

Minutes of the  
Special Meeting of the Third Senate  
Purdue University Fort Wayne  
May 3, 2021  
Via Webex

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Acceptance of the agenda – B. Buldt
3. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 20-47) – H. Di
4. Question time
  - a. (Senate Reference No. 20-32) – J. Badia
  - b. (Senate Reference No. 20-41) – G. Schmidt
  - c. (Senate Reference No. 20-42) – S. Carr
  - d. (Senate Reference No. 20-53) – J. Egger
5. Committee reports “for information only”
  - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-45) – S. LeBlanc
  - b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-46) – S. LeBlanc
  - c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-47) – S. LeBlanc
  - d. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-48) – S. LeBlanc
  - e. Graduate Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-49) – K. Fineran
  - f. Graduate Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-50) – K. Fineran
  - g. Graduate Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-51) – K. Fineran
  - h. Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Procedural Handling of Allegations of Misconduct in the PFW Women’s Basketball Program (Senate Reference No. 20-52) – S. Buttes
6. The general good and welfare of the University
7. Adjournment\*

\*The meeting will adjourn or recess by 2:15 p.m.

---

Presiding Officer: J. Toole  
Parliamentarian: C. Ortsey  
Sergeant-at-arms: G. Steffen  
Assistant: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“College of Engineering, Technology and Computer Science, Promotion and Tenure Documents” (SD 20-47)  
“Question Time – re: Locks on Classrooms” (SR No. 20-32)  
“Question Time – re: ODMA Staffing” (SR No. 20-41)  
“Question Time – re: Stimulus Act Funds” (SR No. 20-42)  
“Question Time – re: Orientation and Registration New Majors” (SR No. 20-53)

“Theater Department Musical Theater BFA” (SR No. 20-45)  
 “Education STEM Proposal” (SR No. 20-46)  
 “Organizational Leadership Concentration” (SR No. 20-47)  
 “ILCS Proposal for Minor in Professional Spanish” (SR No. 20-48)  
 “Education Specialist” (SR No. 20-49)  
 “M.S. in Educational Leadership” (SR No. 20-50)  
 “Concentration in Human Resource Management” (SR No. 20-51)  
 “Spring 2021 Committee Report” (SR No. 20-52)

Senate Members Present:

J. Badia, S. Betz, Z. Bi, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, M. Cain, S. Carr, Z. Chen, Y. Deng, H. Di, S. Ding, P. Dragnev, C. Drummond, P. Eber, J. Egger, B. Elahi, K. Fineran, R. Friedman, S. Hanke, D. Holland, P. Jing, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, C. Lawton, J. Lewis, A. Livschiz, L. Lolkus, A. Marshall, J. Mbuba, A. Mohammadpour, M. Parker, S. Randall, S. Roberts, G. Schmidt, H. Strevel, T. Swim, L. Whalen, S. Wight, M. Wolf, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

K. Creager, D. Bauer, B. Chen, A. Coronado, K. Dehr, R. Elsenbaumer, M. Gruys, M. Johnson, C. Lee, A. Mills, J. O’Connell, N. Rupp, A. Smiley, R. Stone, J. Stover, A. Ushenko, D. West, Y. Zhang, M. Zoghi

Guests Present:

M. Ball, N. Borbieva, K. Burtnette, J. Cashdollar, F. Combs, S. Davis, C. Erickson, M. Frye, C. Gurgur, T. Heath, M. Helmsing, J. Hersberger, S. Johnson, C. Kuznar, S. LeBlanc, T. Luce, J. Malanson, C. Marcuccilli, S. Miller, I. Nunez, E. Ohlander, C. Randall, C. Springer, N. Virtue

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Toole called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

J. Toole: This is a special meeting of the Senate, called by the Executive Committee in accordance with Section 2.1.2. of the Senate by-laws. Among the ways in which a special meeting differs from a regular Senate meeting are two of particular importance today. First is that the Executive Committee has the ability to set the agenda, which does not need to conform to the agenda format of a regular Senate meeting. Thus you’ll see that today’s meeting dispenses with several of our usual agenda sections, including approval of past minutes, faculty speaker and Presiding Officer remarks, and New Business. A second way in which a special meeting differs from a regular meeting is that the agenda cannot be amended. Thus, today we will address only those items included in the agenda distributed to all Senators on Friday.

The Executive Committee’s goal has been to include only those items that are absolutely necessary to include. First, we wanted to ensure that we addressed all items still awaiting our attention on the April agenda, which were three Question Time questions as well as one anticipated item of New Business, which we here have listed as a Committee Report Requiring Action. Second, we also included under Committee Reports for Information Only several items that had been approved by Senate committees and subcommittees

since the document submission deadline for the April meeting. Finally, we included one additional question, posed by a member of the Executive Committee and with the approval of the entire Executive Committee, concerning an important issue of university-wide concern that could not wait until September to be addressed.

Before we begin, I'd also like to point out that the need to call a special session by no means represents a failure of Senate to do its business well. This has been an extraordinary year with an exceptionally heavy Senate workload and a means of doing Senate business—otherwise known as Webex—that inevitably has slowed our ability to work as efficiently as we are able to work when we are all together in the same physical room. We have worked as efficiently as possible while also allowing for thoughtful, reasoned debate. It just so happens that we need one additional week to complete our work in this very unusual Senate year. I'd like to thank all Senators for their cooperation and for their continued commitment to the business of Senate.

Are there any questions before we proceed?

(No questions were asked).

2. Acceptance of the agenda:

B. Buldt moved to accept the agenda.

Agenda approved by voice vote.

3. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 20-47) – H. Di

H. Di moved to approve Senate Document SD 20-47 (College of Engineering, Technology and Computer Science, Promotion and Tenure Documents).

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

4. Question time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 20-32) – J. Badia

I faced a situation this semester where I needed to lock the deadbolt on my classroom to keep out a non-enrolled student who was disrupting my class while we waited for campus police to arrive. The experience left me grateful that I had the option to flip a deadbolt and prevent a possible escalation of the scene. I know there are still many classrooms without deadbolts, unfortunately. When will Building Services complete the project of putting locks on all classrooms across campus? I've not been able to get an answer to this question through conventional routes.

J. Badia: Thanks, Jamie. Just for some context, I had tried to get information about this issue a couple of years ago and then this spring. I also, through email, tried to get the answers to this question. So, I have made effort before bringing this to Senate to get answers.

J. Toole: That is great. Thank you very much, Janet. Let me say two things before we move on. First, I want to thank Janet for attempting to get answers from elsewhere in the university before posing this to Senate. That is a standard that the Executive Committee uses in deciding whether to include questions in question time. We hope that people will try to seek out answers, and if they are unable to do so, and the question has university wide concern, as this one certainly does, then it is certainly appropriate to bring to the Executive Committee.

The other thing I wanted to say, and I meant to say this before asking Janet to speak on her question because this affects all of the questions, is that the Chancellor has notified us that he is unable to attend the meeting today because of a board meeting. My understanding is that he has not delegated anyone else to answer in his stead. We have also been told, however, that he will be sending written answers to at least the first three questions that we have posed to the Executive Committee, and so we intend to distribute those written answers after the fact, as we usually do with Senate minutes. I don't expect that we will have any answers to the four questions that have been posed today. However, we do welcome discussion from Senators on these four questions. We realize this is not ideal, but it does allow the Senate to at least discuss these questions and put the questions on record, and hopefully soon enough the Senate will also have some written answers to these.

N. Younis: Thank you, Jamie. At 12:59 the Chancellor sent the written answers to the faculty leaders, and I think to Josh. So, I don't know. You should have it in your email probably. It is the written answers. I don't know if you can admit it or not.

J. Toole: Thank you very much, Nash. I did not see that. I am reluctant to admit that because I know that the Chancellor likes to...I don't really know how to handle this. My position was that if the answers did arrive at the spur of the moment then we would just go ahead and discuss. I know that the Chancellor does like to present his answers in person and I don't have my email open here anyway. I know that is not a very satisfactory response, but I think that we are probably best off discussing the questions as a Senate. So, is there further discussion of this first question?

A. Livschiz: I don't know what the answer is to this one. I can understand that one of the questions was given later, but these three questions have been available as questions to the Chancellor for quite some time. I feel like especially with this first question, we all know that obviously Building Services have been very busy in the last year dealing with all sorts of pandemic safety related issues, but we now have a summer ahead of us where at least in theory there are not going to be any new safety measures being put in place. The summer seems like a perfect time to deal with this situation. I guess if that is not part of the answer to this question, we don't really have

time to revisit this again until August, at which point it might be too late to do anything about it because Building Services are going to be busy since there are more people on campus than there were before. I feel like there is a slight urgency to this, and that maybe we could see what the answer is.

J. Toole: Okay. Thank you very much, Ann. Yes, let's see. I don't really know how to handle this, and I guess it is my job to figure out how to handle this. I am currently also looking in my email.

C. Drummond: I am happy to paste the responses into the chat as we discuss each question if you would find that helpful.

J. Toole: Yes, thank you. I am just looking at the email that the Chancellor sent, and he did say he would like to submit these written answers. So, that is very good. We are respecting the Chancellor's wishes, I think, and Carl, thank you very much. Now that I have read the email, I think it is very appropriate to paste the answers in. Thank so much for doing that, Carl.

I think Carl has just pasted the answer in. I will give everyone a moment to take a look at that answer and then I will move to anyone who has raised their hand for further discussion.

Another way we could do this is that I think Josh would be able to email the answers to the Senate list.

R. Elsenbaumer: (Email response). All of the classrooms in Kettler Hall and Neff Hall have had the doors retrofitted with the quick-action bolts. This was completed in summer of 2019.

Locks have been replaced in classrooms that have been renovated in the Science Building and the Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science Building. Locks will also be replaced on the two classrooms that are being renovated this summer (2021) in the Liberal Arts Building.

As you might have expected, plans to continue installing locks in additional classrooms were paused last summer (2020), due to the fact that the university was responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and preparing campus for the return of students, faculty, and staff in the fall. Facilities Management needed to focus its resources on more urgent priorities aimed at keeping the campus, especially classrooms, prepared for lessening the potential for the spread of the COVID-19 virus.

While a target completion date for installing locks in additional classrooms has not yet been determined, these locks will be continually installed as rooms are renovated/updated and resources are available and budgeted, as we are doing this summer in the Liberal Arts Building.

J. Badia: I appreciate the Chancellor's response, and I appreciate that there is a long-term plan. It would seem, at the very least, we haven't abandoned our original plan to do deadbolts, but I got to say that I find the explanation that it is COVID that has slowed this up unsatisfactory because this well predates COVID. I can recall at least three, maybe even longer, years ago, Chris Erickson raising this issue a number of times. I know it has come up before.

It just seems to me that we have lost the will to make the deadbolts a priority. Personally, as someone who has had to use one and was terrified, I had students in my classroom with mace in their hands, waiting for the campus police to arrive. If you have not been in this situation, it is horrible. It is terrifying. I just can't impress enough on our campus enough, the importance the deadbolts will play in our security.

If you pay any attention to the news these days, obviously we have a significant problem on this campus and in this country right now with violence and people going off the rails. I really want to just use this opportunity to urge the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to use whatever power he might have over Building Services because this is a faculty and teaching staff issue. This is a safety issue for faculty and students. I just want to urge everybody to take this more seriously and to prioritize it, and to really make it a summer project and plan it out so that we can come back.

It is also at this stage, an equity issue. If some colleges have access to classrooms where they can easily deadbolt their door, while those of us who teach in, say, the Liberal Arts Building or VPA or wherever don't, this is a major discrepancy. Thank you.

S. Betz: I wanted to say that I agree with Janet. I think this is an issue that you don't think is an issue or is as important as it is until you realize that it should have been a big issue. Without having the Chancellor here to ask what the holdup is, if it is finances, I guess I have a question, which is, if departments have this as a higher priority than the university does, can departments use part of their own budgets to install these locks, at least on their priority classrooms, if the university is not going to prioritize it?

b. (Senate Reference No. 20-41) – G. Schmidt

I've heard concerning things about staffing in the Office of Diversity & Multicultural Affairs with regard to people being let go or RIFed. Could we get an update on what is happening currently in ODMA and the rationale behind any current actions?

G. Schmidt: I will note that since I have sent this in, there was a document about restructuring, or something I think was out. But, I still have not heard an overall discussion on it, so the question stands.

R. Elsenbaumer: (Email response). Last December, The Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs moved from the Office of Student Affairs to the newly created Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI). This transition was a direct result of recommendations that emerged from the university's strategic planning process, and implementation recommendations.

Under the leadership of our new chief diversity officer, Dr. MarTeze Hammonds, the vision and direction of the newly formed Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (which includes ODMA) continues to be developed and implemented. When Dr. Hammonds arrived, I asked him to take a look at his functional units and determine how best they should align with the strategic mission and vision of Embracing Diversity Equity and Inclusion at Purdue Fort Wayne.

As part of his recent 120-day update on activity in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Dr. Hammonds announced a new structure for his functional units, which included a reorganization of the ODMA office to be in line with the structures of the other units reporting to him; which consist of two full-time positions, that more accurately reflect the strategic duties and responsibilities of the units—a director and a program assistant.

G. Schmidt: I appreciate the overall context of what is going on. I do have a question about how many people overall were impacted by this, as well as, do we have less people working in this area than before? What is the change? I didn't see anything in the answer related to people affected by this. I know how at least one person was affected by this change, which I don't see. I don't know the overall picture very well.

A. Livschiz: I don't know what the rules are for this sort of thing, but I wonder if it makes sense for the Chief Diversity Officer to actually be part of Senate, the way that other certain senior administrators automatically are. It just seems like a lot of the concerns and questions that are raised in Senate discussions do touch on issues of diversity and equity, and I am sure he hears about them, but it just seems like having him here would benefit us or him.

c. (Senate Reference No. 20-42) – S. Carr

According to an estimate from the American Council on Education, Purdue University Fort Wayne should get an additional \$18.5 million from the newly passed stimulus act.

1. When will the university make a public announcement regarding the precise amount we will receive?
2. Will Senate have an opportunity to weigh in with recommendations on how that money gets spent, before decisions get reached on how to spend it?

R. Elsenbaumer: (Email response). Quote from the Department of Ed in their FAQs April 30, 2021: "To-date, ED has not released HEERF III allocated amounts by

institution. However, the NASFAA website includes an article, [American Council on Education Estimates New HEERF Allocations](#), which estimates the distribution of HEERF III funds across approximately 3,500 colleges and universities.”

Purdue University Fort Wayne has received little guidance or a timeline regarding additional funds (so called CARES III, or HEERF III grant) that may be available to the university as a result of the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund. Thus far, we have received no official notification of this grant award. However, as with the previous CARES I and CARES II funding, these funds are highly restricted only for COVID related expenditures, student emergency aid, and highly selective lost-revenue sources, and are not discretionary funds.

S. Carr: I was just looking over the Chancellor’s response to that question, and it looks like the campus has received very little guidance from the Department of Education in terms of what the actual amount is. It also looks like the money will be very restricted and only for COVID related expenses. So, I would note that I don’t think the two questions that were asked in what I originally submitted got answered, again, mainly when there will be a public announcement, assuming that there is more guidance provided from the university, and then, two, whether Senate will have the opportunity to weigh in with any recommendations before that money gets spent.

Finally, I would just add, I think it is a little concerning that with the current drop in enrollments, that if there is a financial consequence to that for 21-22, that especially with this money coming in, that Senate would not have the opportunity to weigh in on any decisions related to either a decrease in budget or additional possible restructuring that could take place as a result of the decline in enrollments. Thanks.

J. Malanson: I just wanted to quickly address the second part of this, and to kind of provide a bit more detail on Chancellor Elsenbaumer’s written response, which is that the university is not receiving, as with CARES I and CARES II, the university does not receive a pool of money that it can then just use as it sees fit.

The university under CARES I, half of the dollars had to go to student assistance and support, and the other half of the dollars went to reimbursement of COVID related expenses carried out by the university. So, we had to spend money before we could have those funds reimbursed by the first CARES act.

In the case of CARES II, and I believe there have still been no disbursements of CARES II money, but in the case of the second pool of money that was allocated, again, in that case, it was a quarter of the funds had to go to student aid and student assistance programs. At least a quarter had to go to that purpose, and then the rest could either go to, again, reimbursement of COVID related expenses or we had some ability to reclaim lost revenue through that second CARES fund. So, for example, in that case of lost revenue, the university had some money rescinded by the state of Indiana, as part of their financial approach to COVID-19, that we could potentially claim through reimbursement as lost revenue under that CARES II.



Presumably, CARES III will have some similar restrictions in place on it, but it is really important to emphasize, especially in light of the follow up comment that Steve Carr made, that the university isn't just being given \$18 million to spend as it sees fit, but instead those funds have to be used to directly support students most likely, and then to reimburse expenses that have been undertaken to support COVID operations at the university. We are very restricted in what we can do with that, and in most cases, that money is used to either directly replace lost revenue or to reimburse for expenses that have already been made.

d. (Senate Reference No. 20-53) – J. Egger

Given what we know about the importance of relationship in student retention, and the anxiety that is caused by confusing processes and uninformed answers to questions about the intricacies of degree programs, what is the rationale for faculty advisors in the students' school or department ostensibly being cut out of the process by having limited and last access to their new majors for orientation and registration, including not being given their names prior to their arrival for the one hour that has been allotted to the college and school or department?

J. Toole: Thank you very much, John. Now, I haven't had a chance to look at the email from the Chancellor, but my understanding is that he did not provide a written answer for this fourth question, which of course, did come to the Chancellor later than the first three. So, if I am right about that, then all we can do here is have any discussion that anyone would wish to have. The floor is open.

S. Buttes: I guess I am as baffled as anyone else. If the point of creating a new advising unit on campus is to aid students coming into the university it doesn't really make any practical sense why they are being turned over to faculty who don't even know who they are for an hour. I don't really understand the point of this. Also, if you go and look at some of the best practices or standards that the advising unit is saying is going to govern the work that they do, this pretty much goes in direct violation of those. It is pretty much doing the opposite of what those best practices and standards say that they should do. Just as a practical question, I would say that they need to share the names of students with faculty. Otherwise, we are wasting people's time to run redundant reports and things like this. I think it just points to maybe a broader conversation that we should be having as faculty about a new unit on campus, which ostensibly is being charged with teaching, since that is how they are defining advising. And to really sort of ask ourselves, should we be outsourcing teaching, and responsibility and authority over teaching in this way? Thank you.

P. Eber: I have been working closely with Corrie Fox on this and she has met with me. It is my understanding that they will be sending student names to all the advisors that are assigned to various units on campus and we can access that. A faculty advisor will be assigned to each freshman as they come in to do cooperative advising with

this new unit. So, I think if we reach out to our Student Success Center and our assigned advisors, non-faculty advisors, they should be able to help.

A. Livschiz: I have a lot to say on this, but I will be brief to make sure that I don't monopolize the conversation. I would just like to say one thing. I totally appreciate the fact that the question was submitted later than the other questions. The Chancellor is well within his right to not be able to answer it. But, I do think it is important to point out that this information was deliberately kept from us until the last possible moment and only released to us now. So, the fact that the question was late was due to the fact that this information was not made available to us until very late in the game. I think that this is very much part of the overall problem with the current situation, which this is just one of the many manifestations.

J. Egger: Patricia, to kind of follow up on that, I did ask our college advisor about this particular situation and the response was that we would only receive a number on the New Student Orientation day, and that we would only have access to a list of just of who the students have signed up for. As for the Student Success Center, it may have been two weeks ago we have requested a meeting and no response has been given yet.

P. Eber: I would ask to make sure to contact Corrie. Send it out again. Perhaps she missed it. It did take a little bit to get a meeting because she is so busy right now, but she spent an hour and she also has information that she can send to you on the process through email. So, I would just email her again, or Kent Johnson, as well.

R. Friedman: I just want to confirm what John Egger said. We got the same message here in COAS, that we would get the number of students, but not individual names before NSO. The only other thing I would add is that the deans are also trying this week to have a meeting set up with Corrie. We were told that Kent Johnson is on vacation this week. Hopefully we will be able to have that meeting this week and get some more information. Thanks, Jamie.

J. Toole: You bet. Thank you so much, Ron. That is a good opportunity for me to just mention that the faculty leaders and I, and Bernd Buldt, as chair of the Executive Committee, are planning to meet with Carl, and Kent, and perhaps Krissy as well, if not this week then next week, when our schedules align.

S. Betz: Based on my understanding of this issue, for me it is an example of an ongoing way that campus operates, especially when it comes to prospective students, which is, if we request information, the response is, "what information do you want and why do you need it?" versus a mentality of "we really need to recruit students and make them feel welcome on campus, here is all the information various offices on campus have, let's share it with as many people as possible to try to recruit students. How can everyone help?" We are not a campus of 50,000 students. We might not even be 5,000 students in the fall. The approach to operating campuses of those different sizes is very different. When we are under 5,000 students, there is the potential for someone to get to know a student very well. It is just a little unclear of

why we are not taking that approach to recruit students and instead setting up little silos where people just know small snippets of student information. I think in the end it has the potential to hurt our recruitment and retention.

S. Carr: I just wanted to underscore what I think I understood Stacy to say, and also some comments that Ann and Steve had made originally. We hear on this campus a lot of lip service being paid to what is best for students, some of that seems questionable and a leverage point to get someone's personal pet project off the ground. I just have to ask at this moment, how is this kind of hoarding of information, that Stacy had alluded to, really the best thing for our students? Why is it that in these kinds of clutch moments on campus, we find faculty expertise being shunned instead of welcomed as part of the cooperative and collaborative process? It is just worth asking, where was Senate in the development of these plans? How was Senate involved in any meaningful way? Again, I would say, does the shunning of faculty expertise on this or other issues really serve our students? Does sidelining and marginalizing the kind of oversight that Senate has in terms of all matters of the curriculum, including advising, really in the best interests of our students? That is all I have to say. Thanks.

A. Livschiz: I also want to echo what Stacy said. The hoarding of information on this campus is absolutely insane. I have literally had to beg and get special permission to get various reports that are crucial to my ability to reach out to students in distress and to be able to work on retention strategies, specifically directed towards them. It is absolutely exhausting how hard it is to get that necessary information, especially when we claim to make decisions that are data driven.

Just to give an example not totally related to NSO, apparently some students received an email saying that they were entitled to free classes this summer, but there was no effort to notify departments which students they were, and when I tried to get a report, apparently the report doesn't include the majors of the students. Wouldn't that be super helpful information for departments to have in order to help the students in distress to make sure that they can get caught up over the summer? But, as far as the complete disregard for departments and the needs of departments and faculty expertise, we received an email from Corrie, at least in COAS, saying that there is going to be a meeting for advisors from COAS the week before NSO starts and this will be our chance to meet the new advisors that they hired and to tell them about our programs. This was a week before the start of NSO. So, the idea is that we the people who are in these departments who have been advising students, in some cases for decades, can't be trusted to even know their names ahead of time, but people who have been on campus for a month are going to, in the span of an hour long meeting, learn all the intricacies of the various programs and are going to be the ones who are actually advising them. It is just mind-boggling to me. Withholding the names from us so that we come into these meetings not knowing who is going to be there makes us look unprepared. It makes us look unprofessional. It makes us look like we promised we can offer personalized attention, but we can't actually demonstrate that in practice at the very first encounter that the students are going to have with us. I

don't understand why the new policy was determined to make departments look as bad as possible, especially given how important it is for the university to retain, recruit, and register.

M. Parker: Just to go off of what Ann was mentioning about being notified after the fact, about the email that went out about the free courses over the summer, I had a student approach me and ask me what I know about these free courses for the summer. I said, "I haven't heard anything, it must be a rumor." A week later, I get the email on the advisor listserv that says that this email had gone out. That made me look unknowledgeable about what was going on at the university, which I don't appreciate. Then there was a second email in the listserv that just came out that said that they just sent out another email to 3,000 students that they could get credit hours of summer courses for free. Then there was a little blurb that said not to tell everybody because it only went out to a selective portion of the student body. My question is, I don't even know what the criteria was for those 3,000 students, so how do I promote to my students to take advantage of these offers if I don't know who is involved in them and what the criteria is to select them? I really believe that we are being cut out of everything and it is being tightly managed externally for us.

S. Betz: I know the people who it might be useful to hear this are not in this meeting right now, but if the Senate leadership is successful in having a meeting about this I just wanted to give two clear-cut examples of what I was referring to earlier about a lack of information.

A few years ago, our department requested to get non-PFW email addresses for students who had been accepted to PFW but hadn't yet committed to coming because the list we got only had what their PFW email address was. It was very difficult to get anyone to understand why those students would probably not be checking their PFW email yet since they were still high school students that hadn't yet committed to coming. We were successful. It took nine months, but we were successful in getting that information and Cheryl was key in ensuring that she continued to help us beat down the bushes to get that.

We are currently in the same process with getting cell phone numbers for students. We are on month four of that right now. Admissions will give them to us, but we have to ask them specifically for that. We have been told no that we can't get it as part of a regular report. That includes information from students about whether or not they want to receive text messages, which I think is us trying to respect their wishes and not just texting a number without knowing whether or not they want it.

I think Ann's word about calling it exhausting is true. This is burning out faculty who truly want to do something to improve recruitment and retention, and it is making it harder for people who maybe don't really know how to do as much recruitment and retention work as possible. They are learning how to do it, but don't really have the tools needed. One thing that I think is really important for us as faculty to make sure we do is that at least I want to truly collaborate. I think part of what the problem is is

that we set up a “who is going to do it,” but it should be everyone doing it together. That is a part that I think we are going to need to move forward on and that we need to emphasize, otherwise it won’t be solved.

P. Dragnev: I wanted to say that it is really important for some programs for students to connect with faculty at the very beginning. I will give you an example with the Actuarial program where students meet with the director of the Actuarial program, Joe Francis, even on the NSO day. It is that important. It has led to significant accomplishments where our students have been able to obtain internships with local companies, really great companies, like Central Insurance and Lincoln Financial, during their first summer. This is kind of unheard of. We as a small institution can actually do this for our students. I really hope that this gets sorted out, and I will work tirelessly, so that faculty advisors can be involved on day one with collaboration with the advisors from the central advising office. Thank you.

A. Livschiz: I want to, once again, emphasize a point that Stacy made, but with a caveat. I do think, obviously, having many people hear about student success is obviously good, but I think a partnership can only work if there is genuine commitment to that partnership on both sides. I feel like given the pattern of hoarding information, which is obviously at its peak right now, but certainly has been a pattern before, for example, last summer, we were not given all of the intake forms for students and at least in some cases having that information would have been helpful for retention purposes.

I think that the spirit of partnership is very much absent and instead all of these policies just emphasize how little the university seems to value what it is that we do. Leaving aside the fact that this is insulting, at the end of the day we are ones that are going to be held responsible for our students, so we need to have this information. I am really frustrated. I am frustrated by the fact that the Chancellor is not here, of course. But, I am also frustrated by the fact that midway through this discussion Carl logged off. I know Pat suggested that we send more emails to Corrie and that if we are persistent then maybe somebody would respond to us, but it seems to me that this is about running down the clock. We were given this information at the last possible moment and at the most inconvenient time for faculty, which is finals week. In a week the semester is going to end and NSO is going to come one way or the other, and we are still not going to be anywhere, while different groups are begging for an audience with somebody who can give us information just so we can do our jobs effectively.

B. Buldt: I cannot really make a decision here on behalf of the Executive Committee, but what I will announce is that I will ask the Executive Committee, and then the Executive Committee to ask Josh, our secretary, to make the minutes a high priority item and we get the minutes out as quickly as possible so that all of the concerns that were raised, and I think all of these were good concerns to voice, that we get them out to all of the stakeholders in the process so that the information is out there for everyone to see. That was just my footnote. Thank you.

S. Carr: I just want to point out one other thing that maybe didn't get mentioned in this discussion, but I think it is also important in a way to observe the kind of culture that operates at this university. I think in some cases, maybe not as much as with advising as in other cases, faculty, like anyone else on this campus, can have minimal opportunity to have their say and provide input before administration decisions then move forward in a unilateral fashion. I think the idea here is not that we should just let people say whatever they want and give their opinion so that administration can then move on and do whatever it wants. Rather, I think that when we are talking about cooperation and collaboration, and communication, that faculty and other groups need to be involved early and consistently throughout the process, not just a kind of one and done mentality where people can just say whatever they want and then the decision gets made regardless of the input. That is all I wanted to say about that.

5. Committee reports “for information only”:

- a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-45) – S. LeBlanc

Senate Reference No. 20-45 (Theater Department Musical Theater BFA) was presented for information only.

- b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-46) – S. LeBlanc

Senate Reference No. 20-46 (Education STEM Proposal) was presented for information only.

- c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-47) – S. LeBlanc

Senate Reference No. 20-47 (Organizational Leadership Concentration) was presented for information only.

- d. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-48) – S. LeBlanc

Senate Reference No. 20-48 (ILCS Proposal for Minor in Professional Spanish) was presented for information only.

- e. Graduate Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-49) – K. Fineran

Senate Reference No. 20-49 (Education Specialist) was presented for information only.

- f. Graduate Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-50) – K. Fineran

Senate Reference No. 20-50 (M.S. in Educational Leadership) was presented for information only.

- g. Graduate Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 20-51) – K. Fineran

Senate Reference No. 20-51 (Concentration in Human Resource Management) was presented for information only.

- h. Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Procedural Handling of Allegations of Misconduct in the PFW Women's Basketball Program (Senate Reference No. 20-52) – S. Buttes

Senate Reference No. 20-52 (Spring 2021 Committee Report) was presented for information only.

6. The general good and welfare of the University: There was no general good and welfare of the University.
7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon  
Assistant to the Faculty

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Talia Bugel, Chair  
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: April 14, 2021

SUBJ: College of Engineering, Technology and Computer Science, Promotion and Tenure documents

WHEREAS, Fort Wayne Senate Document 14-36 states that “Purdue Fort Wayne and its autonomous academic units shall establish, within the time frames and by means of guiding principles and criteria established in other documents, procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure”; and

WHEREAS the College of Engineering, Technology and Computer Science has developed its own Promotion and Tenure document to guide the process for tenure-track, tenured, clinical and lecturer faculty; and

WHEREAS the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed and approved the above-mentioned document;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate approve the following Promotion and Tenure document submitted by the College of Engineering, Technology and Computer Science.



Senate Document 89-2  
(Supersedes SD 88-37)  
(Amended & Approved, 9/18/1989)  
(Amended, 10/10/1994)  
(Amended, 4/10/2006)

**ETCS Assembly Document 93-94 03**

*(Amended & Approved 9-18-89)*  
*(Amended 11-22-93)*  
*(Amended 3-28-94)*  
*(Amended 2-6-2006)*  
*(Amended 4-6-09)*  
*(Amended 02-09-2015)*  
*(Amended 10-5-2015)*  
*(Amended 2-1-2016)*  
*(Amended 3-14-2016)*  
*(Amended 4-30-2018)*  
*(Amended 4/5/2021)*

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, TECHNOLOGY AND COMPUTER SCIENCE**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE PROCEDURES**

**A. CAMPUS COMMITTEE**

1. The Assembly of Representatives shall conduct a faculty election by ranked ballot each spring semester for up to three nominees to serve on the Campus Committee. The slate of candidates will include only tenured faculty and promoted clinical faculty of the college. Faculty who applied for Promotion and/or Tenure and received positive recommendation from the chancellor are also eligible. The names of the nominees will be forwarded to the chief administrative officer of Purdue Fort Wayne by the chair of the Assembly of Representatives. When necessary a tie shall be resolved by a simple ballot.

**B. COLLEGE COMMITTEE**

1. The committee shall consist of one faculty member from each department/school in the College, having been promoted to the rank of Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Professor, Associate Professor or Professor. Members must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the college committee. Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors may serve as voting members for Clinical promotion cases. Only Tenured faculty, Clinical Associate Professors, Clinical Professors, and Senior Lecturers may serve as voting members for Senior lecturers. Members of this committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be staggered and may not be longer than three years. Individuals prohibited from serving and participating on this committee include:

- Department/School Chairs, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and Deans.
- Anyone with a Promotion or Tenure case going forward.
- Anyone serving on the Campus P&T committee.

In addition, the following committee members shall be recused from hearing a particular case:

- Anyone who has shared significant credit for research or creative endeavor or for other work which is a major part of the candidate's case.
- Anyone who has a conflict of interest with the candidate's case.
- Anyone who collaborates with the candidate, if the committee decides recusal is warranted.

Committee members decide if a member should recuse. Next highest administrator decides if administrator recuses. Any recused committee member must leave the room during the discussion of that case. In the case of recusal, the department/school shall have the opportunity to appoint a replacement.

2. Each department/school with a vacant position on the College P&T Committee shall send the names of two qualified faculty, if available, to the Assembly by April 15. The Assembly of Representatives shall conduct a faculty election by voting for one of the two from each required department/school to select the needed committee members who shall serve for their rotating three-year term. The Assembly of representative shall complete their election by April 30. When necessary a tie shall be resolved by a coin toss.
3. The committee shall meet to evaluate and make recommendations on all cases for promotion and/or tenure. A positive vote in the committee shall consist of a simple majority. A tie vote is not permitted and a recommendation is required.
4. As part of the review, the committee shall evaluate 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.
5. The review shall include consideration of the basis of the decision made by the Department/School Committee. If the College Committee judges that the Department/School Committee's decision is contrary to the evidence, the College Committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department/school criteria.
6. The committee shall elect a chair from among the elected members. The duties of the chair shall be to run the meetings of the committee, keep the record of discussions for use in writing the committee statement and hold the open votes on each case. The committee's statement shall be a written statement of the decision and the candidate's strengths and/or weaknesses. The committee shall agree to the final written committee Statement. The chair shall communicate the final written committee statement, including any applicable minority report. The final written committee statement for each case shall be delivered to the Dean within three working days of the end of all case deliberations. The recorded vote (totals only) shall be a part of the written committee statement for each case. The letter shall clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee, including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels. Additionally, the award letter of a faculty member appointed to more than one academic unit shall identify that department/school whose tenure/promotion process shall apply to the appointee. Each decision level forwards a letter only and without attachments.

7. The committee chair shall provide the written statement to the candidate, the chair of the department/school committee, the chair of the department/school, the department/school committee members, and the college committee members, within seven working days after the committee completes its reports on all cases. Candidates may respond in writing within seven calendar days of the date of the recommendation.
8. The deliberations of that committee shall be strictly confidential. Within the confidential discussions of the committee, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No proxies or abstentions are permitted. Committee members must be present during deliberations in order to vote.
9. The College Chief Academic Officer shall review how well the process has adhered to documented procedures and review the recommendation of the lower levels. If the College Chief Academic Officer questions a decision of a lower level, the Officer may review the case based on department/school criteria.
10. Senate document SD 19-13 provides for some exceptions to the College P&T process for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The College committee shall include at least one Senior Lecturer from the college, or if none are available, from another college. Senior Lecturers and other eligible faculty may join an existing college P&T committee for the sole purpose of reviewing cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

**C. DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

1. Each department/school shall inform all full time clinical, lecturer, tenured, or tenure-track members of the department/school of all cases for promotion and/or tenure, from that department/school, and provide opportunity for discussion. The department/school committee shall then be formed, and shall elect a chair. The department/school committee shall then be elected according to departmental/school procedures. The majority of the members of the department/school committee shall have the same or higher rank to which the candidate aspires. Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors may serve as voting members for Clinical promotion cases. Only Tenured faculty, Clinical Associate Professors, Clinical Professors, and Senior Lecturers may serve as voting members for Senior lecturers. If fewer than 3 department/school faculty are eligible to serve, the department/school chair/director shall submit to the dean the names of acceptable faculty from other departments/schools. The dean shall appoint sufficient faculty from this list to constitute a department/school committee of 3 to 5 members. No individual with a Promotion or Tenure case going forward may serve on this committee. The following committee members shall be recused from hearing a particular case:
  - Anyone who has shared significant credit for research or creative endeavor or for other work which is a major part of the candidate's case.
  - Anyone who has a conflict of interest with the candidate's case.

- Anyone who collaborates with the candidate, if the committee decides recusal is warranted.

Any recused committee member shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.

2. The candidate must identify the Department/School P&T criteria document used for evaluating the case. This document must have been in effect at some point during the six years preceding submission of the case.
3. The department/school committee shall meet to evaluate and recommend action on the case. All T/TT, Clinical, full-time lecturer faculty in the department may read and provide feedback on the case and submit to committee, before committee is done deliberating, but this does not become part of the case. A simple majority vote in favor of promotion or tenure shall be interpreted as constituting a positive recommendation. The department/school chair shall not serve on the department/school committee, nor participate in meetings.
4. All voting members of the department/school committee shall be tenured faculty (see exception below for promotion of Lecturers). Faculty who applied for Promotion and Tenure and received positive recommendation from the chancellor are also eligible.
5. The committee chair shall communicate the committee's decision. The chair communication shall be a written statement of the decision and the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. This statement shall be provided to the candidate, the next higher level, and all members of the department/school committee, within seven working days after the committee completes its deliberation on all cases. Candidates may respond in writing within seven calendar days of the date of the recommendation. Once the Department/School committee vote and recommendation are made, no information (other than updates) may be added to the case. Each decision level decides if evidence submitted later than the department/school level can be included and reviewed at that level.
6. The deliberations of the committee shall be strictly confidential. Within the confidential discussions of the committee, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared.
7. The Department Chair / School Director reviews the case based on department/school criteria, reviews how well the process adheres to procedures, reviews committee recommendations, and writes a recommendation letter. This letter should address agreement or disagreement with the committee's recommendation.
8. Senate document SD 19-13 provides for some exceptions to the departmental P&T process for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The department committee should include the department/school's "head for teaching and learning" (i.e., chair of curriculum or faculty affairs committee, a faculty member recognized for teaching excellence), one or more faculty with teaching responsibilities in the same general area as the Lecturer, and one or more Senior Lecturers (if not available from within the department, recruited from another unit). Senior Lecturers and other eligible faculty may join an existing P&T committee for the sole purpose of reviewing cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

#### **D. DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL PROBATIONARY REVIEW PROCESS**

- 1 Each Department/School shall have a process for reviewing progress of probationary faculty to tenure and promotion, using annual reviews and reappointment letters. Procedures must be in Department/School documents and approved by the College, and they must adhere to Senate guidelines, as outlined in SD 14-36.

#### **E. APPROVAL OF DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL P&T PROCEDURES & CRITERIA**

- 1 Upon creating or revising P&T procedures, the Department/School shall submit the document to Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for feedback.
- 2 The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall forward feedback on P&T procedures to the Department/School and to the College.
- 3 The Department/School shall submit the P&T procedures document to the College P&T Committee for review and approval. The review shall meet all requirements and guiding principles listed in FWSD 14-35, 14-36, 18-15, and 19-13. A simple majority constitutes approval.
- 4 Upon creating or revising P&T criteria, the Department/School shall submit the P&T criteria document to the College P&T Committee for approval. A simple majority constitutes approval.
- 5 The College P&T Committee shall forward its recommendations to the Faculty Assembly for a final vote of approval.

#### **F. APPROVAL OF THIS DOCUMENT BY THE SENATE**

- 1 Approval of this Assembly document follows Senate Document SD 14-36, whereby the document must be approved by the College, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Senate.
  - 2 Upon creating or revising these ETCS P&T procedures, the College P&T Committee shall submit the document to the Assembly for approval. Next, the secretary of the Assembly shall forward the document to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for feedback. If this committee approves the document, it will submit the document to the Senate for approval. Otherwise, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall provide feedback to the secretary of the Assembly, who will forward the feedback to the College P&T Committee for review and revision (step E.1).

Question Time

I faced a situation this semester where I needed to lock the deadbolt on my classroom to keep out a non-enrolled student who was disrupting my class while we waited for campus police to arrive. The experience left me grateful that I had the option to flip a deadbolt and prevent a possible escalation of the scene. I know there are still many classrooms without deadbolts, unfortunately. When will Building Services complete the project of putting locks on all classrooms across campus? I've not been able to get an answer to this question through conventional routes.

J. Badia

Question Time

I've heard concerning things about staffing in the Office of Diversity & Multicultural Affairs with regard to people being let go or RIFed. Could we get an update on what is happening currently in ODMA and the rationale behind any current actions?

G. Schmidt

Question Time

According to an estimate from the American Council on Education, Purdue University Fort Wayne should get an additional \$18.5 million from the newly passed stimulus act.

1. When will the university make a public announcement regarding the precise amount we will receive?
2. Will Senate have an opportunity to weigh in with recommendations on how that money gets spent, before decisions get reached on how to spend it?

S. Carr



Question Time

Given what we know about the importance of relationship in student retention, and the anxiety that is caused by confusing processes and uninformed answers to questions about the intricacies of degree programs, what is the rationale for faculty advisors in the students' school or department ostensibly being cut out of the process by having limited and last access to their new majors for orientation and registration, including not being given their names prior to their arrival for the one hour that has been allotted to the college and school or department?

J. Egger

**Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate**  
**Ad Hoc Committee**  
**to Investigate Procedural Handling**  
**of Allegations of Misconduct**  
**in the PFW Women's Basketball Program**

**Spring 2021 Committee Report**

This Ad Hoc committee was created after a resolution (Document A below), passed by voice vote on January 25, 2021, charged the Senate with creating an Ad Hoc committee charged with the following characteristics, as laid out in that resolution's "BE IT RESOLVED" clauses:

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the FW Senate immediately sets up an ad hoc Senate committee that will be responsible for fielding confidential reports from athletes while the FW Senate sets up its independent investigation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this ad hoc Senate committee does not include any current or past members of the Mastodon Athletics Advisory Subcommittee to ensure impartiality; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that contact information for members of this ad hoc Senate committee will be made available to all student athletes at PFW; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the FW Senate take the necessary steps to set up or participate in an independent investigation, ensuring that the people involved in the first version of the investigation are not allowed to be voting members of the investigative team; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Senate takes AAUP's suggestion to "conduct an internal investigation led by an independent committee composed of a majority of faculty and academic administrators, and chaired by a faculty member elected by the Faculty Senate. The charge of this committee will be to examine the manner in which the university handled these allegations initially, how it reached its decision to reinstate the women's basketball coach, and whether the university followed its own internal policies as well as those of Purdue University in the handling of both the allegations as well as the investigation;" and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the university administration and all athletics staff, including the Chancellor and Athletic Director, make clear to the students that the university does not tolerate retaliation and will protect all students and staff who participate in the investigation by ensuring that all allegations of retaliation will be investigated thoroughly."

Subsequent to the passing of this resolution, the Senate Executive Committee met the resolution's charge by meeting with various parties, including Purdue's Chief Privacy Officer and Deputy General Counsel, Trent D. Klingerman, and PFW Associate Director of Compliance and Title IX Coordinator, Christine Marcuccilli. The

Executive Committee learned that certain legal obstacles prevented creating a committee to meet all charges in the Senate resolution. The Executive Committee issued a February 15, 2021 memorandum (Document B below) that explained these matters and created a specific set of tasks for the Ad Hoc committee to carry out.

The Executive Committee then charged the Senate Nominations and Elections Committee (via a separate February 15, 2021 memorandum (Document C below)) with receiving names of nominees and, when a complete slate of candidates was received, conducting an election. Because the committee received few faculty nominees (initially limited only to Senators, who are limited to serving on four committees), the Executive Committee expanded the scope of faculty who could submit their names to all Voting Faculty as well as up to one administrator with or without Faculty rank (previously any administrative member of the committee was required to have Faculty rank). After this revision, Nominations and Elections received a full slate of nominees on March 22, 2021.

The Committee conducted an election and announced on April 2, 2021 that the following faculty members were elected to the committee:

**Janet Badia** (POLS)  
**Stephen Buttes** (ILCS)  
**Steven Carr** (COM)  
**Michelle Kelsey** (COM)  
**Ann Livschiz** (HIST)

In addition to these faculty members, **Sharon Wight**, Senior Academic Advisor and Assessment Administrator, serves on this committee.

The faculty members of the committee engaged in email discussion regarding who would serve as chair of the committee. Stephen Buttes submitted his name for selection as chair. As no others on the committee wished to serve as chair, he was declared elected as chair of this committee.

In advance of any committee meeting (and with knowledge that the Senate would need to re-approve this committee to complete its work in the next academic year), Stephen Buttes notified the faculty members of the committee in an April 11, 2021 email (Document D below) that outlined some preliminary information gathering that would need to take place before the first meeting of the committee.

In an April 24, 2021 email to the full committee (Document E below), Buttes notified everyone that he created a SharePoint site with all supporting documents he had gathered in relation to this investigation, the initial January 25 resolution creating the committee, the Executive Committee's February 15 charging memo and an initial outline of committee tasks for meeting each of the four charges in the Executive Committee memo. Buttes reminded everyone that the Ad Hoc Committee needed to be re-approved by the Senate in its April 26, 2021 continuance meeting.

The Senate did re-approve the committee (SD 20-45) (Document F below) in its April 26, 2021 continuance.

The Committee will plan to meet to begin engaging with and potentially revising the set of tasks Buttes proposed to the committee and will hope to submit a report to the Executive Committee in Fall 2021.

**Report submitted April 28, 2021 by Stephen Buttes, Chair, Senate Ad Hoc Committee**

**Document A:**  
**Senate Resolution Creating Ad Hoc Committee**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Janet Badia, Ann Livschiz, Steven Carr

DATE: 1/25/21

SUBJ: Senate Oversight in Abuse Allegations Against Coach Nelson

WHEREAS, the article in *Indianapolis Star* on January 20, 2021 and the slow trickle of additional information reveal serious allegations of abuse by Coach Nelson and failures by the university to protect members of the university community;

WHEREAS, evidence in the article suggests the university may have engaged in cover up of the abuse, discreditation of the victims, and coercion of possible victims;

WHEREAS, allegations detailed in the *Indianapolis Star* report suggest that the investigation that was carried out by the university was inadequate;

WHEREAS, the FW Senate has a responsibility to protect PFW staff and students from mistreatment and injustice;

WHEREAS, the FW Senate has a responsibility to ensure that PFW's policies and procedures are followed and applied fairly and consistently;

WHEREAS, a proper and truly independent investigation is necessary, though it may take time to properly organize;

WHEREAS, PFW chapter of AAUP issued a statement on 1/21/21, outlining suggested steps that need to be taken on this matter;

WHEREAS, as long as Coach Nelson, who has serious allegations of abuse against her, and others in positions of power at PFW who may have helped cover up her abuses continue to have power over the young women on or affiliated with the women's basketball team;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the FW Senate immediately sets up an ad hoc Senate committee that will be responsible for fielding confidential reports from athletes while the FW Senate sets up its independent investigation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this ad hoc Senate committee does not include any current or past members of the Mastodon Athletics Advisory Subcommittee to ensure impartiality; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that contact information for members of this ad hoc Senate committee will be made available to all student athletes at PFW; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the FW Senate take the necessary steps to set up or participate in an independent investigation, ensuring that the people involved in the first version of the investigation are not allowed to be voting members of the investigative team; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Senate takes AAUP's suggestion to "conduct an internal investigation led by an independent committee composed of a majority of faculty and academic administrators, and chaired by a

faculty member elected by the Faculty Senate. The charge of this committee will be to examine the manner in which the university handled these allegations initially, how it reached its decision to reinstate the women's basketball coach, and whether the university followed its own internal policies as well as those of Purdue University in the handling of both the allegations as well as the investigation;" and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the university administration and all athletics staff, including the Chancellor and Athletic Director, make clear to the students that the university does not tolerate retaliation and will protect all students and staff who participate in the investigation by ensuring that all allegations of retaliation will be investigated thoroughly.

**Document B:**  
**Senate Executive Committee Charging Memorandum**  
**(February 15, 2021)**

M E M O R A N D U M

To: XXX, Chair  
Ad hoc committee of the Fort Wayne Senate

From: Bernd Buldt, Chair  
Executive Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate

Date: February, 15

Subj: Charge to Conduct an Independent Investigation

---

As you know, SD 20-34 (which passed on a voice vote January 25) instructs the Fort Wayne Senate to form an ad hoc committee and to charge it with conducting an “independent investigation” into allegations of misconduct by the Purdue Fort Wayne Women’s Basketball Coach and how these were addressed by the Purdue Fort Wayne Administration. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Executive Committee (henceforth: EC) herewith responds to the charges outlined in SD 20-34, albeit with some with qualifications.

First, SD 20-34 wants the ad hoc committee to “field[...] confidential reports from athletes” and to make “contact information for members of this ad hoc Senate committee [...] available to all student athletes at PFW.” The EC finds that it is unable to fulfill this charge.

The EC arrived at that conclusion after it had received legal counsel from both Christine Marcuccilli, Associate Director of Compliance and Title IX Coordinator at Purdue Fort Wayne, and Trenten D. Klingerman, Deputy General Counsel and Chief Privacy Officer at Purdue West Lafayette. The reason for the decision is that faculty and staff on the ad hoc committee could not guarantee confidentiality as requested by SD 20-34 since they would be mandatory reporters under Title IX. And even if these concerns were addressed by making sure student athletes understood what a suitable qualified concept of confidentiality can and cannot mean in the given context, committee members would still be acting outside their scope of employment (they were not hired nor trained to investigate such matters) and thus exposing themselves to possibly very significant individual legal risks and liabilities without having any protection from Purdue University (see Purdue’s indemnification policy at <https://www.purdue.edu/policies/business-finance/indemnification.html>).

Second, SD 20-34 charges the ad hoc committee with examining:

- (1) “the manner in which the university handled these allegations initially”;
- (2) “how it reached it [sic!] decision to reinstate the women’s basketball coach”; and
- (3) “whether the university followed its own internal policies as well as those of Purdue University in the handling of both the allegations as well as the investigation.”

Since concerns were raised also whether current policies are sufficient for faculty to exercise their responsibilities—in particular the responsibility to be “concerned with the general social, cultural, and practical welfare of all PFW students. Specific non-classroom matters of concern shall include but not be limited to intramural and intercollegiate athletics [...]” (By-Laws, 5.3.4.2.)—the EC wishes to add a fourth charge, namely, to examine:

- (4) whether existing policies are adequate or need to be revised.

We therefore ask the ad hoc committee to do the following:

1. Complete the tasks (1) through (4) listed above.
2. Report to the EC on the outcomes of all four tasks.

While the quality and thoroughness of the investigation should take priority, the EC requests to receive, if not the final report, then an interim progress report in time for the last Senate meeting of the AY 2020-21 in April. This is important since the By-laws stipulate “[a]d hoc committees cannot be carried over to a new academic year without special authorization by the Senate” (5.4.3.). Any decision by the Senate as to whether the investigation should carry over to the next academic year can then be informed by the preliminary report.

We, the members of the Executive Committee, appreciate the work that this may entail, and we are grateful in advance for the commitment that you devote to it.

Sincerely,

Bernd Buldt  
Senate Executive Committee, Chair

**Document C:**  
**Senate Executive Committee Memorandum**  
**to Senate Nominations and Elections Committee**  
**(February 15, 2021; revised March 5, 2021)**

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Suining Ding, Chair  
Nominations and Elections Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate

From: Bernd Buldt, Chair  
Executive Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate

Date: February 15, 2021; revised March 5, 2021

Subj: Charge to help form an ad hoc committee and to help elect its chair

---

As you know, SD 20-34 (which passed on a voice vote January 25) instructs the Fort Wayne Senate to form an ad hoc committee and to charge it with conducting an “independent investigation” into allegations of misconduct by the Purdue Fort Wayne Women’s Basketball Coach and how these were addressed by the Purdue Fort Wayne Administration. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Executive Committee (henceforth: EC) herewith responds to the charges outlined in SD 20-34 and requests the help of the Nominations and Elections Committee (henceforth: NEC).

First, SD 20-34 states that the ad hoc committee will be

(1) “composed of a majority of faculty and academic administrators.”

Combining this with the permission stated in the By-Laws—that the work of an ad hoc committee or subcommittee can be “conducted by a group specially appointed for the purpose”—and thus allowing for one administrator and one staff member to serve on said committee, the EC suggests a size of up to seven committee members:

(2) five senators and/or faculty, up to one administrator with or without faculty rank, and up to one staff person.

Here, the number of senators and/or faculty is mandatory; the other two seats may or may not be filled depending on whether people volunteer or not. When soliciting names of people who wish to serve on the ad hoc committee, NEC should communicate clearly that not everyone is eligible to serve for two reasons. The By-laws stipulate that

(3) “No one may serve on more than four Senate committees and/or subcommittees in a given academic year” (5.1.2.)



and SD 20-34 states that the committee will not

- (4) “include any current or past members of the Mastodon Athletics Advisory Subcommittee.”

Moreover, it should also be communicated that according to SD 20-34 voting rights will not be granted

- (5) “to people involved in the first version of the investigation.”

Second, SD 20-34 states the ad hoc committee will be

- (6) “chaired by a faculty member elected by the Faculty Senate.”

We therefore ask the Nominations and Elections Committee to do the following:

- (a) Solicit names from senators and Voting Faculty who are willing to serve on the ad hoc committee as a member and/or its chair if elected;
- (b) circulate a call among all academic administrators (i.e., administrators who hold academic rank) and APSAC and ask for volunteers willing to serve on the ad hoc committee as a member if elected;
- (c) solicit from CSSAC names of staff persons willing to serve on the ad hoc committee as a member if elected;
- (d) run an election among senators based on a preferential voting system if there are more volunteers than seats;
- (e) run an election among senators to elect a chair from among the volunteers on the ad hoc committee.
- (f) Complete tasks (a) through (e) as quickly as possible but within the limits determined by (1) through (6) above.

Please, find the charge of the ad hoc committee attached. You may want to use it, or parts of it, for the solicitation process.

We would very much appreciate if you could find ways to expedite the process. We are aware that everyone is unduly busy and feel therefore grateful for the time you will devote to this.

Sincerely,



Bernd Buldt

Senate Executive Committee, Chair

**Document D:**  
**Buttes email to Faculty Members of the Committee**  
**(April 11, 2021)**

**Ad Hoc Committee - Beginning Our Work**

Stephen Buttes <buttes@pfw.edu>

Sun 4/11/2021 3:37 PM

**To:** Janet Badia <badiaj@pfw.edu>; Steve Carr <carr@pfw.edu>; Michelle Kelsey <kelseym@pfw.edu>; Ann Livschiz <livschia@pfw.edu>

■ 1 attachments (47 KB)

Charging Memo AdHoc.pdf;

Hi everyone:

I am attaching to this email the charging memo for our ad hoc committee as well as an agenda for our first meeting. I am also attaching the AAUP statement on Faculty oversight of athletics.

We have four tasks charged to us from the Senate (see below), and we need to work pretty quickly since a continuation of this committee would require extension.

So, to facilitate our process, I'm gathering together all the information I have. I am creating an initial summary of what we know in terms of allegations prompting the 2019 investigation (which, as I read documents, looks like it might actually be two investigations (an athletics investigation in "late 2018/early 2019" that prompted "an additional review" from the Office of Institutional Equity [not clear, but questions are prompted by reading the official university statement on this]) and other pertinent timelines.

I'm also going to create a summary of our institutional processes, particularly the senate governance bodies and what minutes are available from the Mastodon Athletics Advisor Subcommittee and its parent committee, the Student Affairs Committee.

Once I have these documents created early this week, I will send them for your review and will schedule our first meeting.

Thanks,

Steve B.

Second, SD 20-34 charges the ad hoc committee with examining:

- (1) “the manner in which the university handled these allegations initially”;
- (2) “how it reached it [sic!] decision to reinstate the women’s basketball coach”; and
- (3) “whether the university followed its own internal policies as well as those of Purdue University in the handling of both the allegations as well as the investigation.”

Since concerns were raised also whether current policies are sufficient for faculty to exercise their responsibilities—in particular the responsibility to be “concerned with the general social, cultural, and practical welfare of all PFW students. Specific non-classroom matters of concern shall include but not be limited to intramural and intercollegiate athletics [...]” (By-Laws, 5.3.4.2.)—the EC wishes to add a fourth charge, namely, to examine:

- (4) whether existing policies are adequate or need to be revised.

**Document E:  
Buttes email to Full Committee  
(April 24, 2021)**

## **Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Allegations**

Stephen Buttes <buttess@pfw.edu>

Sat 4/24/2021 5:50 PM

To: Janet Badia <badiaj@pfw.edu>; Steve Carr <carr@pfw.edu>; Michelle Kelsey <kelseym@pfw.edu>; Ann Livschiz <livschia@pfw.edu>; Sharon Wight <wighsl01@pfw.edu>

Hi everyone:

I've just created a SharePoint site for our committee and have added all of you as members.

There you will find a lot of documents I've been collecting. But the main thing I'd like you to take a look at is the resolution creating our committee, the Senate Executive Committee's charging memo and the plan of work I'm proposing for us in order to meet these charges.

These three documents are located in the first folder on the SharePoint site: [📁 01 - Ad Hoc Committee Charge and Plan of Work](#)

The Senate needs to vote to extend our committee into the new academic year since we are ad hoc. This may happen on Monday, or it may happen at a special Senate meeting in May, which I've heard may take place if we do not make it all the way through the agenda in Monday's continuance.

If our committee is extended into the next academic year, I will send out a Doodle poll to have our first meeting to determine a more concrete calendar of getting the various tasks completed so that we can write our report.

In the meantime, you'll see on the SharePoint site a folder I've created for agendas, minutes and working documents (currently empty since we don't have any of these) and a folder with supporting documents, where I've tried to collect as many pertinent things as I've been able. It's a little messy right now, but I will clean it up once we get working (assuming we are approved to do so).

Let me know if you have any suggestions for clarifying the plan of work, improving it or oversights I've made.

Hopefully the Senate will approve the extension of our committee so that we can engage in this work in full.

Thanks, everyone!

Steve Buttes

Document F:  
SD 20-45

Senate Document SD 20-45

MEMORANDUM

To: Fort Wayne Senate

From: Bernd Buldt, Chair  
Executive Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate

Date: March 31, 2021

Subj: Request to re-authorize the ad-hoc committee established by SD 20-34 for the next AY

---

WHEREAS Senate voted to create an Ad-hoc Senate Committee to examine questions and investigate issues that emerged when faculty learned about allegations of abuse surrounding the Women's Basketball team; and

WHEREAS the Executive Committee (EC) immediately acted upon the resolution, made preparatory inquiries, then wrote a charge for said committee and asked Nominations and Elections Committee (NEC) to populate the committee February 15; and

WHEREAS the NEC was able to populate said committee only after its composition had been changed by the EC March 5; and

WHEREAS for the reasons mentioned above the ad-hoc committee is unable to submit their final report in time for the last meeting of Senate in April of 2021 and can therefore be expected to have to continue their work in the fall of 2021; and

WHEREAS, Bylaws 5.4.3 states that an "Ad hoc committees cannot be carried over to a new academic year without special authorization by the Senate;"

BE IT RESOLVED that Senate authorizes the ad-hoc committee formed as per SD 20-34 to continue their work in the AY 2021-22.

<b>Approved</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Abstained</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Non-Voting</b>
Bernd Buldt				Craig Ortsey
Hui Di				
Peter Dragnev				
John Egger				
Ann Marshall				
James Toole				
Nash Younis				