

Minutes of the  
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Seventh Senate  
Purdue University Fort Wayne  
February 10 and 17, 2025  
KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 13
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Nowak
4. Reports of the Faculty Chairs
  - a. Past Chair (UPC Representative) – B. Buldt
  - b. Chair (Presiding Officer) – C. Gurgur
  - c. Chair-Elect (IFC Representative) – J. Nowak
5. Special business of the day
  - a. Originality Checking & AI Detection Group Update, SR 24-28 – K. Jia and E. Mann
6. Unfinished business
7. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Process for Determining Faculty Qualifications, SD 24-13 – FAC, A. Khalifa (for discussion)
  - b. The Future of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at Purdue University, SD 24-14 – EC, J. Nowak (for discussion)
  - ~~c. Clarifying Amendments to the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Faculty, SD 24-15 – EC, J. Nowak (for discussion)~~
8. New business
9. Question time
  - a. RE: VPN Rollout, SR 24-29 – A. Livschiz
10. Committee reports “for information only”
  - a. Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2023-2024, SR 24-26 – EC, J. Nowak
  - b. Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2022-2023, SR 24-27 – EC, J. Nowak
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment\*

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

---

Presiding Officer: C. Gurgur  
Parliamentarian: C. Ortsey  
Sergeant-at-arms: A. Nasr  
Assistant: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“Originality Checking & AI Detection Group Update” (SR No. 24-28)  
“Process for Determining Faculty Qualifications” (SD 24-13)  
“The Future of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at Purdue University” (SD 24-14)  
~~“Clarifying Amendments to the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Faculty” (SD 24-15)~~  
“Question Time – re: VPN Rollout” (SR No. 24-29)  
“Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2023-2024” (SR No. 24-26)  
“Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2022-2023” (SR No. 24-27)

Senate Members Present:

A. Backer, J. Badia, K. Barker, B. Berry, A. Blackmon, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, S. Cody, Y. Deng, C. Drummond, R. Elsenbaumer, K. Fineran, C. Freitas, R. Friedman, J. Givens, S. Hanke, J. Johns, M. Jordan, A. Khalifa, J. Lawton, T. Lewis, J. Li, H. Luo, V. Maloney, E. Mann, D. Miller, P. Mishra, D. Momoh, A. Montenegro, A. Nasr, J. Nowak, I. Nunez, E. Ohlander, D. Ohlinger, H. Park, L. Roberts, J. Rouleau, R. Shoquist, S. Steiner, K. Stultz-Dessent, K. Surface, D. Tahmassebi, G. Wang, M. Wang, M. Wolf

Senate Members Absent:

N. Adilov, B. Dattilo, S. Elfayoumy, M. Hammonds, S. Johnson, D. Kaiser, J. Lewis, J. Mbuba, J. McHann, G. Nakata, J. O’Connell, P. Saha, S. Schory, K. White, Y. Zhang

Guests Present:

N. Borbieva O’Neill, S. Carr, A. Coffman, A. Dirksen, C. Firestine, T. Grady, K. Jia, K. Johnson, S. Kever, C. Kuznar, A. Livschiz, C. Marcuccilli, T. Swim

Acta

1. Call to order: C. Gurgur called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 13: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:  
  
J. Nowak moved to accept the agenda.  
  
Agenda passed on a voice vote.
4. Reports of the Faculty Chairs:

- a. Past Chair (UPC Representative):

B. Buldt: Good afternoon, everyone!

If you're looking for a committee that provides your annual productivity report with another line of service you can list but won't steal your time b/c it doesn't meet, try UPC, the University Policy Committee. For a third time in a row, I have nothing to report since no meeting was called. [That was my UPC report, btw.] The catch, however, is that you have to be a faculty chair to serve on UPC, which can come with costs and, now all jokes aside, brings me to my topic.

You will have noticed that the call for my successor went out: Senate is looking for the next faculty chair, which is a three-year commitment. So what is expected of a faculty chair? Faculty chairs serve, individually, on UPC, IFC, or as PO. They serve on the Executive Committee as members or its chair; they are charged to liaise with the administration and, on occasion, they meet with the Chancellor to appoint faculty to certain committees, such as the Campus P&T Committee. Before we revised the Constitution last AY and called them faculty chairs, the position was called a faculty leader. Does what I just listed make you a leader? I don't think so. But you may become a leader by the way you fill the role. It is like anything in life: the world is what we make it, and a role is what you make of it.

So why am I bringing this up? I believe we are all aware of the fact that higher education will face a lot of headwinds from Washington and the state legislature in the coming years. It started with SEA 202 and is only likely to get more intrusive and more challenging. To quote Cypher from the movie The Matrix: "Buckle your seatbelt, Dorothy, 'cause Kansas is going bye-bye." For someone like me coming from Germany, where the freedom of research and teaching from any outside interference is enshrined in the constitution, a lesson from Nazi-Germany, this is deeply concerning. Now your mileage may vary, but as for me, please, look around and identify the one or two colleagues you want to see as a faculty chair and nominate them, in the hope that the way they fill the role will make them also a faculty leader. We will need them.

Thank you!

b. Chair (Presiding Officer):

**C. Gurgur: Faculty Reviews: The Real Problems in the Academy**

The honorable Dr. Andrew J. Hoffman, an MIT world-class scholar who is teaching at the University of Michigan with dual appointments at the Ross School of Business and the School for Environment & Sustainability, was kind enough to share a relevant academic article with me.

It is a suitable time to bring the abstract of the peer-reviewed article into a decent perspective. This is especially true now with what has been going on in higher education. Academy of Management Learning & Education is an “A” level reputable publishing outlet verified by Provost Drummond recently in one of my correspondences last week.

There are a lot to consider honestly and discuss the factual issues in the academic landscape. Although the article mentions “management studies”, the presented critical thinking does apply to many academic disciplines. I encourage you to read the article at your earliest chance.

**Academy of Management Learning & Education 2019, Vol. 18, No. 2, 286–297.**  
**<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2018.0107>**

CONFRONTING THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT STUDIES:

WHY SENIOR SCHOLARS NEED TO STOP SETTING A BAD EXAMPLE

By BILL HARLEY, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

There is an emerging crisis of confidence in management studies. This is expressed in growing disquiet about the lack of value in our research outputs and increasing frustration about the nature of teaching in business schools. This crisis of confidence can be understood as a response to a series of developments, including an apparent lack of practical or academic impact from most published research, a narrowing of focus in the field, increases in unethical behavior, the downgrading of teaching, and increased pressure in both publishing and teaching. Traditional academic values are coming into conflict with processes of rationalization in business schools and universities. The changes driving these outcomes are long-term and reflect powerful institutional pressures, rendering them difficult to change. Nonetheless, established management studies scholars have a responsibility to address them. One way they can show leadership in this regard is by setting a good example. Three suggestions can be made about how to do this: rejecting the fiction that what we do is analogous to laboratory science; rejecting the myth of what this essay calls “the heroic workaholic publishing machine;” and refusing to promote flawed approaches to assessing academic success.

As the spring 2025 semester is rapidly making progress, this is a suitable time to remember how to be a better critical thinker (for scholars and the students) as well:

1. Be 10% more skeptical of people you agree with—and 10% more charitable to people you disagree with.
2. Look for flaws in ideas you like—and strengths in arguments you dislike.
3. Learn from sources that engage with competing ideas.

During the senate meetings and committee worktime, we should keep the following in mind:

1. Thoughtful disagreement doesn't start with "You're wrong!" It begins with "I'd love to understand your thinking better."
2. Attacking conclusions closes minds. Asking about reasoning opens them.
3. Good debates don't have winners or losers. They leave everyone more informed.

c. Chair-Elect (IFC Representative):

J. Nowak: Greetings and welcome to our February 2025 University Faculty Senate meeting. The Intercampus Faculty Council met on January 24. David Liu and I both attended. Of note to our campus, I had asked Sheila Hurt, University Registrar on the PWL campus, to inquire further on how PFW might better recruit strong students who are not admitted to PWL. She confirmed the standard practice as of right now is that they are *referred* to regional campuses. David and I are working to try to improve on that practice and make it easier for these students to be accepted to our campus in areas where we share major and minor areas of study.

Professor Liu also shared plans for the Surack-Sweetwater Music Industry Building.

On a planning note, related to our upcoming Spring Break, if you are planning to vacation somewhere along the marginal sea of the Atlantic Ocean, please be aware that airline tickets to the **Gulf of America** are selling out fast.

Thank you

5. Special business of the day:

- a. Originality Checking & AI Detection Group Update (Senate Reference No. 24-28) – K. Jia and E. Mann

Please see attachment.

E. Ohlander: If the decision was to turn it off, would an alternative be implemented?

K. Jia: No.

A. Nasr: Why is it even a choice? Why not be without it?

K. Jia: It is part of the process. We hope that by doing the workshops that we are communicating the message about how to appropriately use it. We let the faculty know what they are dealing with and maybe we decide to keep it on. There is a procedure.

E. Mann: There is the potential of students to be falsely accused even when students have not used AI. So, this goes back to faculty understanding that this is an impersonal form of evaluating and we can't just take it as it is. Some students have just gotten a report.

K. Jia: Right. It is a choice. It is part of the process. But if there are too many concerns about misuse then turning it off is an option.

S. Buttes: Is there a way on a campus level, if students are accessing whatever tool because they are on campus, to have a watermark added when they are on the university internet? You know what I mean?

K. Jia: Yeah. So, basically, we have heard this a lot from faculty, but we can't limit what is out there. There are more and more tools out there. These can easily be bypassed and there is no way for you to find out. There is another third approach, which is instead of saying "I am trying to catch you," why don't we have an approach where we teach students what is the more important use. They can use AI as their assistant instead of it doing the job for them. For example, Grammarly has this tool for publishing where it has exactly what you described. You can start writing and you can type things out and copy things from AI and it has kind of like the watermark thing that you are mentioning. The problem is that we are seeing that as students have ownership they are not transparent with the faculty about their learning process. It is bigger than just the "how can I catch you?" It is more about what role does AI play in the learning process and making sure that they are prepared for the age of AI.

R. Friedman: Are the AI techniques powerful enough that you can ask AI to write an essay that would not be detected by AI techniques? Can it do that?

K. Jia: Well, technically there is a way. You can say to make it a freshman level. You can provide broader directions. When you are working with AI it is not about what AI can do for you. If you know what is less likely to be detected then you give directions that are less likely to be detected.

J. Lawton: Is the Turnitin survey looking for faculty feedback just if they use the AI detection software or not or will there be more to the survey?

K. Jia: The survey will be sent out this week. It is about if you are aware of this feature and have you used this before, and if you have used this before then what actions have you taken. The options are to keep this on or turn it off. It is asking what is your recommendation and why. Do you have any concerns, any questions? Please take the time to do the survey to make sure your voice is being heard.

L. Roberts: Sometimes, not always, but sometimes, scholarly works that are written by legitimate scholars have a machine-like quality. Are there instances where AI is detecting true scholarly work as written by a robot?

K. Jia: I think that is what is called false positive. Yes.

M. Wolf: The downstream effects of this stuff, like work study and other things. Is that part of your...?

K. Jia: Yes. That is part of it. For this semester, we have three major focuses. First, what do they do for assignments. For the faculty, what are the faculty doing to really change their approaches? We are providing workshops about how you can use AI to draft a rubric, and how you can do it more consistently, and how students can use it. It is so faculty are doing work in their classroom and not just seeing “how can I catch you?” It is about how we can use AI as an assistant.

E. Mann: I will also say that there is a lot of active involvement in evaluating the process and the detection tools.

S. Steiner: You are asking questions about how we use the AI or are you asking questions about how we interact with students with that?

K. Jia: Right. Basically, it says have you used the AI detection to check the students work.

S. Steiner: I mean, do we let the students see the report?

K. Jia: You have that option.

S. Steiner: At what point are we convinced to communicate to a student that we believe they are using AI? Are we asking questions of them?

K. Jia: We currently don't have a question about releasing a report to a student, but I believe that is a really good question to add. If they say “yes, I used it to turn it in” then we can add a question to say “I allowed my student to see the report.”

E. Mann: There are options that say “what do you do after you get this report?” And then “do you report it?”

S. Steiner: I know that this lawsuit thing is also part of the concern.

D. Miller: I was just wondering if this group looks at any other of our software or AI tools that we have as faculty. For example, I just started using Respondus Webcam Monitor, which if you are not familiar with has some AI in it. It looks at the face of the students and whether they are looking at all kinds of things. I only did it once. This is antidotal evidence, so take it with a grain of salt if you want. It flagged a number of my students as being out of the frame when they were

clearly in the frame. It was mostly doing it for black faces, so it seems as if the AI has some difficulty detecting black faces, particularly in the lighting. That is a grain of salt to take.

K. Jia: There are two types of AI tools. What you are talking about is the AI facial detection. It doesn't really address the idea of AI generated content. We have had some suspicious behavior when taking exams. What it does is exactly what you described. It sees if you are the only person in that room and if you are looking somewhere else to find someone to help you. Last year we sent out emails to everyone in the faculty saying to be cautious about some of the features because some students panic when they are being recorded and there are some privacy issues with that too. That is being used by faculty if they are concerned about the quiz taking.

M. Jordan: My question is about if this group looked at the graduate school theses.

K. Jia: What do you mean by that? For example, how the graduate school is using the detection or accuracy?

M. Jordan: As a plagiarism checker for theses.

K. Jia: There are two parts. There is AI detection for matching that says whether it is likely to be AI generated content. You are talking about the similarity report for initial plagiarism checking, which is pretty accurate for the most part because you can see where it is matching. The AI one is really a black box. No one knows what it is matching. That is why it is an issue.

A. Dirksen: If I can add to that real quick, if West Lafayette decides they again want to do a review in a couple of years, the tools out there for plagiarism detection. The push at this point is that Turnitin knows they have a monopoly and that has not impacted us a whole lot because our percentage of the shared contract is so much smaller, but that is an important point that we will need to bring up with that review for the plagiarism detector.

E. Mann: Yeah, I will say that West Lafayette and Global will use it far more than we will. They do take that into account, but when they change it is important.

H. Park: Are there any programs that can be used for course discussion?

K. Jia: For AI detection to work we have to have a certain amount of text to match the content. Also, one thing from a student's perspective is that we would also want to be cautious about using AI detection for discussion in real quizzes and exams because they have a very different focus. Usually when it comes to discussions many cases are about you integrate it and you do your own work. If you turn on the AI detection it can cause extra stress for students to learn about whether their writing is matching. It is more important for the student to integrate what they are learning. In other words, the assessment design part of the discussion is probably more prominent from what we see. There have been a lot of things faculty have been asking about this feature, so I would not be surprised if it might one day include discussions, but we don't have that now.



J. Givens: So, the AI detector is an unreliable tool with the possibility of a false positive that could target one of our international students, right? Why are we even discussing this issue?

E. Ohlander: I have found it extremely useful. I think 95% of the students that I have caught admitted to using AI. I think it depends on the context. I found it extremely helpful.

K. Jia: So, it depends. It depends on how your students are using it. Students could be using prompts to make it less detectable. There are some cases where students are using a tool at the last minute to do something very quickly and then paste that into Brightspace. The key is not about this tool having the potential to be problematic so let's get rid of it. The key is to be aware of the potential problem and have a conversation with students. To go back to your comment, if you have a suspicion, sometimes students will use a tool and you are suspicious, you can start a conversation.

E. Ohlander: The onus is on the instructor to teach it and discuss it.

A. Dirksen: Just a point of clarification. Just so you all know. CELT does not make any policy decisions. We provide trainings and outreach. Our teachings on this campus have an unusually close relationship with faculty and the IT side so we get put in charge in a lot of cases of gathering input and then could make recommendations to the administration here or to teams across the Purdue system, but your input is what drives those decisions. Please make sure that you complete the survey and encourage your colleagues to do so as well because our teaching center on this campus has an unusually strong voice in the Purdue system.

6. Unfinished business: There was no unfinished business.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 24-13) – A. Khalifa

A. Khalifa moved to approve Senate Document SD 24-13 (Process for Determining Faculty Qualifications).

E. Ohlander moved to suspend the rules in order to vote on the resolution.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

Resolution passed on a voice vote.

b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 24-14) – J. Nowak

J. Nowak moved to approve Senate Document SD 24-14 (The Future of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at Purdue University).

The meeting is suspended at 1:15 until noon, Monday, February 17, 2025.

Session II  
(February 17)

Acta

Senate Members Present:

A. Backer, J. Badia, K. Barker, B. Berry, A. Blackmon, B. Buldt, S. Buttes, S. Cody, Y. Deng, C. Drummond, R. Elsenbaumer, K. Fineran, R. Friedman, J. Givens, M. Hammonds, J. Johns, M. Jordan, A. Khalifa, T. Lewis, J. Li, V. Maloney, E. Mann, J. Mbuba, D. Miller, D. Momoh, A. Montenegro, A. Nasr, J. Nowak, I. Nunez, E. Ohlander, D. Ohlinger, L. Roberts, J. Rouleau, R. Shoquist, S. Steiner, K. Surface, D. Tahmassebi, G. Wang, M. Wang, M. Wolf

Senate Members Absent:

N. Adilov, B. Dattilo, S. Elfayoumy, C. Freitas, S. Hanke, S. Johnson, D. Kaiser, J. Lawton, J. Lewis, H. Luo, J. McHann, P. Mishra, G. Nakata, J. O'Connell, H. Park, P. Saha, S. Schory, K. Stultz-Dessent, K. White, Y. Zhang

Guests Present:

N. Borbieva O'Neill, A. Dirksen, T. Grady, C. Kuznar, A. Livschiz, K. Tierney-Louch

C. Gurgur reconvened the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on February 17, 2025.

b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 24-14) – J. Nowak

S. Cody moved to amend by adding “WHEREAS, the Indiana General Assembly voted on Thursday 6 February to pass Senate Bill 235 and ban diversity, equity, and inclusion at Indiana educational institutions; and” as the first “WHEREAS.”

R. Friedman moved to amend by changing ““WHEREAS, the Indiana General Assembly voted on Thursday 6 February to pass Senate Bill 235 and ban diversity, equity, and inclusion at Indiana educational institutions; and,” to “WHEREAS the Indiana General Assembly voted on 6 February 2025 to pass Senate Bill 289 which effective July 1, 2025 would ban all state spending on diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives at Indiana educational institutions; and.”

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

S. Cody moved to amend by adding "BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that, in keeping with measures already underway in the Purdue system, the Fort Wayne Senate recommend renaming and realigning our DEI Offices in order to adapt to the current legislative challenges and safeguard PFW's commitment to fostering a supportive and inclusive campus environment" as

the line of the resolution.

C. Gurgur moved for unanimous consent to strike “adapt to the current legislative challenges and” from the amendment.

No objects to vote of unanimous consent.

“Adapt to the current legislative challenges and” removed from the amendment.

Motion to amend failed on a hand vote.

B. Buldt moved to amend by adding “WHEREAS this resolution does not purport to speak for every single member of the Faculty nor to reflect an official position of our university or of Purdue University, it does reflect what Faculty Senate believes the official position of the university should be” as the last “WHEREAS.”

Motion to amend pass on a voice vote.

Resolution moved to the March Senate agenda.

c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 24-15) – J. Nowak

B. Buldt moved to remove Senate Document SD 24-15 (Clarifying Amendments to the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Faculty).

C. Gurgur moved for unanimous consent to remove Senate Document SD 24-15 from the agenda.

No objections to vote of unanimous consent.

Resolution removed from the agenda.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Question time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 24-29) – A. Livschiz

At 8:45PM on Saturday of the weekend before the start of spring semester, faculty and staff received notification that they would need to use VPN to get to certain university resources, including Brightspace and go.pfw.edu. IT Services would not reopen until Monday morning. Instructions that we received did not appear to work for everyone. By Monday, in addition to faculty struggling with this new policy, students discovered the problem as well, and many

faculty, many of whom were still trying to figure this out, were flooded with panicked emails from students about access to their online classes, etc.

The policy's roll out brought chaos and stress and has negatively impacted many people's ability to do their jobs. I can not even imagine how much stress all this in turn placed on people who still work at IT services at PFW, who, as I understand it, had no say in the policy but got to bear the brunt of the aftermath.

Even those of us who eventually were able to get things to work properly have discovered that problems can crop up unexpectedly. As I am typing this question on Thursday evening, after being able to use VPN for 8 days, I discovered that it no longer works. I have emails from students that need to be answered that require me to go into their records, something that I assumed I would be able to do (since I could this morning) but am not able to do, and won't be able to get fixed until tomorrow when IT reopens.

When I described what happened on our campus to people who work in cyber security in the private sector, they were utterly horrified by the way the roll out happened.

It would be helpful to have an explanation for why the policy had to be implemented so abruptly without warning or adequate preparation. What made it necessary to make so many people's working environments so stressful and challenging? What are the plans for ensuring that students, especially students who only take online classes, are able to access the materials they need?

R. Elsenbaumer: (Answer delivered via email).

The timing of the move to implement of VPN was indeed unfortunate and disruptive; however, all indications from the Purdue University Information Technology office are that the critical nature of an email phishing incident required immediate action in order to protect university systems, as well as students, faculty, and staff.

Purdue University Fort Wayne was first notified by Purdue's Information Technology office on Wednesday, January 8, that there was a critical data security incident that was beginning to impact Purdue Fort Wayne systems and pose a significant threat to students, faculty, and staff. As everyone is aware, all Purdue Fort Wayne information technology staff began reporting directly to Purdue's Information Technology office last summer, and the Purdue IT office now oversees all IT operations on the Fort Wayne campus.

During the following three days, there were multiple Teams calls to assess the full impact of the incident and the continuing threat. These calls were driven by Purdue's IT office and included Purdue IT staff housed on our campus, as well as Purdue Fort Wayne staff from the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Financial and Administrative Affairs. Purdue Fort Wayne's Office of Communications and Marketing was notified on that Saturday to be ready in the event campus messaging needed to be deployed to students, faculty, and staff.

As the meetings unfolded, the following information became evident:

- A phishing email that was sent to Purdue Fort Wayne students, faculty, and staff resulted in 1,280 unique users clicking on an unauthorized link. Some users clicked more than once, resulting in a total of 1,522 clicks.
- As a result of the clicks, 458 email users were negatively impacted on the Purdue Fort Wayne campus. Of those 458 users who were impacted:
  - o 246 users had scrambled/compromised email accounts because they clicked on the phishing link
  - o 157 users had scrambled/compromised email accounts related to logging in via unauthorized IP addresses
  - o 55 users had scrambled/compromised email accounts related to changing their banking information in TouchNet
- A total of 212 users (adding the 157 and 55 users above) had confirmed email account takeovers.
- As a result of their interaction with the phishing email, two Purdue Fort Wayne students had their financial aid disbursements sent to the perpetrator's unauthorized accounts with a total cost to the university of \$3,800.

As a result of this activity and the ongoing threat to Purdue Fort Wayne systems, Bob Geswein, Chief Information Security Officer for Purdue University, directed on Saturday afternoon, January 11, that all Purdue Fort Wayne students, faculty, and staff must immediately begin using VPN when accessing systems from off campus. They further directed that a message communicating this information, including instructions for installing and accessing VPN must be sent to all Purdue Fort Wayne students, faculty, and staff that evening. Those emails arrived in email inboxes around 8:45 p.m. on Saturday evening, January 11.

Additional calls were initiated on Sunday, January 12, between the team from West Lafayette and the team from Purdue Fort Wayne. As a result, an additional campus message about VPN access was sent to all Purdue Fort Wayne students, faculty, and staff that afternoon, arriving in inboxes around 5:15 p.m.

Purdue Fort Wayne leadership is well aware of the impact an eleventh-hour email had on our university community just as we were starting up for the spring semester—especially our students. However, that decision came from the Purdue Information Technology office, and by all accounts was unavoidable.

While the disruption was inconvenient, the immediate action curtailed any additional compromised student email accounts or bank accounts—or any additional university expense. Additionally, since the VPN implementation in January, there have been no compromised university accounts as a result of phishing emails.

#### 10. Committee reports “for information only”:

- a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 24-26) – J. Nowak

Senate Reference No. 24-26 (Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2023-2024) was presented for information only.

- b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 24-27) – J. Nowak

Senate Reference No. 24-27 (Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2022-2023) was presented for information only.

11. The general good and welfare of the University: There was no general good and welfare of the university.

12. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon  
Senate Clerk

# Originality Checking & AI Detection Group Update

PFW Senate Presentation

Spring 2025

**PURDUE**  
UNIVERSITY®  
FORT WAYNE

# ***Group Project Description***

*“Identify the current needs of Purdue regarding originality and AI detection as part of the academic integrity process. This initiative will determine what specific technical resources are needed and if they are even possible to implement. It will also review potential impact of change to current academic integrity processes, resources, and policies”*

Turnitin produces 2 reports:

- “Originality Check”
- “AI Writing Detection”



# *Group Members*

Heather Servaty-Seib (VPT&L)

Chantal Levesque-Bristol (CIE)

Howard Sypher (Ed Policy Comm)

Harry Denny (Purdue OWL)

Lindsay Hamm (Sociology)

Jess Stefancic (OSRR)

Kate Kozikowski (TLT)

Katie Brown (Purdue IT)

Judy Lewandowski (Purdue Global)

Sam Weber (Purdue Global)

Adam Dircksen (Purdue Fort Wayne)

Kathie Surface (Purdue Fort Wayne)

Adolfo Coronado (Purdue Fort Wayne)

Erika Mann (Purdue Fort Wayne)

Jessica Ivy (Purdue Northwest)

Emily Hixon (Purdue Northwest)

# *Current Progress and Future Considerations*

1. We need to keep originality checking for academic integrity consideration.
2. Currently, market research shows Turnitin is likely the best option for the Purdue system, and so Turnitin is renewed for this academic year.
3. All GenAI “detection” software is unreliable and will likely remain that way for the foreseeable future.
4. Another market research might be conducted in a year or two to investigate technology development.

# Instructors' View of Turnitin Results in Brightspace


  [AI and the Future of Workforce Panel Discussion...](#) (3.53 MB) 1 % 

  [Diffusion of Innovation Introduction.docx](#) (18.74 KB) 23 % 

  [Version 6.docx](#) (13.63 KB) 0 % 

## Submission 3

**Unevaluated** Tuesday, July 16, 2024 12:37 PM



 AI and the Future of Workforce Panel D  
DOCX • 3.5 MB

Turnitin Similarity Report


1 % 

## Submission 2

**Unevaluated** Tuesday, July 16, 2024 12:10 PM

  Diffusion of Innovation Introduction  
DOCX • 18.7 KB

Turnitin Similarity Report

23 % 

- When Turnitin is enabled for assignments, instructors can see the similarity score.
- Instructors click on the Turnitin Similarity Report score to open it.

# The First Page of the Turnitin Report



## 31% Overall Similarity

Filters

1 Exclusion →

Match Groups

Sources

19 matches found with Turnitin's database

Show Help

	11 Not Cited or Quoted	9%
	0 Missing Quotations	0%
	3 Missing Citation	10%
	5 Cited and Quoted	12%

- The default is the Similarity Report.
- Detailed report is on the right side.

The "AI Writing" Report for less than 20% of the Paper Content "Detected" as AI-Generated

AI Writing \*18%


**\*18% detected as AI** ⓘ

Percentage indicates the amount of qualifying text within the submission that was likely generated using AI.

*\*AI detection scores below the 20% threshold, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives.*

---

☰ **Submission Breakdown**

 **1 AI-generated only** 18%

Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.

# Example AI Detection Report



Similarity 23%    Flags    **AI Writing 56%**



2.5% of the population.

- **Early Adopters:** The early adopters are the next to try new ideas. They are influential and often lead others by example with their enthusiasm and positive attitude. They are well-connected, respected, and educated, making up about 13.5% of the population.
- **Early Majority:** These people are more cautious and need more evidence before adopting new ideas. They follow the early adopters but take a little longer to decide. The early majority make up about 34% of the population.
- **Late Majority:** This group is skeptical and resistant to change. They only adopt new ideas after the majority of their peers have done so. They also make up about 34% of the population.
- **Laggards:** The laggards are the last to adopt new ideas. They are traditional, isolated, and very reluctant to change. They only adopt new ideas when they have no other choice or when the new idea is already outdated. This group make up about 16% of the population.

However, it is worth mentioning, the speed at which new ideas are adopted depends on several factors, such as the characteristics of the innovation, communication channels, the social system, and timing. Rogers pointed out that innovations perceived as having relative advantage, compatibility, simplicity, observability, and trialability are more likely to be adopted quickly and widely.

## How does diffusion of innovation work?

According to Rogers, diffusion of innovation follows a process that consists of five phases: information. These phases describe the adopting or rejecting an innovation.



## 56% detected as AI ⓘ

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

### Submission Breakdown



**13 AI-generated only** 56%  
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.

**0 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased** 0%  
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.





# The "AI Writing" Report for 100% of the Paper Content "Detected" as AI-Generated

100% detected as AI ⓘ

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

## ☰ Submission Breakdown



-  **1 AI-generated only** 74%  
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.
-  **2 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased** 26%  
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.



FAQs

[View FAQs](#)



Resources

[Explore](#)



Guides

[View guides](#)

[Hide Disclaimer](#) ▲

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

# *Turnitin Disclaimer*

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that **might be** prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment **may not always be accurate** (it may misidentify writing that is likely human generated as AI generated and likely AI generated as human generated) so it **should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions** against a student. It takes **further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies** to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.



# Add a slide for student view

Instructors can choose to allow students to see the similarity report or not.

## Turnitin™ Integration

### Similarity Report

Enable similarity checking to identify matching or similar text to sources in Turnitin's databases.

Enable Similarity Report for this folder




#### Display

Allow learners to see similarity scores in their submission folder

#### Submissions Checked

Automatic similarity checking on all submissions

Identify individual submissions for similarity checking

Submission ID	Submission(s)	Turnitin Similarity Report	Date Submitted
10448382	 <a href="#">Version 6.docx</a> (13.63 KB) Version 6 Turnitin™	0 %	Apr 4, 2023 1:08 PM
14674549	 <a href="#">Diff</a> Turnitin™	23 %	Jul 16, 2024 12:10 PM
14674596	 <a href="#">Ala</a> (MB) Turnitin™	1 %	Jul 16, 2024 12:37 PM

# *Consequences of AI Detection Models like Turnitin*

1. They have regular and frequent false positives, and can easily be manipulated (Weber-Wulff et al., Cassal & Kessler, Perkins et al., Lu et al., Creo & Pudasaini)
2. Even a very generous assumption of 90% accuracy would have falsely flagged 17,500 student assignments last year.
3. Early research suggests non-native English speakers are many more times likely to be falsely flagged (Liang et al.).
4. A student is suing a high school in Massachusetts for using AI detection software.

# *PFW Plan*

- We have major concerns with the AI detection feature component.
- Turnitin AI Detection is a campus-level configuration.
  - PWL and PFW currently have the feature turned on in Brightspace.
  - If it is turned off, nobody can use the AI detection feature.
  - If remained on, instructors can choose to use it or not.
- The Ed Tech team plans to send out a survey to all PFW instructor to collect feedback.

*Thank You*

**PURDUE**  
UNIVERSITY  
**FORT WAYNE**

MEMORANDUM

TO : Fort Wayne Senate  
FROM : Amal Khalifa, Chair  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
DATE : 01/24/2025  
SUBJECT : Process for Determining Faculty Qualifications

WHEREAS, the Higher Learning Commission states that “faculty should participate substantially in the establishment of institutional policies and procedures for faculty qualifications” (HLC Guidelines, Institutional Policies and Procedures for Determining Faculty Qualifications: HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices, November, 2023);

WHEREAS, the Faculty Affairs Committee is responsible for setting policies through joint effort concerning the conduct, welfare, privileges, tenure, appointment, retention, and promotion of the faculty (SD 15-22 Bylaws of the Senate; 3.1.1.1);

BE IT RESOLVED, that departments develop policies and procedures for hiring qualified faculty that 1) cover the factors of achievement of academic credentials at least one level above the degree level taught, progress towards credentials, and equivalent experience (HLC, 2023); 2) are codified, transparent, consistently implemented, and regularly reviewed (HLC, 2023); and 3) extend to all instructors regardless of location (e.g., on campus vs Dual Credit in high schools) or delivery method (e.g., face-to-face vs online). Then submit them to the Office of Academic Affairs for review and approval by March 31, 2025.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that documentation for hiring faculty deemed qualified via “equivalent experience” include how that equivalent experience was determined. Equivalent experience qualifications include (but are not limited to) a minimum threshold of experience in an industry/occupation/field, actual tests or certifications (i.e., licensing exams, board exams, EC-Council Certified Ethical Hacker (C|EH) certification, CPA, etc.), research and/or scholarship in the area, and/or other public forms of recognized achievement (i.e., juried exhibits, publications, patents, awards).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that departmental policies and procedures for hiring qualified faculty will in no way impact Graduate Faculty status. The Purdue Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Scholars sets policies regarding Graduate Faculty as well as guidelines for Service on Graduate Degree Committees.

<b>Approved</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Abstention</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Non-Voting</b>
Mark Jordan, Jay Johns, Hui Di, Sarah Wagner, Amal Khalifa.			Adam Dirksen, Promothes Saha, Wylie Sirk.	Kim O’Connor.

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Fort Wayne Senate  
FROM: Cigdem Gurgur, Executive Committee Chair  
Steve Carr and Noor Borbieva O'Neill, Voting Faculty  
DATE: 24 January 2025  
SUBJ: The Future of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at Purdue University Fort Wayne

**The Future of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Initiatives at Purdue University**

WHEREAS the Indiana General Assembly voted on 6 February 2025 to pass Senate Bill 289 which effective July 1, 2025 would ban all state spending on diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives at Indiana educational institutions; and,

WHEREAS House Bill 1496 currently introduced in the Indiana Legislature “prohibits use of public funds by a state educational institution for policies or programs and campus activities outside the classroom that... advocate for campus diversity, equity, and inclusion”; and,

WHEREAS our web page titled “Mission, Vision, Values, and Principles” lists “Diversity and Inclusion” among the university’s “Core Values” at <https://www.pfw.edu/about-pfw/mission-vision-values-principles>; and,

WHEREAS the university’s “Diversity Statement” listed under “Our Principles” on the same web page reads as follows:

Purdue University Fort Wayne is committed to creating an environment that enhances learning by recognizing the inherent worth of all individuals at the university. Diversity stimulates creativity, promotes the exchange of ideas, and enriches campus life. The term *diversity* encompasses differences of culture, background, and experience among individuals and groups. Such differences include, but are not necessarily limited to, differences of race, ethnicity, color, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, class, age, and disabilities, as well as political and religious affiliation, and socioeconomic status;

and,

WHEREAS Purdue University Fort Wayne created a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Office which includes seventeen staff positions across six units including the Multicultural Center, the Women’s Center, the Q Center, TRIO Student Support Services, and TRIO Upward Bound; and,

WHEREAS principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion figure prominently throughout the curriculum at Purdue University Fort Wayne at multiple levels including General Education, College, and Program-level requirements; and,

WHEREAS House Bill 1496 would potentially eliminate the entire Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Office as well as terminate seventeen staff positions by forcing the University to choose between its principles and its funding; and,

WHEREAS House Bill 1496 offers only vague and ambiguous standards for what counts as advocacy or “activities outside the classroom;” and,

WHEREAS this vague and ambiguous language could potentially result in the Indiana General Assembly banning any systematic curricular requirement concerning diversity, equity because such requirements exist “outside the classroom;” and,

WHEREAS this resolution does not purport to speak for every single member of the Faculty nor to reflect an official position of our university or of Purdue University, it does reflect what Faculty Senate believes the official position of the university should be;

BE IT RESOLVED Fort Wayne Senate oppose House Bill 1496; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED Fort Wayne Senate discuss additional steps the University needs to take to protect our curriculum, the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Office and the seventeen staff members who work there, and our stated Mission, Vision, Values, and Principles.

**Approved**

K. Barker

B. Buldt

C. Gurgur

J. Johns

J. McHann

J. Nowak

L. Roberts

**Opposed****Abstention****Absent****Non-Voting**

C. Ortsey



# HOUSE BILL No. 1496

---

## DIGEST OF INTRODUCED BILL

**Citations Affected:** IC 21-7-13; IC 21-39.5-6-1.5; IC 21-41-16.

**Synopsis:** State educational institution administration. Prohibits use of public funds by a state educational institution for policies or programs and campus activities outside the classroom that: (1) advocate for campus diversity, equity, and inclusion; or (2) promote or engage in political or social activism. Makes related changes.

**Effective:** July 1, 2025.

---

---

**Bascom, Teshka, Zimmerman,  
Davis**

---

---

January 21, 2025, read first time and referred to Committee on Education.

---

---



First Regular Session of the 124th General Assembly (2025)

PRINTING CODE. Amendments: Whenever an existing statute (or a section of the Indiana Constitution) is being amended, the text of the existing provision will appear in this style type, additions will appear in **this style type**, and deletions will appear in ~~this style type~~.

Additions: Whenever a new statutory provision is being enacted (or a new constitutional provision adopted), the text of the new provision will appear in **this style type**. Also, the word **NEW** will appear in that style type in the introductory clause of each SECTION that adds a new provision to the Indiana Code or the Indiana Constitution.

Conflict reconciliation: Text in a statute in *this style type* or ~~this style type~~ reconciles conflicts between statutes enacted by the 2024 Regular Session of the General Assembly.

# HOUSE BILL No. 1496

A BILL FOR AN ACT to amend the Indiana Code concerning higher education.

*Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:*

1 SECTION 1. IC 21-7-13-9.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA CODE  
2 AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY  
3 1, 2025]: **Sec. 9.5. For purposes of IC 21-41-16, "campus diversity,  
4 equity, and inclusion" has the meaning set forth in IC 21-41-16-1.**  
5 SECTION 2. IC 21-7-13-18.4 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
6 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
7 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 18.4. For purposes of  
8 IC 21-41-16, "federal funds" has the meaning set forth in  
9 IC 21-41-16-2.**  
10 SECTION 3. IC 21-7-13-25.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
11 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
12 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 25.5. For purposes of  
13 IC 21-41-16, "political or social activism" has the meaning set  
14 forth in IC 21-41-16-3.**  
15 SECTION 4. IC 21-7-13-27.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
16 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
17 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 27.5. For purposes of**



- 1 **IC 21-14-16, "programs or campus activities" has the meaning set**  
 2 **forth in IC 21-41-16-4.**
- 3 SECTION 5. IC 21-7-13-31.4 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
 4 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
 5 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 31.4. For purposes of**  
 6 **IC 21-41-16, "social issues" has the meaning set forth in**  
 7 **IC 21-41-16-5.**
- 8 SECTION 6. IC 21-7-13-32.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
 9 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
 10 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 32.5. For purposes of**  
 11 **IC 21-41-16, "state funds" has the meaning set forth in**  
 12 **IC 21-41-16-6.**
- 13 SECTION 7. IC 21-7-13-34.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
 14 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
 15 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 34.5. For purposes of**  
 16 **IC 21-41-16, "student-led organization" has the meaning set forth**  
 17 **in IC 21-41-16-7.**
- 18 SECTION 8. IC 21-39.5-6-1.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA  
 19 CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS  
 20 [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2025]: **Sec. 1.5. This article is subject to**  
 21 **IC 21-41-16.**
- 22 SECTION 9. IC 21-41-16 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA CODE  
 23 AS A **NEW** CHAPTER TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE  
 24 JULY 1, 2025]:
- 25 **Chapter 16. Prohibition on Funding**
- 26 **Sec. 1. As used in this chapter, "campus diversity, equity, and**  
 27 **inclusion" means any:**
- 28 **(1) policy; or**  
 29 **(2) program or campus activity;**
- 30 **that classifies individuals on the basis of race, color, sex, national**  
 31 **origin, gender identity, or sexual orientation and promotes**  
 32 **differential or preferential treatment of individuals on the basis of**  
 33 **the classification.**
- 34 **Sec. 2. (a) As used in this chapter, "federal funds" means those**  
 35 **funds provided to the state educational institution directly or**  
 36 **indirectly by an appropriation by the Congress of the United**  
 37 **States. The term includes financial aid provided to the state**  
 38 **educational institution by or on behalf of a student attending the**  
 39 **state educational institution if the financial aid is provided to the**  
 40 **student via a governmental aid or grant program.**
- 41 **(b) The term does not include student fees to support student-led**  
 42 **organizations notwithstanding any speech or expressive activity by**



1 such organizations that would otherwise violate this chapter if the  
 2 student fees must be allocated to student-led organizations  
 3 pursuant to written policies adopted by the board of trustees of the  
 4 state educational institution.

5 **Sec. 3. (a) As used in this chapter, "political or social activism"**  
 6 **means any activity:**

7 (1) organized with a purpose of effecting or preventing change  
 8 to a government policy, action, or function, or any activity  
 9 intended to achieve a desired result related to social issues;  
 10 and

11 (2) with which the state educational institution endorses or  
 12 promotes a position in communications, advertisements,  
 13 programs, or campus activities.

14 **(b) The term does not include:**

15 (1) authorized government relations and lobbying activities of  
 16 the state educational institution concerning matters that  
 17 directly affect the operations of the state educational  
 18 institution or direct-support organizations of the state  
 19 educational institution; or

20 (2) endorsement or promotion of a position that encourages  
 21 compliance with state or federal law or a rule of the  
 22 commission for higher education.

23 **Sec. 4. As used in this chapter, "programs or campus activities"**  
 24 **means any activities authorized or administered by a state**  
 25 **educational institution that involve:**

26 (1) student participation, other than classroom instruction; or

27 (2) hiring, recruiting, training, evaluating, promoting,  
 28 disciplining, or terminating institution employees or  
 29 contractors.

30 **Sec. 5. As used in this chapter, "social issues" refers to topics**  
 31 **that polarize or divide society among political, ideological, moral,**  
 32 **or religious beliefs.**

33 **Sec. 6. (a) As used in this chapter, "state funds" are those funds**  
 34 **provided to a state educational institution by an appropriation**  
 35 **enacted by the general assembly. The term includes financial aid**  
 36 **provided to the state educational institution by or on behalf of a**  
 37 **student attending the state educational institution if the financial**  
 38 **aid is provided to the student via a state government aid or grant**  
 39 **program.**

40 **(b) The term does not include student fees to support student-led**  
 41 **organizations notwithstanding any speech or expressive activity by**  
 42 **the organizations that would otherwise violate this chapter if the**



1 student fees must be allocated to student-led organizations  
2 pursuant to written policies adopted by the board of trustees of the  
3 state educational institution.

4 Sec. 7. As used in this chapter, "student-led organization"  
5 means an organization recognized by the state educational  
6 institution as an active and registered student organization that is  
7 comprised of student members with a faculty or staff advisor,  
8 including an organization that receives activity and service fees  
9 authorized by the board of trustees of the state educational  
10 institution.

11 Sec. 8. A state educational institution may not expend state  
12 funds or federal funds to promote, support, or maintain programs  
13 or campus activities that:

- 14 (1) advocate for campus diversity, equity, and inclusion; or
- 15 (2) promote or engage in political or social activism.

16 Sec. 9. A state educational institution advocates for campus  
17 diversity, equity, and inclusion when it implements a policy or  
18 engages in a program or campus activity that:

- 19 (1) advantages or disadvantages, or attempts to advantage or  
20 disadvantage, an individual or group on the basis of race,  
21 color, sex, national origin, gender identity, or sexual  
22 orientation, to equalize or increase outcomes, participation, or  
23 representation as compared to other individuals or groups; or
- 24 (2) promotes the position that a group's or an individual's  
25 action is inherently, unconsciously, or implicitly biased on the  
26 basis of race, color, sex, national origin, gender identity, or  
27 sexual orientation.

28 Sec. 10. Student-led organizations may use state educational  
29 institution facilities, notwithstanding any speech or expressive  
30 activity by the organizations that would otherwise violate section  
31 8 of this chapter, if the use must be granted to student-led  
32 organizations pursuant to written policies of the state educational  
33 institution adopted by the board of trustees.

34 Sec. 11. Section 8 of this chapter does not prohibit programs or  
35 campus activities or functions required for:

- 36 (1) compliance with general or federal laws or regulations;
- 37 (2) obtaining or retaining institutional or discipline specific  
38 accreditation with the approval of the commission for higher  
39 education; or
- 40 (3) access to programs for military veterans, Pell Grant  
41 recipients, or other scholarships provided by the federal or  
42 state government.



1           **Sec. 12. Section 8 of this chapter does not prohibit expenditure**  
2 **of state funds or federal funds if:**  
3           **(1) except as prohibited under IC 21-16-2-4(4), IC 21-20-6,**  
4 **and IC 21-41-4-5, the expenditure is for ministerial or**  
5 **administrative activities of a program or campus activity that**  
6 **is not unique to that program or campus activity; and**  
7           **(2) the specific program or campus activity is otherwise**  
8 **supported by private funds.**  
9           **Sec. 13. A state educational institution must designate a state**  
10 **educational institution official or officials who are responsible for**  
11 **compliance, oversight, and adherence to the prohibited**  
12 **expenditure provisions of this chapter.**



**Question Time**

At 8:45PM on Saturday of the weekend before the start of spring semester, faculty and staff received notification that they would need to use VPN to get to certain university resources, including Brightspace and go.pfw.edu. IT Services would not reopen until Monday morning. Instructions that we received did not appear to work for everyone. By Monday, in addition to faculty struggling with this new policy, students discovered the problem as well, and many faculty, many of whom were still trying to figure this out, were flooded with panicked emails from students about access to their online classes, etc.

The policy's roll out brought chaos and stress and has negatively impacted many people's ability to do their jobs. I can not even imagine how much stress all this in turn placed on people who still work at IT services at PFW, who, as I understand it, had no say in the policy but got to bear the brunt of the aftermath.

Even those of us who eventually were able to get things to work properly have discovered that problems can crop up unexpectedly. As I am typing this question on Thursday evening, after being able to use VPN for 8 days, I discovered that it no longer works. I have emails from students that need to be answered that require me to go into their records, something that I assumed I would be able to do (since I could this morning) but am not able to do, and won't be able to get fixed until tomorrow when IT reopens.

When I described what happened on our campus to people who work in cyber security in the private sector, they were utterly horrified by the way the roll out happened.

It would be helpful to have an explanation for why the policy had to be implemented so abruptly without warning or adequate preparation. What made it necessary to make so many people's working environments so stressful and challenging? What are the plans for ensuring that students, especially students who only take online classes, are able to access the materials they need?

A. Livschiz

**Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2023-2024**

Due to EC: Monday, December 9, 2024

## SD 23-2: Persona Non Grata Determination Process

- Complied with
- Vice Chancellor of Financial and Administrative Affairs, Glen Nakata, gave a brief presentation on *persona non grata* at Faculty Senate in February 2024.

## SD 23-9: Responding to Concerns from Campus Climate Survey: Deadnaming

- Partly complied with
- As of Fall 2024, COGNOS reports include students' preferred names rather than legal names.
- The OAA did not develop and promote policies that clearly distinguish between free speech and the commitment to fostering inclusive classrooms.

## SD 23-16: Indiana Senate Bill 202 to Amend the Indiana Code Concerning Higher Education

- Not complied with
- The administration did not take a public stance against SEA 202; instead, Chancellor Elsenbaumer indicated that Purdue Fort Wayne would follow the guidance provided by Purdue West Lafayette regarding any statements on the matter.

## SD 23-27: PFW Faculty Senate Position on Conflict in the Middle East

- Partly complied with
- Administration did not take a public stance on the ongoing conflict in the Middle East.
- In June 2024, PFW hosted a vigil for Gaza, emphasizing the themes of peace and unity. The event served as a space for reflection and remembrance of those who have lost their lives in the Middle East due to conflict.



**Executive Committee Report on Administrative Compliance 2022-2023**

November 6, 2023

**SD 22-4: Access to Reproductive Health Care for All Benefited Purdue Employees**

- Not complied with
- Senate EC must ask Chancellor Elsenbaumer whether he communicated with the Purdue Board of Trustees about this issue. Channels for getting such questions answered remain unclear (see notes below about past procedures).

**SD 22-6: Review of the Created Equal Event on Campus on Tuesday, September 20, 2022**

- Partly complied with
- During Faculty Senate, a member from Administration informed Senators on the process organizations must follow to be allowed on campus, which involved a formal signed agreement.
- Administration informed Senators that organizations with diverse backgrounds and missions will continue to have campus access, provided they adhere to the agreement process.
- It is still uncertain whether this organization returned to campus since this issue occurred.

**SD 22-10: Public Sharing Information about Deaths of Students at PFW**

- Complied with
- The University continues to follow the “Protocol for Response to the Death of a Student”

**SD 22-16: Shared Governance and Consideration of Greek Life**

- Complied with

**SD 22-23: Support for WL University Senate Document 22-20 PNW Concerning Chancellor Thomas Keon’s Racist Comments**

- Not complied with – BUT deemed unnecessary
- The Purdue Board of Trustees approved Kenneth Holford as the new chancellor of Purdue University Northwest starting on January 8, 2024. So, Thomas Keon is no longer chancellor of PNW. It did not have anything to do with the Elsenbaumer administration, and so it can be considered resolved.

**SD 22-30: Reminder to Our Administrative Leadership**

- Partly complied with