

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Fifth Senate
Purdue University Fort Wayne
January 9, 2023
Via Webex

Agenda
(as amended)

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 12
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) – D. Maloney
 - b. 2022 Campus Climate Survey (Senate Reference No. 22-17) – J. Malanson
7. Unfinished business
8. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-12) – W. Sirk
 - b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-13) – W. Sirk
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-14) – W. Sirk
 - d. Educational Policy Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 22-15) – S. Hanke
9. New business
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 22-16) – A. Nasr
10. Question time
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 22-15) – N. Borbieva, C. Erickson, M. Kelsey, S. LaVere, A. Livschiz, and N. Virtue
11. Committee reports “for information only”
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)
 “2022 Campus Climate Survey” (SR No. 22-17)
 “Approval of Replacement Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee” (SD 22-12)
 “Guiding Principles of Promotion to Include Professors of Practice” (SD 22-13)
 “Procedures of Promotion to Include Professors of Practice” (SD 22-14)
 “Military Experience Policy” (SD 22-15)
 “Shared Governance and Consideration of Greek Life” (SD 22-16)
 “Question Time – re: Created Equal” (SR No. 22-15)

Senate Members Present:

J. Badia, K. Barker, S. Betz, S. Bischoff, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, Z. Chen, S. Cody, Y. Deng, C. Drummond, B. Elahi, R. Elsenbaumer, T. Foley, R. Friedman, M. Gruys, K. Gyi, S. Hanke, V. Inukollu, P. Jing, J. Johns, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, C. Lawton, J. Leatherman, J. Lewis, A. Livschiz, D. Maloney, E. Mann, J. Mbuba, J. McHann, A. Montenegro, G. Nakata, A. Nasr, I. Nunez, K. O’Connor, E. Ohlander, M. Perkins Coppola, A. Pinan-Llamas, P. Saha, R. Shoquist, W. Sirk, G. Steffen, S. Steiner, K. Stultz-Dessent, D. Tembras, N. Virtue, L. Whalen, M. Wolf, N. Younis, Y. Zhang

Senate Members Absent:

D. Bauer, B. Chen, M. Hammonds, S. Johnson, H. Luo, J. O’Connell, H. Park, T. Soule, K. Surface

Guests Present:

A. Blackmon, N. Borbieva, K. Burnette, J. Cashdollar, F. Combs, M. Dixon, P. Eber, J. Eck, C. Erickson, K. Fineran, C. Fox, M. Helmsing, D. Hoile, M. Kelsey, M. Kirchner, A. Kopec, J. Malanson, C. Marcuccilli, R. Nerad, G. Petroviak, A. Seilheimer, T. Swim, K. Wagner

Acta

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

A. Nasr moved to amend the agenda by adding Jeff Malanson’s presentation on the 2022 Campus Climate Survey as the second item under “special business of the day.”

Motion to amend the agenda passed on a voice vote.

A. Nasr moved to grant Andrew Kopec speaking privileges for Senate Document SD 22-15 (Military Experience Policy).

Motion to grant Andrew Kopec speaking privileges passed on a voice vote.

A. Nasr moved to accept the amended agenda.

Motion to accept the amended agenda passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Deputy Presiding Officer:

N. Younis: Happy New Year, colleagues.

I hope you had a relaxing and peaceful break and you are enjoying the start of the spring semester.

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.

Tuition and state appropriations are the primary sources of our budget. Therefore, two years ago, we created a new vice chancellor position and a new division to deal with enrollment. Well, the enrollment continues to decline.

Recently, the Division of Enrollment Management and the Student Experience has engaged a consulting group to assist PFW in the development of a strategic enrollment management plan. I am invited for an interview with this consulting group next week.

As a faculty speaker, I would like to hear from you about the goals, challenges and motivations related to enrollment. I will be glad to meet you or you can email me regarding this subject or other issues.

Have a great semester.

b. IFC Representative:

A. Livschiz: I hope everyone had a restful and safe winter break. We have a lot of work ahead of us this semester—there are a lot of important projects in the works by various senate committees that should be coming to the senate floor later in the semester, and I look forward to working with all of you to get it done.

I also want to second Nash's point. I am also happy that I get to meet with a consultant, and am happy to hear from anybody that has concerns that they

would like to add. More broadly, I want to remind everyone that part of the responsibilities of speakers is to be advocates for faculty. If people have concerns or questions that they need help with, I hope that they do not hesitate to reach out to us.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

H. Strevel: Happy New Year, everyone. I am glad that we made it through the holidays. I hope everyone had a wonderful stay away from work with lots of rest.

Going forward, I am obviously a new presiding officer, so I know I do make some mistakes. I apologize for any perception that I have made any biased mistakes. That is not my intention.

I do want to remind everyone that we are all a team here. We are all on the same side. That being said, I do encourage everyone to speak their minds even if it is against one another, but do so civilly with the understanding that as presiding officer I will highly recommend and encourage 100% participation from everyone. I will never deny a voice in that way.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 22-16) – D. Maloney

B. Buldt moved to postpone Senate Reference No. 22-16 (Memorial Resolution-Richard E. Miers) until February.

Motion to postpone passed on a voice vote.

b. 2022 Campus Climate Survey (Senate Reference No. 22-17) – J. Malanson

Please see attached PowerPoint.

B. Buldt: You mentioned that you haven't quoted from the responses. Will there be a more detailed report coming forward?

J. Malanson: When we release a broad report to the campus generally speaking we try not to provide many quotes from the open-ended response questions, largely because people filled out the survey anonymously. While I may see a quote as being anonymous and not being able to figure out who it is, that is certainly not always going to be the case. So, we always try to be very sensitive to that in terms of any reporting that we do on a broad base. In terms of sharing information with the committee for follow up action or anything else, it is a little bit easier at times to share a bit more information. We will certainly be addressing these issues in as much detail as possible in future open forums and reports.

B. Buldt: If we want to act on what the survey brought out we need more detail, but I understand that anonymity is very very important. I do not want to even remotely touch on this. Thank you.

7. Unfinished business: There was no unfinished business.

8. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-12) – W. Sirk

W. Sirk moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-12 (Approval of Replacement Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee).

S. Buttes moved for unanimous consent.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Resolution passed.

b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-13) – W. Sirk

W. Sirk moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-13 (Guiding Principles of Promotion to Include Professors of Practice).

S. Betz moved to amend by changing the bottom of page four from “beyond the standards for Assistant Professor” to “beyond the standards for Assistant Clinical Professor or Assistant Professor of Practice.”

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 22-14) – W. Sirk

W. Sirk moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-14 (Procedures of Promotion to Include Professors of Practice).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

d. Educational Policy Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 22-15) – S. Hanke

S. Hanke moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-15 (Military Experience Policy).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

9. New business:

a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 22-16) – A. Nasr

A. Nasr moved to approve Senate Document SD 22-16 (Shared Governance and Consideration of Greek Life).

B. Buldt moved to amend by changing the “BE IT RESOLVED” from “abstain from making any plans” to “abstain from making major plans.”

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

10. Question time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 22-15) – N. Borbieva, C. Erickson, M. Kelsey, S. LaVere, A. Livschiz, and N. Virtue

In SD 22-6, the Purdue Fort Wayne faculty spoke with a clear and unified voice: we want information about the way the administration approved and handled the visit of the outside organization, Created Equal, which during its visit, according to accounts by students, faculty, and staff, harassed PFW students, and after its visit posted demeaning videos of interactions with PFW students on YouTube. Faculty support of this document was on display again at the Nov. 14 senate meeting, after Chancellor Elsenbaumer presented a memorandum that did not answer a single question that was included in 22-6, but instead directed concerned campus members to form a committee that would “engage in a collaborative dialogue” toward the goal of developing an understanding “of university policies and principles, how they were applied in this instance, and what appropriate next steps might be in evaluating our current policies and practices.” This committee will be an “ad hoc committee,” and it could include members of the Senate Executive Committee and the Student Affairs Committee as well as interested faculty, staff, and students. Vice Chancellor Nakata has suggested in subsequent communications that this ad hoc committee could function in coordination with or as part of the Public Safety committee.

While deliberative work will need to be done to determine the best course of action moving forward when it comes to policies towards outside groups coming to campus, the following questions included in 22-6 do not require deliberation but answers to them are necessary before any deliberation, discussion, and reconsideration can take place:

- Were any meetings held, virtually, in person, or over email, about the visit in advance?

- Was anyone with trauma-informed training involved in screening “Created Equal,” and has anyone with trauma-informed training been involved in conversations among the administration since the visit? If so, who?
- Did the organization have an on-campus sponsor? If so, who?
- Was the PFW Solicitation Policy followed?
- Who approved Created Equal’s appearance on campus?
- Who worked with Created Equal on the Request to Solicit form? A copy of this form should exist on file with the university. Can we see whether any conditions were included in the arrangements, for example, something that would explain absence of any advance promotion of the event?
- Who helped with other arrangements in advance of the visit?
- According to the campus policy, a campus representative must review all materials an outside group brings to campus. Who did this for the Created Equal visit?

Moving beyond the specific event and specific outside organization,

- Are there any consequences for outside organizations that do not adhere to existing PFW solicitation policy?

A. Livschiz: There are a couple of things that should be noted. There was a meeting that Glen Nakata organized that discussed some of the issues that were raised in our question. I believe that the plan after that meeting was that Glen was going to do some data gathering and call another meeting to continue the conversation. I think it is important that until the concerns that were raised, both about the event but also more broadly about our policies, are addressed then it is important that we as Senate remember that this is an unresolved issue. But, at least for now there are steps that are being taken to address it.

G. Nakata: Ann, you are correct. We have had an initial meeting with everyone. We have identified areas that we want to address based on this event going forward. Obviously, we had winter break. We will be reconvening the group within the next week or so to circle back on the points that we felt need to be addressed for any future events to prevent any issues. I am going to be getting the group together, along with the Executive Committee and other members of Faculty Senate that have been involved, and we will reconvene along with the students that were involved. We will prepare our recommendations for the Faculty Senate at that time.

11. Committee reports “for information only”: There were no committee reports “for information only.”

12. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Malanson: Welcome back, everyone!

13. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:09 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 circuitry. 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.

Senate Reference No. 22-17

2022 CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY: ITEMS FOR SENATE CONSIDERATION

Purpose

- Goal today is not to provide a comprehensive overview of the campus climate survey, but rather to share two important findings related to the impact that faculty have on campus climate that the Senate can help to address
- We will host an open forum on Wednesday, January 25 at 1:30 p.m. in Neff 101 (and via Zoom) to present a more complete overview and key findings

2022 Campus Climate Survey Participation

Population	Invitations	Completions	Pct.
Students	6,206	1,381	22.3%
Employees	1,222	593	48.5%
Full-Time Faculty*	335	210	62.7%
Full-Time Staff*	524	284	54.2%

- Issues addressed today were raised in the open-ended response questions:
 - How would you describe the campus culture at this institution?
 - What is one thing that you would do to improve the campus culture at this institution?

Key Issues for Senate Consideration

■ Faculty Conduct

- Faculty treatment of other faculty, staff, administration, and students

“Certain members of the faculty need to take a step back and look at their words and actions and realize the negative impact they have on students, staff and other faculty.”

- No one holds faculty accountable, giving implicit sanction to the behavior and encouraging more of it

Key Issues for Senate Consideration

- Faculty Conduct
- **Deadnaming and Misgendering of Transgender Students**
 - Deadnaming is damaging to student mental health, academic success, belonging, and retention
 - Faculty (and to a lesser extent, staff) behavior in classrooms and elsewhere
 - The Senate has an opportunity to promote best practices for establishing and maintaining inclusive classrooms
 - Preferred name processes not systematically developed or implemented
 - The Senate can help to identify systems, reports, places where preferred names do not automatically populate but should; can advocate for the well-being of our students (and our faculty and staff colleagues navigating the same difficulties)

Open Forum on Campus Climate Survey

- Wednesday, January 25, 1:30-2:30 p.m.
- Neff 101, livestreamed via Zoom, and recorded



THANK YOU!

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY

FORT WAYNE

LEARN MORE AT:
tinyurl.com/PFWStrategyStatus

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: Wylie Sirk
Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
DATE: November 30, 2022
SUBJECT: Approval of Replacement Member of the Faculty Affairs 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 Faculty Affairs Committee, created by Donna Holland resignation from the Faculty Affairs Committee, which became effective on November 14, 2022; and

WHEREAS, The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has appointed Mark Jordan 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: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Wylie Sirk, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: November 28, 2022

SUBJ: Guiding Principles of Promotion to include Professors of Practice

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate approved Guiding Principles for Clinical Faculty (SD 18-15); and

WHEREAS, Purdue allows for Professors of Practice and, thus, PFW can use the designation for faculty;

WHEREAS, Purdue defines Clinical/Professional Faculty as: “a promotable, but non-tenure track, faculty classification. These individuals provide education and/or supervision of students engaged in clinical and professional practice. Clinical/Professional Faculty may carry the title clinical professor, professor of practice or teaching professor. Each school may choose the appropriate title for their Clinical/Professional Faculty.” (Clinical/Professional Faculty Appointment and Promotion (VI.F.10).

WHEREAS, it is expected that Professors of Practice, as positions whose primary responsibilities are teaching, will follow the guidelines set forth in SD 18-15;

WHEREAS, SD 18-15 did not require teaching as a basis for promotion for Clinical Faculty (also a position whose primary responsibilities are teaching);

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt the following revisions to SD 18-15 to allow Professors of Practice to be promoted given the guidelines in SD 18-15;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt the following revisions to SD 18-15 to require teaching as one basis for promotion for Clinical and Professors of Practice.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PROMOTION OF CLINICAL FACULTY AND PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE

(Information regarding promotion and tenure guiding principles for tenure track and tenured faculty can be found in SD 14-35)

PFW is a comprehensive university that is committed to maintaining a standard of excellence for teaching, scholarship and/or creative endeavor, and service in its diverse programs, departments, and schools/colleges. Maintaining this standard can be accomplished only by employing and promoting clinical faculty and professors of practice who share this mission.

The most important decisions in the academic profession, for clinical faculty, for professors of practice and for the institution, regard the awarding of promotion. Promotion is recognition of past achievement.

Clinical faculty and professors of practice provide invaluable contributions to the University community, its students, and the community at-large. It is through promotion that the University rewards those contributions. Retaining clinical faculty and professors of practice who are focused on blending theoretical and clinical knowledge, who provide practical instruction and the application of ~~practical~~professional- knowledge and skills, and who are more oriented to practice than to scholarship and/or creative endeavor ensures the University is able to meet its mission.

Significant diversity exists with respect to the needs and goals of programs, and the ways in which clinical faculty and professors of practice contribute to the university. Such diversity is essential to the intellectual health of the university and its success in meeting its mission. At the same time, pursuit of the university's mission and goals unifies all programs and gives a sense of shared purpose while preserving and fostering diversity of work. This document lays out guiding principles that are reflective of the university's mission, vision, goals, and values. Departments must define criteria for promotion for their clinical faculty and professors of practice that are appropriate for their respective disciplines, but that are also in keeping with these guiding principles.

The awarding of promotion is the university's recognition that individual clinical faculty members and professors of practice have successfully met their department's criteria, and in so doing, have worked to advance the university's mission and goals. Promotion criteria are the standards for summative judgment, and as such, must be guidelines for clinical faculty and professors of practice development. Departments must develop their own promotion policies, defining criteria for excellence and competence in teaching, scholarship and/or creative endeavor, and service at all levels. A department's policy should define what the department means by "teaching," "scholarship and/or creative endeavor," and "service," and list activities and achievements properly associated with those terms, along with qualitative standards by which they may be judged.

The promotion policies developed by each department must be clear, meaningful, and include

criteria for being promoted. They must be consistent in content with the guiding principles laid out in this document. The promotion policies and criteria adopted by a department must be used uniformly as the only standard by which to judge cases for promotion from that department.

All candidates for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor, Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice or Professor of Practice must demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship and/or creative endeavor, or service. Candidates must choose to demonstrate excellence in only one category. All candidates must also demonstrate competence in one other category. One category must be teaching. Clinical Instructors, Assistant Clinical Faculty and Associate Clinical Faculty, Instructors of Practice, Assistant Professors of Practice and Associate Professors of Practice may seek promotion after five years in-rank.

TEACHING

PFW faculty are expected to demonstrate a significant and ongoing commitment to advancing student learning and fostering student success. Such a commitment is reflected, in part, by remaining current in the content and pedagogy appropriate to one's discipline, but is also reflected in the continual consideration of one's own teaching effectiveness. This expectation extends to all faculty who teach, regardless of rank.

Teaching by clinical faculty and professors of practice occurs in a variety of contexts including, but not limited to, credit courses, non-credit programs and workshops, seminars, and continuing education programs, and the supervision of the clinical work of students / interns / practicum students. A range of activities that affect student learning – directly and indirectly – should be considered when documenting and evaluating one's teaching effectiveness. Documentation and formative evaluation should take place over time, and be informed by multiple measures that represent multiple perspectives (e.g., students, professional peers, self-evaluation). Demonstrating competency must include input from outside the department which might be on or beyond the campus. Demonstrating excellence must include input from outside PFW.

When teaching is the primary basis for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor and Assistant Professor of Practice, in addition to demonstrating an exemplary learning environment ~~teaching~~, the candidate's performance must exceed the standard of competence ~~for Instructor~~ in both qualitative and quantitative ways.

When teaching is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and Associate Professor of Practice, in addition to demonstrating an exemplary learning environment ~~teaching~~, the candidate's performance must clearly exceed the standard of ~~competence~~ excellence for Assistant Clinical Professor and Assistant Professor of Practice in **both** qualitative and quantitative ways.

When teaching is the primary basis for promotion to Clinical Professor and Professor of Practice, in addition to demonstrating an exemplary learning environment ~~teaching~~, the candidate should have made significant contributions to teaching, pedagogy, and/or instruction outside their department, and/or in the university system, and/or in their discipline that has led them to gain

recognition outside PFW appropriate to a faculty member at a regional comprehensive campus for their teaching and/or pedagogical work.

The specific standards of competence and excellence, as well as how they are to be documented and evaluated, shall be established by the department and articulated clearly in their promotion and tenure criteria document.

PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTIVITY OR SCHOLARSHIP AND/OR CREATIVE ENDEAVOR

PFW clinical faculty and professors of practice are expected to maintain currency in their discipline. One way to do so is to ~~and to~~ engage in professional productivity or scholarship and/or creative endeavors. The specific forms of this work and its reach must be defined by department criteria.

While assessing the professional productivity or scholarly and/or creative contributions of a candidate, some of the factors which may be important in establishing excellence are originality, significance, depth of consideration, contribution to the discipline, and relevance to the candidate's teaching. The evaluation of professional productivity or scholarly and/or creative contributions by authorities in the field is accomplished by a variety of means. Documentation concerning the frequency of opportunities for such work within the discipline, the stature of the publication, conference / meeting, the selection process (e.g. refereeing), as well as sources of funding may also be important in establishing excellence. Depending upon the discipline and area of endeavor, some combination of several or all of these aspects may be involved in building a case. The quantity of professional productivity or scholarship and/or creative endeavor is a sign of productivity; however, its quality is more important. The judgment of the candidate's work is primarily qualitative and it cannot be reduced to quantitative formulae. In general, the widely accepted evaluation practices within the discipline will determine what evidence a candidate includes in a promotion case. Demonstrating competence must include input from outside the department which might be on or beyond the campus. Demonstrating excellence must include input from outside PFW.

When professional productivity or scholarship and/or creative endeavor is the primary basis for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor and Assistant Professor of Practice, the candidate should have demonstrated appropriate achievement beyond the most recent degree in clinical or professional practice - as noted in the department's criteria document.

When professional productivity or scholarship and/or creative endeavor is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and Associate Professor of Practice, the candidate should have demonstrated appropriate achievement ~~as appropriate~~ beyond the standards for Assistant Clinical Professor or Assistant Professor of Practice for the discipline and as noted in the department's criteria document.

When scholarship and/or creative endeavor is the primary basis for promotion to Clinical Professor and Professor of Practice, the candidate should have gained national or international recognition appropriate to a faculty member at a regional comprehensive campus for their~~his or her~~ work.

The specific standards of competence and excellence, as well as how they are to be documented and evaluated, shall be established by the department and articulated clearly in their promotion and tenure criteria document.

SERVICE

PFW faculty at all ranks are expected to take an active role in the campus beyond teaching and scholarship and/or creative endeavor; they are encouraged to contribute their expertise on a community, regional, national, and/or international level and/or to participate in professional organizations. For clinical faculty and professors of practice this can be a significant, and maybe even primary, part of their appointment.

Department criteria should distinguish between professional activities (those related to the faculty member's discipline or assigned university duties, or to the mission of the university) and nonprofessional activities (those not so related). If a candidate wishes to introduce evidence of service beyond the scope of the department criteria, it is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the relevance of such service to their/his/her profession, disciplinary area, and/or role as a faculty member at PFW. The evidence to demonstrate excellence should include both quantity and quality of the service. The evaluation of service as excellent by authorities beyond the campus is accomplished by a variety of means. Demonstrating excellence must include input from outside PFW.

Unlike non-clinical faculty, clinical faculty and professors of practice are permitted to pursue promotion to any rank based on excellence in service. The service should be measured qualitatively and quantitatively.

When service is the primary basis for promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor and Assistant Professor of Practice, the candidate should have demonstrated service well-beyond the expectations of all faculty in that discipline in terms of quality and quantity.

When service is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and Associate Professor of Practice, the candidate should have demonstrated service well-beyond the expectations of all faculty in that discipline in terms of quality and quantity, with a significant impact at the department and/or the campus levels.

If service is the primary basis for promotion to Clinical Professor and Professor of Practice, it must represent a significant contribution to beyond the campus, the community, or the profession of significant impact. Significant impact-contribution goes beyond simply serving on a large number of committees or serving on particular committees for extended periods of time.

The specific standards of competence and excellence, as well as how they are to be documented and evaluated, shall be established by the department and articulated clearly in their promotion and tenure criteria document.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Wylie Sirk, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: November 28, 2022

SUBJ: Procedures of Promotion to include Professors of Practice

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate approved SD 14-36 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure; and

WHEREAS, Purdue allows for Professors of Practice and, thus, PFW can use the designation for faculty;

WHEREAS, Purdue defines Clinical/Professional Faculty as: “a promotable, but non-tenure track, faculty classification. These individuals provide education and/or supervision of students engaged in clinical and professional practice. Clinical/Professional Faculty may carry the title clinical professor, professor of practice or teaching professor. Each school may choose the appropriate title for their Clinical/Professional Faculty.” (Clinical/Professional Faculty Appointment and Promotion (VI.F.10)).

WHEREAS, it is expected that Professors of Practice will follow the same procedures of promotion as Clinical, tenure track and tenured professors;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt the following revisions to SD 14-36 to allow Professors of Practice to be promoted given the guidelines in SD 14-36.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE AND THIRD YEAR REVIEW

Purdue Fort Wayne and its autonomous academic units shall establish, within the timeframes and by means of guiding principles and criteria established in other documents, procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure according to the following procedures.

Autonomous academic units shall consist of those units subject to the powers of the Faculty detailed in Section VI of the Constitution of the Faculty; other units may, at their option, adhere to these guidelines and procedures.

The procedures for evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure ensure fair and consistent treatment of candidates. The procedures include multiple levels of review with clear expectations for each level. When considered in its entirety, the procedures create a coherent whole that includes a system of checks and balances. While there are variations between academic units, all procedures are based on these principles. If a department/program (department) or college/school/division (college) cannot comply with specific procedures in this document, they are expected to explain why they cannot and utilize a procedure that conforms as closely as possible to the procedures in this document. The explanation and amended procedure shall be included in a separate document with recommendations regarding cases for promotion and tenure.

The procedures and guiding principles for evaluating faculty for promotion and/or tenure are discussed in separate documents (see SD 14-35 & SD 18-15 for guiding principles), but the two are interrelated. The procedures for evaluating faculty members are the method for implementing the guiding principles.

Amendments to this document shall trigger reviews of college and department procedure documents. It shall be the responsibility of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, in concert with the Senate Secretary, to notify colleges and departments of any amendments to this document and the need to review their procedure documents.

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.

1. Document Review and Approval

1.1. Department documents

- 1.1.1. Departments must include procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure in documents.
- 1.1.2. Department procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in college and Senate documents.
- 1.1.3. Department criteria must align with college guiding principles.
- 1.1.4. Department procedures must be submitted to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for feedback and then reviewed and approved at the college level. The feedback from the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be forwarded to the college.
- 1.1.5. Department criteria must include:

- 1.1.5.1. Criteria for quality of performance (e.g. competence, excellence) in all relevant areas (e.g. teaching, service, research/creative endeavor) for all levels (e.g. associate professor, associate professor of practice, clinical professor, and full professor, librarian), except criteria for excellence in service to associate professor.
- 1.1.5.2. Rationale of the department for the criteria.
- 1.1.6. Department criteria must be reviewed and approved at the college level. The review by the college must focus on:
 - 1.1.6.1. The completeness of the department criteria document.
 - 1.1.6.2. The explanation of how the department criteria align with the guiding principles of the college. This explanation should reference credible evidence as to the appropriateness of the criteria for the discipline.
- 1.1.7. If a college rejects the criteria of a department, a thorough explanation of the rejection must be sent to the department.
- 1.1.8. If there is a disagreement between a department and college about criteria, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee will arbitrate the disagreement.
- 1.1.9. Upon passage of this document by the Senate, departments have one academic year to draft, approve, and seek review of department promotion and tenure documents.
- 1.2. College documents
 - 1.2.1. Colleges must include procedures and guiding principles in documents. Colleges may choose to elect the campus guiding principles as the guiding principles of the college.
 - 1.2.2. College procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in senate documents.
 - 1.2.3. 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.
- 2. Decision Levels: Nominations for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels. The quality of the evidence presented in the case is best evaluated at the department level. Candidates may respond in writing to recommendations at all levels. Written responses must be submitted within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and proceed with the case.
 - 2.1. The department committee
 - 2.1.1. Establishing the department committee: 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 college. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.
 - 2.1.2. Composition of the department committee:
 - 2.1.2.1. The majority of the departmental committee shall be persons possessing the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires.
 - 2.1.2.2. If, by established departmental criteria, fewer than three persons are eligible to serve on the department committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the college the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department

committee. From this list, the chief academic officer of the college shall

appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to between three and five.

- 2.1.2.3. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
- 2.1.2.4. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.
- 2.1.3. Primary Tasks: The department committee shall review the evidence presented in the case, compare the case to department criteria, and make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.1.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the department committee shall be based on the case and department criteria and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including commenting on the candidate's professional standing.
- 2.1.5. Other:
 - 2.1.5.1. Any full-time lecturer, clinical, professor of practice, tenure track or tenured faculty member at PFW shall have the opportunity to read and provide feedback on cases in their home department until 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.
- 2.2. The chief academic officer of the department
 - 2.2.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the department shall:
 - 2.2.1.1. Review the case and compare the case to department criteria.
 - 2.2.1.2. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
 - 2.2.1.3. Review the recommendation of the lower level.
 - 2.2.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.2.2. Letter of Recommendation: 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.
- 2.3. The college committee
 - 2.3.1. Establishing the college committee: The college committee composition and functions shall be established by the college faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the college, and approved by the Senate. This procedure shall be periodically published, simultaneously with the Bylaws of the Senate, as and when the Bylaws of the Senate are distributed.
 - 2.3.2. Composition of the college committee
 - 2.3.2.1. There is no requirement that the majority of the college committee members be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which a candidate aspires.
 - 2.3.2.2. Members of the college committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the college committee.

- 2.3.2.3. Members of the college committee may serve at the department level, but not at the campus level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the college committee.
 - 2.3.2.4. Members of the college committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be staggered and may not be longer than three years.
 - 2.3.2.5. Members of the college committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
 - 2.3.2.6. The chief academic officer of the college may not serve on the college committee or participate in the meetings.
 - 2.3.3. Primary Tasks: The college committee shall:
 - 2.3.3.1. 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.
 - 2.3.3.2. Review the recommendation of the lower levels.
 - 2.3.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.3.3.2.2. 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.
 - 2.3.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the college committee shall be based on the committee’s review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.4. The chief academic officer of the college
- 2.4.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the college shall:
 - 2.4.1.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
 - 2.4.1.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels. This review:
 - 2.4.1.2.1. Shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.4.1.2.2. May include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a decision from a lower level is judged to be contrary to the evidence.
 - 2.4.1.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.4.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the college shall be based on the chief academic officer’s review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.5. The Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee (a.k.a. the campus committee)
- 2.5.1. Establishing the campus committee
 - 2.5.1.1. Members of this committee shall be selected to staggered, three-year terms, by the Chief Administrative Officer of PFW and the two Speakers of the Faculty.

- 2.5.1.2. The committee members will be selected from a panel of nominees composed of at least two representatives from the faculty of each college elected according to procedures adopted by the college faculty and incorporated into the documents which define the protocols of faculty governance within the college and a person with prior service on a college committee. The vote totals from the elections shall be included with the panel of nominees.
- 2.5.2. Composition of the campus committee
- 2.5.2.1. The campus committee shall consist of seven (7) members.
- 2.5.2.2. A minimum of five (5) academic units must be represented on the campus committee and no more than three (3) members of the campus committee may be from one academic unit.
- 2.5.2.3. A majority of the members of the campus committee must be at the rank of professor, or librarian.
- 2.5.2.4. Members of the campus committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the campus committee.
- 2.5.2.5. Members of the campus committee may serve at the department level, but not at the college level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the campus committee.
- 2.5.2.6. Members of the campus committee may not serve consecutive terms.
- 2.5.2.7. Members of the campus committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
- 2.5.2.8. The chief academic officer of PFW may not serve on the campus committee or participate in the meetings.
- 2.5.3. Primary Tasks: The campus committee shall:
- 2.5.3.1. 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.
- 2.5.3.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels.
- 2.5.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
- 2.5.3.2.2. 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.
- 2.5.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.5.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the campus 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.
- 2.6. The chief academic officer of PFW
- 2.6.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of PFW shall:
- 2.6.1.1. Recognize the credibility of the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.6.1.2. Review split votes and/or inconsistencies in findings and recommendations at, and between, lower levels. When there is a split vote and/or inconsistency, the chief academic officer of PFW will focus the review on that part of the case dealing with the split vote and/or inconsistency.

- 2.6.1.3. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures.
- 2.6.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.6.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of PFW shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of recommendations from lower levels, the process to this point, and must clearly explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of the lower level(s).
- 2.7. The chief administrative officer of PFW shall forward recommendations to the President of Indiana University or to the President of Purdue University.
- 3. Case Process: Nominations for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels.
 - 3.1. The candidate must identify the criteria document that should be used to judge the case. The department criteria document used must have been in effect at some point during the six years preceding the submission of the case.
 - 3.2. All cases for promotion and/or tenure shall pass sequentially through the decision levels above.
 - 3.3. 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.
 - 3.4. Each decision level forwards only a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments or supplemental information.
 - 3.5. The administrator or committee chair at each level shall inform the candidate in writing of the vote tally or recommendation on the nomination, with a clear and complete statement of the reasons therefor, at the time the case is sent forward to the next level. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may submit a written response to the statement to the administrator or the committee chair within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and must proceed with the case. At the same time that the case is sent forward to the next level, the administrator or committee chair shall also send a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons, and the candidate's response, if any, to administrators and committee chairs at the lower level(s). Committee chairs shall distribute copies to committee members.
 - 3.6. The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential, and only the chair may communicate a committee's decision to the candidate and to the next level. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No abstentions or proxies are allowed. Committee members must be present during deliberations in order to vote.
- 4. Individual Participation
 - 4.1. Only tenured faculty may serve as voting members of promotion and tenure committees to Associate Professor and Professor
 - 4.2. Clinical Associate Professors ~~and Clinical Professors~~. Associate Professors of Practice and Professors of Practice may serve as voting

members for Clinical and Professor of Practice promotion cases.

- 4.3. 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.
- 4.4. The department level excepted, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before college committees.
- 4.5. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (college or campus).
- 4.6. Voting members of committees and chief academic officers shall recuse themselves from considering cases of candidates with whom they share significant credit for research or creative endeavor or other work which is a major part of the candidate's case or if they have other conflicts of interest. The committee will decide if committee members who collaborate with the candidate need to recuse themselves. The next highest administrator will decide if a chief academic officer who collaborated with the candidate needs to recuse her/himself.
- 4.7. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.
- 4.8. Chief academic officers who have written a letter of recommendation as part of 2.2.2. will recuse themselves from discussion or vote on that candidate's case at a higher level.

REVIEW OF PROGRESS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY TO TENURE AND PROMOTION

It is in the best interest of PFW to see its faculty succeed. One way to judge success for probationary faculty is to evaluate progress toward tenure and promotion at the midway point. The diversity of colleges and departments at PFW makes it difficult to develop a single procedure for reviewing progress of probationary faculty to tenure and promotion.

5. Development of Review Procedure: Departments must develop a procedure for reviewing progress of probationary faculty toward tenure and/or promotion that adheres to the following principles.
 - 5.1. The procedure must make use of annual reviews (discussing performance in the previous year) and annual reappointments (discussing progress toward promotion and tenure).
 - 5.2. Departments/programs must have a thorough formative review process that provides specific details about where improvement is needed and must be based on department criteria. The formative review must occur half way through the third year.
 - 5.3. The formative review must be voted on by the department promotion and_ tenure committee.
 - 5.4. The chief academic officer of the department must comment on the case and the review from the committee.
 - 5.5. The probationary faculty member must have opportunities to respond during_ the review.

- 5.6. If, at any point during the probationary period, a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending the reappointment of a probationary faculty, the input and vote of the promotion and tenure committee at the same level must be sought.

Department procedures for reviewing progress shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the college. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be consulted about any newly established review procedures and any changes to a review procedure. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

6. Senate Procedure to be used in the absence of a department or college procedure:

- 6.1. The required review of the progress of probationary faculty to tenure and/or promotion must make use of annual reviews (discussing performance in the previous year) and annual reappointments (discussing progress toward promotion and tenure).
- 6.2. This review must be formative and be based on department criteria.
- 6.3. This review must occur halfway through the third year.
- 6.4. This review must move forward with the reappointment documentation for that year.
- 6.5. This review must occur at the first two levels (department promotion and tenure committee and chief academic officer of the department referred to in 2.1 and 2.2 above) and result in a written recommendation from both levels.
- 6.6. This review must be voted on by the department promotion and tenure committee.
- 6.7. The chief academic officer of the department must comment on the case and the review from the committee.
- 6.8. The probationary faculty member must have opportunities to respond during the reviews.
- 6.9. If, at any point during the probationary period, a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending the reappointment of a probationary faculty, the input and vote of the promotion and tenure committee at the same level must be sought.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Steven Hanke, Chair of the Education Policy Subcommittee

DATE: 12/01/2022

SUBJ: Military Experience Policy

WHEREAS, Purdue University Fort Wayne (PFW) designated as a Military Friendly Institution; and

WHEREAS, Indiana statute (I.C. 21-42-7-2; <http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2020/ic/titles/021#21-42-7>) requires that each state educational institution shall adopt a policy to award educational credit to an individual with military courses which are part of the individual's military service and meet the standards of the American Council on Education for awarding academic credit; and

WHEREAS, the Indiana statute also specifies providing educational credit for the completion of CLEP, DSST, and Excelsior College examination scores; and

WHEREAS, the Indiana statute also stipulates that the amount of credits transferred though the JST, and CLEP, DSST and Excelsior College exams may not exceed 70% of an individual's degree requirements for online programs or 75% for in person programs; and

WHEREAS, during the transition from IPFW to PFW, Faculty Senate withdrew SD 17-25 which sought to amend the policy of awarding undistributed credit based on the length of military service (i.e., 0-6 months = no credit; 6-12 months = 4 credits; 12+ months = 8 credits) to include:

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

WHEREAS, PFW Academic Regulation 7.3 states "Credit for military service. Each school/division shall decide whether credit for participation in military service may be applied toward a degree"; and

WHEREAS, Purdue University has no system-wide policy on awarding military credit; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the policy for awarding educational credit for military courses read:

Distributed or undistributed credit will be awarded, based on evaluation by appropriate PFW disciplinary faculty, to optimize student academic progress and paths to degree completion while meeting expectations of professional accreditation and associations, for

all Joint Service Transcript (JST)¹ ACE academic credit recommendations at the undergraduate level. For military students, the maximum number of transferrable credits through the JST, CLEP, DANTES and Excelsior Exams may not exceed 70% of an individual's degree requirements for online programs or 75% for in person programs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Catalog be edited, according to the following page, to reflect this new approach.

¹ The JST is an official education transcript tool for documenting the recommended college credits for professional military education, training courses, and occupational experiences of Service members across the Services.

To keep information together regarding all transfer options for students with military service, the section will include all transfer options specified in the Indiana statute.

UG Catalog

Academic Regulations, Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct

Special Credit, Credit for Military Service, and Excess Undergraduate Credit

7.0: Special Credit, Credit for Military Service, and Excess Undergraduate Credit

7.3: Credit for military service. Distributed or undistributed credit will be awarded, based on evaluation by appropriate PFW disciplinary faculty, to optimize student academic progress and paths to degree completion while meeting expectations of professional accreditation and associations, for all Joint Service Transcript (JST) ACE academic credit recommendations at the undergraduate level. For military students, the maximum number of transferrable credits through the JST, CLEP, DAN TES and Excelsior Exams may not exceed 70% of an individual's degree requirements for online programs or 75% for in person programs. Transfer for military personnel include:

- Distributed or undistributed credit, based on evaluation by appropriate PFW disciplinary faculty, for all JST ACE undergraduate level academic credit recommendations.
- Distributed or undistributed credit for transfer of courses from other institutions in accordance with established PFW transfer credit policies.
- Distributed or undistributed credit as established by the appropriate PFW disciplinary faculty for CLEP scores of 50 or higher.
- Distributed or undistributed credit as established by the appropriate PFW disciplinary faculty for DSST scores of 400 or higher.
- Distributed or undistributed credit as established by the appropriate PFW disciplinary faculty for Excelsior College examination scores of C or higher.

Information about admission will also be amended to ensure that students with military service know to submit their JST.

Policies

Admission

- **Students with military service**
 - To be considered for admission, an applicant must apply, provide all required documentation, and pay an application fee.
 - Documentation includes an official Joint Service Transcript (JST), official transcripts from all colleges attended, and test scores, as applicable, on CLEP, DSST, and/or Excelsior College examinations.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: The Senate Executive Committee

DATE: December 16, 2022

SUBJECT: Shared Governance and Consideration of Greek Life

WHEREAS, the PFW Division of Enrollment Management and the Student Experience has announced a [feasibility study](#) to bring Greek life to the Purdue University Fort Wayne per the November 15, 2022 Inside PFW – Special Edition email to the campus community,

WHEREAS, [section 5.3.4.2. of the Senate bylaws](#) state that the Student Affairs Committee “shall be concerned with the general social, cultural, and practical welfare of all PFW students [...] and other matters which would enhance the university environment of the student for learning and living;”

WHEREAS, the Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management and the Student Experience is a member of the Student Affairs Committee with the expectation that they share information and work collaboratively with the Student Affairs Committee to better serve our students; and

WHEREAS, the Student Affairs Committee received no information about said Division’s consideration of Greek life on campus;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Division of Enrollment Management and the Student Experience abstain from making major plans without involving the appropriate Senate committees; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the ex officio member representing the Division of Enrollment Management and the Student Experience on the Student Affairs Committee share information relevant to the committee’s responsibilities in a spirit of a shared concern for the well-being of our students.

SENATE QUESTION

In SD 22-6, the Purdue Fort Wayne faculty spoke with a clear and unified voice: we want information about the way the administration approved and handled the visit of the outside organization, Created Equal, which during its visit, according to accounts by students, faculty, and staff, harassed PFW students, and after its visit posted demeaning videos of interactions with PFW students on YouTube. Faculty support of this document was on display again at the Nov. 14 senate meeting, after Chancellor Elsenbaumer presented a memorandum that did not answer a single question that was included in 22-6, but instead directed concerned campus members to form a committee that would “engage in a collaborative dialogue” toward the goal of developing an understanding “of university policies and principles, how they were applied in this instance, and what appropriate next steps might be in evaluating our current policies and practices.” This committee will be an “ad hoc committee,” and it could include members of the Senate Executive Committee and the Student Affairs Committee as well as interested faculty, staff, and students. Vice Chancellor Nakata has suggested in subsequent communications that this ad hoc committee could function in coordination with or as part of the Public Safety committee.

While deliberative work will need to be done to determine the best course of action moving forward when it comes to policies towards outside groups coming to campus, the following questions included in 22-6 do not require deliberation but answers to them are necessary before any deliberation, discussion, and reconsideration can take place:

- Were any meetings held, virtually, in person, or over email, about the visit in advance?
- Was anyone with trauma-informed training involved in screening “Created Equal,” and has anyone with trauma-informed training been involved in conversations among the administration since the visit? If so, who?
- Did the organization have an on-campus sponsor? If so, who?
- Was the PFW Solicitation Policy followed?
- Who approved Created Equal’s appearance on campus?
- Who worked with Created Equal on the Request to Solicit form? A copy of this form should exist on file with the university. Can we see whether any conditions were included in the arrangements, for example, something that would explain absence of any advance promotion of the event?
- Who helped with other arrangements in advance of the visit?
- According to the campus policy, a campus representative must review all materials an outside group brings to campus. Who did this for the Created Equal visit?

Moving beyond the specific event and specific outside organization,

•Are there any consequences for outside organizations that do not adhere to existing PFW solicitation policy?

Noor Borbieva
Chris Erickson
Michelle Kelsey

Suzanne LaVere
Ann Livschiz
Nancy Virtue