer of the School shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to three.

    iii. There is no requirement that the majority of the School committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.

    iv. Members of the School committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the School committee.

    v. Members of the School committee may serve at the department level, but not at the campus level in the clinical promotion process while serving on the School committee.

    vi. Members of the School committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be for three years and must be staggered.

    vii. Members of the School committee shall elect a chair from among its members.

    viii. The chief academic officer of the School may not serve on the School committee or participate in the meetings.

3. **Role of the School Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.3.3 & 2.3.4):

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.

   1. The "basis of the decisions" is understood to specifically mean departmental criteria, as it is the responsibility of the School committee to ensure that the decision made at the lower level accurately reflects those criteria.

      a. Due to the diversity of fields within our School, it is vital that the School Committee follows the criteria of each department.

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.

   1. In the circumstance that the School committee believes that a decision has been rendered at a lower level due to a misreading of departmental criteria, then the School Committee will identify those procedural discrepancies.

      a. The purpose of this policy is to ensure due process for a candidate, as the School Committee is tasked with ensuring that the process has adhered to documented procedures.

iv. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter. The letter of recommendation from the School 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.

4. **The Chief Academic Officer of the School** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.4)

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

 i. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.

 ii. 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 evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a lower-level decision is judged to be contrary to the evidence.

 iii. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.

The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the School 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.

5. **Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee** (adapted from SD 14-36: 2.5)

The Faculty Governance Committee, in consultation with the chief academic officer of the School, will solicit eligible nominees for consideration by the voting faculty of the School. 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.

V. Accreditation

A. UNIT
Programs and/or departments within the SOE may affiliate for the purpose of acquiring or maintaining accreditation.

B. FACULTY
Faculty members within an accreditation unit will be responsible for addressing all accreditation requirements.

VI. Assessment of Student Academic Achievement

The Assessment of Student Academic Achievement Committee in the School of Education shall consist of one voting faculty representative elected from each department to serve a two-year term and shall be chaired by a member of that committee. The assessment process will include the evaluation of each program/department and a written summary following the guidelines in SD 15-6.

The Faculty Governance Committee in conjunction with the Associate/Assistant Director will oversee the School-level assessment process which includes assessments from each department in SOE in alignment with SD 15-6 Assessment of Student Academic Achievement. This assessment report will be completed within the timeframe presented by the VCAA.

VII. Curriculum Review

The Curriculum Review Committee in the School of Education shall consist of one voting faculty representative elected from each department to serve a two-year term and shall be chaired by a member of that committee.

The Faculty Governance Committee in conjunction with the Associate/Assistant Director shall oversee the School-level curriculum review process in accordance with guidelines set forth in SD 19-1: Changes to Academic Programs and Structures. The curriculum review process shall include review of undergraduate and graduate level proposals for new or revised academic programs and new or revised courses from each department in SOE. The process may also include examination of existing academic programs or courses when significant questions of proper sponsorship or academic quality arise, or as part of a PFW-wide effort to ensure the periodic review of academic programs by a body, functioning above the department level.

The Curriculum Review Committee shall be responsible for ensuring that new or revised academic programs and new or revised courses are evaluated based upon:
1. The rationale for the new or revised program or course.

2. The use of PFW resources.
3. The relationship among proposed and examined programs or courses.
4. Other effects of the proposed program or course on PFW and on PFW's constituents.

The Curriculum Review Committee shall either: (1) recommend to the Director of the School that reviewed proposals be advanced for additional campus-level reviews; or (2) provide feedback to the submitting Department with a request for revisions and resubmission.

VIII. Grade Appeals

The Grade Appeals Committee in the School of Education shall consist of one voting faculty representative elected from each department to serve a two-year term and shall be chaired by a member of that committee. The Grade Appeals Committee shall review both undergraduate and graduate grade appeals as part of the "Step 2" process outlined in the PFW undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

Prior to September 1st of each academic year, the membership of the Grade Appeals Committee will meet to elect a Chair and review the following School procedures for hearing Step 2 grade appeals:

1. After a student receives a decision on their grade appeal at the Department level (i.e., Step 1), the student has three calendar weeks to file a written request to have their appeal reviewed by the Grade Appeals Committee of the School. Written appeals received more than three calendar weeks following a decision at the Department level (i.e., Step 1) will not be heard by the Grade Appeals Committee of the School.

2. As per the University Catalog, the student's Department Chair will direct the student procedurally in making an appeal to the Grade Appeals Committee of the School.

3. A School level grade appeal (i.e., Step 2) shall be initiated when a student files a written letter of appeal with their Department Chair requesting to have their grade appeal heard by the Grade Appeals Committee of the School.

4. The student's Department Chair shall record the date and time of the student's written appeal and immediately forward the student's written appeal to the Director's Office who will forward the student's appeal to the Chair of the Grade Appeals Committee of the School.

5. Within ten (10) business days of a student filing a written appeal through their

Department Chair, the Chair of the Grade Appeals Committee shall organize and communicate a date and time for the Grade Appeals Committee of the School to hear the student's appeal.

6. As per the University Catalog, the student filing a Step 2 grade appeal shall have the opportunity to be heard in person by the Grade Appeals Committee of the School. The Committee shall invite the instructor. The instructor has the right to determine if they will choose to attend and address the Committee.

7. The Grade Appeals Committee of the School will communicate a written decision within thirty (30) days of the student's submitted appeal. Per the process outlined in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, this decision will be sent electronically by the Committee's Chair to the student and the instructor. A copy of the committee's procedures will be given to the vice chancellor for academic affairs, to the dean of students, and to students upon request.

8. As per the University Catalog, a student seeking to appeal a decision of the Grade Appeals Committee of the School must make an appointment with the Director of Students, who will direct the student procedurally in submitting the case to the University Grade Appeals Committee.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Steven Hanke, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee

DATE: 01/09/2023

SUBJ: Approval of Replacement Member of the Educational Policy Committee

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.4.1.) that "Senate committees shall have the power to fill committee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting and to the guidelines established in sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.4"; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.2.) that "No one may serve on more than four Senate committees and/or subcommittees in a given academic year"; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.4.) that "Senators must comprise at least 2/3 of the voting membership of any committee";

WHEREAS, There is one vacancy on the Senate Educational Policy Committee, created by Donna Holland resignation from the Educational Policy Committee, which became effective on November 14, 2022; and

WHEREAS, The Senate Educational Policy Committee has appointed Andres Montenegro as the replacement member for the remainder of the 2022-23 academic year, to become effective immediately after the passage of this resolution;

BE IT RESOLVED, The request that the Senate approve this appointment.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: Assem Nasr, Chair
            International Education Advisory Subcommittee

DATE: January 10, 2023

SUBJECT: Approval of Filling Vacancy on the International Education Advisory
            Subcommittee

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.5.1.) that "Senate subcommittees shall have the power to fill subcommittee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting and to the guidelines established in sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.5."; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.5.) that "Voting Faculty must comprise at least 2/3 of the voting membership of any subcommittee"; and

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee requests that the Senate approve <u>Nancy Virtue</u>, International Language and Culture Studies, as the replacement member for the remainder of the 2022-23 academic year.

Question Time

The use of battery-powered, plug-in hybrid, and pure electric vehicles is rising on our campus. Some of these vehicles need to be plugged overnight into regular 120-volt electric outlets, the same as household electric sockets, while higher voltage outlets may be needed for faster charging. Some of the users of these vehicles live in apartments with no access to electric outlets for overnight charging. This creates the need to charge during the day while they work or attend classes. The need is evident in Parking Garages 1 and 2, where a spot-check confirmed a few such vehicles plugged into the few power outlets located next to the emergency blue light posts. This need for plug in outlets on campus will only keep rising in keeping with the growing incentives for car owners to consider going electric. Thus, providing reliable car-charging outlets on campus would be a step in the direction of the future, not to mention that it would also encourage students and employees to come to campus. The question is, what steps is the university taking to address the rising need for car charging electric outlets on campus?

J. Mbuba

Question Time

As Catalog production continues to proceed through its processes, it would be helpful if a representative from OAA could give a brief but clear presentation to Senate laying out in as simple terms as possible what role OAA plays in the overall process for the following scenarios, and how that role changes at different stages of the process:

- Changes to an existing course - undergrad and grad
- Changes to an existing program - undergrad and grad
- Proposal for a new course - undergrad and grad
- Proposal for a new program - undergrad and grad

S. Buttes
S. Carr

<u>MEMORANDUM</u>

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Shannon Johnson, Chair
         Curriculum Review Subcommittee

DATE: December 8, 2022

SUBJ: Information Technology Concentration

The Curriculum Review Subcommittee approved on December 8, 2022 the attached documents
regarding the Information Technology Concentration
The committee finds that the proposed program requires no Senate review.

Shannon Johnson, MLS
Chair, Curriculum Review Subcommittee
Walter E. Helmke Library

<u>Approving</u>:   <u>Not Approving</u>:   <u>Abstain</u>:   <u>Absent:</u>
Laurel Campbell
Lee Roberts
Behin Elahi
Teri Hogg
Xiaoguang Tian
Shannon Johnson

Degree/Certificate/Major/Minor/Concentration Cover Sheet

Date:

Institution: Purdue

Campus: Fort Wayne

School or College:

Department:

Location: 80% or more online: Yes   No

County:

Type:

Program name:

Graduate/Undergraduate:

Degree Code:

Brief Description:

Rationale for new or terminated program:

CIP Code:

Name of Person who Submitted Proposal:

Contact Information (phone or email):

Undergraduate Academic Program Memo

Date: 10/12/22

From: Kimberly O'Connor

To: Gary Steffen and Carl Drummond

Re: Creation of Information Technology (IT) Concentration within OL Program

Brief description of the program:

The Organizational Leadership Program aims to create a six-course, 18-credit hour Information Technology concentration as a means of helping prepare students majoring in Organizational Leadership develop a fundamental understanding of information technology services that exist in organizations.
Information Technology Concentration Learning Objectives:
Describe the fundamental components and technologies that are used in Information Technology
Analyze problems and select the appropriate technology solutions to solve those problems
Apply management and leadership skills to Information Technology projects
Understand the importance of data and network security in organization

Brief rationale for program request:

Purdue West Lafayette Organizational Leadership degree website states that "students who understand the intersection of technology, innovation, and organizational leadership are in great demand across mangy fields including manufacturing, technology, government, and non-profits." This specialization will help create those skills in students on our regional campus.

2. Students could opt to take the IT minor, but the minor does not include a technology management course or the ability to take other ITC courses that interest them. OL faculty collaborated with ETCS faculty to create this option to address the needs of OL students.

CIP Code: 52.0213

	For completion by Office of Academic Affairs
Kimberly O'Connor 66E4791669034A1...	11/22/2022
Department Chair Signature	*Date*
Gary Steffen 6F8EE89AEAEC4B1...	11/22/2022
School Dean Signature	*Date*
Carl Drummond 27109142004745C...	11/22/2022
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Signature	*Date*

PLEASE NOTE: The Office of Academic Affairs will collect electronic signatures from the Chair, Dean, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs after the form has been filled out and submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs with the rest of the program proposal.

Request for a New Major or Concentration

I. Name of proposed major, or concentration

Information Technology Concentration

II. Title of degree to be conferred

Bachelor's in Organizational Leadership

III. Field of study, department, and college involved

Information Technology, Department of Organizational Leadership, ETCS

IV. Objectives of the proposed major or concentration

- *Describe the fundamental components and technologies that are used in Information Technology*
- *Analyze problems and select the appropriate technology solutions to solve those problems*
- *Apply management and leadership skills to Information Technology projects*
- *Understand the importance of data and network security in organization*

V. Proposed Date of Initiation

Fall 2023

VI. Describe the relationship of the proposed major or concentration to the mission of the campus or the department

Within PFW's Organizational Leadership degree program, we teach our students how to "lead innovative and meaningful change." Organizations are increasingly relying on technology to meet the needs of their remote and hybrid workforce. Students who pursue this concentration will have both the leadership and IT skills necessary to lead these significant workplace changes.

In addition, Purdue West Lafayette Organizational Leadership degree website states that "students who understand the intersection of technology, innovation, and organizational leadership are in great demand across mangy fields including manufacturing, technology, government, and non-profits." This specialization will help create those skills in students on our regional campus.

VII. Describe any relationship to existing programs within the campus

There is an existing minor in Information Technology. However, that option does not meet the needs of OL students. Thus, OL and IT faculty worked together to create this new option. The proposed concentration extends the relationship OL has with the Information Technology program and builds a unique knowledge and skill set for current and future OL students.

VIII. Describe any cooperative endeavors explored and/or intended with other institutions or organizations

N/A.

IX. Describe the need for the major or concentration

As stated above, PFW has an existing IT minor that students could opt to take. However, the minor does not include a technology management course or the ability to take other ITC courses that interest them. Also, the minor requires students to take more technical courses in programming and databases, which do not match will with OL industry needs. In addition, the job market for IT specialists/computer support specialists is projected to grow at an annualized rate of six percent over the next decade (bls.gov). In Indiana, information services had the fourth highest wage growth between 2011-2021 and 2019-2021 suggesting demand for these job specialties will continue to remain high. Blending OL with IT will help to make our students particularly sought-after in the business community.

X. Describe the resources required over and above current levels to implement the proposed major or concentration*

No additional resources over or above current levels are required.

XI. A Liaison Library Memo

Please see included Liaison Library memo.

XII. Proposed curriculum – 18 Credits

	Course #	Course Name	Credits
1	ITC 11000	IT Fundamentals	3
2	ITC 31000	IT Project Management	3
3	ITC 33100	Networks I	3
4	ITC 38000	Project Analysis, Design, and Implementation	3
5	ITC 41400	Information Assurance	3
6	One Additional ITC course elective		3

Liaison Librarian Memo

Date:

From:

To:

Re:

Describe availability of library resources to support proposed new program:

 Comments:

_____Sarah Wagner_____   _____10-19-22_____

Liaison Librarian Signature   *Date*

Please email academic_program@pfw.edu with questions about this form.
Send signed original to Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
Kettler Hall, Room 174