

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Tenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
January 28, 1991
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 10, 1990
3. Acceptance of the agenda - G. Szymanski
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
5. Report of the Presiding Officer Senate Reference No. 90-8) - W: Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. IU Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 90-9) - M. Downs
 - b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 90-14) - A. Friedel
 - c. PU Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Document SD 90-15) - A. Finco
 - d. Senate Document SD 90-16 - W. Frederick
7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 90-10)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 90-11) - M. Auburn
 - b. University Resources, Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 90-12) - A. Friedel
 - c. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 90-13) - J. Switzer
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Memorial resolutions:
 - a. Lloyd Wilson Smith (Senate Reference No. 90-14) - R. Kendall
 - b. Edwin A. Haglund (Senate Reference No. 90-15) - R. Pacer
12. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: S. Harroff

Sergeant-at-Arms: R. Barrett

Senate Members Present:

M. Auburn, J. Blakemore, E. Blumenthal, F. Sorelli, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, J. Carnaghi, A. Chatterjea, P. Conn, D. Cox, V. Craig, M. Downs, S. Dhawale, J. Eichenauer, A. Finco, E. Foley, A. Friedel, J. Haw, R. Hawley, R. Jeske, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, J. Lantz, D. Legg, J. Lutz, M. Mansfield, J. Manzer, J. Meyers, R. Miers, R. Novak, D. Oberstar, S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, D. Schmidt, A. Shupe, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, G. Szymanski, M. H. Thuente, W. Unsell, K. Wakley, W. Walker, E. Waters

Senate Members Absent:

A. Karim, J. Klotz, D. Kruse, J. Owen, J. Silver, J. Sunderman, J. Switzer

Attachments:

"Results of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review Election" (SR No. 90-16)

["Amendment of Senate Bylaws: Proposed Change in Charge to the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee"](#) (SD 90-14)

["Fort Wayne Faculty Representation on the \[Purdue University at West Lafayette\] University Senate"](#) (SD 90-15)

["Resolution of Appreciation: John R. Carnaghi"](#) (SD 90-16)

Faculty Members Present:

K Balthaser, L. Balthaser, A. Bassett, J. Beard,,E. Cowen, V. Coufoudakis, L. Griffm, R. Kendall, D. McCants, R. Pacer, M. Souers, R. Svoboda

Visitors Present: K Beery J. Dahl, N. Newell, H. Relue, R. Ritchie, R. Steiner, K. Zimmerman

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of December 10.1990: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

G. Szymanski moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.
4. Resorts of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Indiana University: M. Downs had no report .
 - b. Purdue University:

A. Finco: Pat Collins has informed me that the IPFW focus group has met to discuss the TIAA/CREF Retirement Task Force list of options. Hewitt Associates, the consulting firm that conducted the focus group meetings, claims that the response to requests to serve on the focus group at our campus was the best of any of the other Purdue University campuses. In fact, they were so overwhelmed by the number willing to serve on the Task Force, they had to schedule a larger room to accommodate all of the participants. Moreover, they claim the IPFW focus group asked several important questions that hadn't been asked on any other campus. I want to offer my personal thanks and the gratitude of the Task Force for the time and input of those who served on the IPFW focus group. Thank you.

I just received all of the information I need to call a [Purdue University] Committee on Institutional Affairs meeting for the purpose of obtaining their input regarding the Task Force list of options. Pat Collins, the other person from IPFW on the Task Force, will be invited to attend this CIA meeting. It is my intent to call the meeting for next week. There are a couple of items having to do with health that Don Schmidt is privy to. I wonder if I may give the floor to him?

D. Schmidt: Purdue's Health Plan Advisory Committee will be meeting this fall. They currently have two programs under consideration which will be forwarded to the president for his approval. One is the Medical Claims Appeal Board, which would be a mechanism to be used by a person who has filed medical claims and has had the claims turned down. With this plan they could go through an adjudication process. The other, item in process is a long-term-care insurance program. It will be a group type of Purdue policy where you can opt to purchase this yourself for long-term care. The preparation for that program is about at the same stage as the other program. Both are being written in preparation for forwarding to Purdue University.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

W. Frederick referred the body to SR No. 90-8 [Report on Senate Documents].

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. IU Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 90-9) - M. Downs:

M. Downs conducted the election for the IU Faculty Board of Review (see SR No. 90-16 attached).

b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 90-14) - A. Friedel:

A. Friedel moved to approve SD 90-14 (Amendment of Senate Bylaws: Proposed Change in Charge to the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

c. PU Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Document 90-1 - A. Finco

A. Finco moved to approve SD 90-15 (Fort Wayne Representation on the [Purdue University at West Lafayette] University Senate). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

d. Senate Document SD 90-16 - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick yielded the chair to M. Downs.

W. Frederick moved to approve SD 90-16 (Resolution of Appreciation: John R. Carnaghi). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

M. Downs yielded the chair back to W. Frederick.

7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 90-10):

Q: Whaddya [sic] think of the following statistics (from the most recent annual issue of the campus's *Statistical Profiles* booklet)?

- Despite Increases in credit hours and bodies enrolled, the number of faculty is slightly smaller this year than last, although the number of associate faculty is larger and, as usual, the number of administrators has, as always, increased (the latter by almost 6%).
- Budgeted state appropriations have again declined as a percentage of the IPFW budget, and the percentage of the budget paid by student fees has again increased.
- Only 19.2% of this year's IPFW freshman class came from the top 20% of their high-school graduating class (down from 20.6% last year, and reflecting an unbroken decline from 26.0% only four years ago).
- Only 57.7% of this year's IPFW freshman class came from the top 50% of their high-school graduating class (down from 60.4% last year, and reflecting an unbroken decline from 69.0% only four years ago).
- The apparently perpetual, slow decline in the SAT scores of IPFW's freshmen has continued
- Despite indications--some believed them promises--that Guided Studies admissions would be cut back, the number of Guided Studies students this year leaped to 625, an increase of more than 30% over the 467 enrolled last year. [S. Hollander]

A: J. Lantz: Addressing the first item, we have not cut faculty positions. You need to be aware that "visiting professors" are not included in the counting of permanent faculty. We have what we call "visiting faculty" positions because, for one reason or another, we have not been able to go with permanent faculty. We also have within the various schools "unfilled" positions. Those lines are still there.

In response to item two, I would say that that appears to be true and, in fact, projections about where we might go in the next two years concern me even more than what appears to have happened the last year or two.

The next items I will not address individually. These figures do concern me. I am concerned that we do not look at very small differences as great differences. I am concerned about an apparent decline over a period of years. I am not thoroughly convinced that all of the figures are as accurate as they might be.

A. Finco: Has the number of faculty lines been reduced and will the number of faculty lines be reduced this

J. Lantz: The number of faculty lines has not been reduced. My hope is that we would not have to reduce faculty lines or next year.

M. Downs: This is a follow up question. I have not-checked these statistics against what the Statistical Profiles says, but if they are inaccurate is it because they don't correspond to what the *Statistical Profiles* says or because the *Statistical Profiles* booklet is wrong?

J. Lantz: I think the profile booklet is not incorrect. I was most concerned about whether the figures were accurate in the very last item because there were some changes that were involved in that. While the figures indicate an increase, we did, in fact, live by the letter of the law as passed by the Senate, we did restrict the admission of some students.

M. Downs: The questioner's statistics are incorrect in the last item then?

J. Lantz: Frank do you want to tell them what we did?

F. Borelli: As we presented the proposal to the Senate last year, we indicated to you that we were going to eliminate the lowest-level Guided Studies category. Which we did. Subsequently, ninety-five students who would have been admitted under that category were denied admission in the fall of 1990. That number reflects the retention of previous students admitted to the category along with students in the regular Guided Studies program. So it shows retention, not admissions.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 90-11) - M. Auburn:

M. Auburn introduced SR No. 90-11 (Name Changes: Earth & Spaces Sciences and Mental Health Technology) for information only.

b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 90-121- A. Friedel):

A. Friedel introduced SR No. 90-12 (Budget Emphasis Areas, 1991-92) for information only.

c. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 90-13) - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick introduced SR No. 90-13 (Documents under Deliberation by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Lantz: Ten days ago we received Governor Bayh's budget recommendations for this campus. There is no money for our "Commitment to Quality" initiatives; there is no money for general inflationary increases; and there is only a small portion of the enrollment-adjustment funding. The Governor's proposal calls for a 1.77% reduction from 1990-91 in the 1991-92 state general-operating appropriations, or a loss of about \$376,000. In 1992-93, his budget calls for an increase over 1991-92, but it's still about \$226,000 below our current 1990-91 level. To give you an idea of what these figures mean, each one percent increase in student fees for next year will generate about \$121,000; each one percent increase to all salaries on the campus will cost about \$235,000.

The Governor's proposal assumes a 4.1% increase in student fees. Next year about one and one-half million dollars of fee replacement money will come on line; this is money which the General Assembly pledged when they authorized construction. It is dedicated: we can't use it for any purpose except retiring bonds. We can't use it for salary or for supplies' and expenses. It is figured as an offset to our student fee income and an increase in state appropriations, so you may hear that the Governor proposes to increase state appropriations. Since the total state appropriations include all of the income which we generate through charging fees, including that 4.1% increase, it is true that state appropriations will increase this year under the Governor's plan by 4.8%. But, in terms of money which we can use for general-operating expenses, for salaries and supplies and expenses, the Governor's plan reduces us by \$376,000.

There are several expenses which we must meet next year, regardless of whatever else we do. We must meet mandatory increases in the minimum wage. We must absorb a significant increase in the cost of health insurance. We must begin paying social security for many part-time employees. We have uncertain increases in utilities to absorb. These are "unavoidables," and we must meet them even if our state general-operating expenses are being reduced.

Vice Chancellor Auburn and the deans and I have spent some time studying this information and will spend a lot more time over the next three months while the General Assembly is in session. We won't have a final budget picture until the middle of lay. We

hope that the Governor's proposal represents a floor rather than a midpoint and that our friends in the legislature will amend it upward. However, there is some talk of deeper cuts than the Governor's. so, even in the most optimistic picture we can now imagine, 1991-92 is going to be a lean year.

The Vice Chancellor has asked the deans to discuss the details of this budget picture with the chairs and with all the faculty. It remains my highest priority to find money to provide raises for next year. But every dollar which we put into increasing base salaries is a dollar we cannot put into reducing our dependency upon associate faculty, lowering class size improving S&E and travel accounts, or launching new initiatives. Hard times also mean that we'll want to allow enrollments to increase, and increased enrollment means uncertainty about student preparation. I want to be certain that faculty understand our budget picture. My own instinct is to spend the majority of any money which we can capture and reallocate on salary increases. I need to hear from the faculty if they agree.

M. Downs: The first observation that I made when I read the story in *The News Sentinel* was that John Carnaghi made the right decision in going to Florida.

J. Carnaghi: Let me comment. Florida State has given back \$10 million dollars this year to its legislature since I accepted the position. I understand that on March 1 they will give back even more. So the state of Indiana is in far better shape than the state of Florida.

M. Downs: I still think I'd rather deal with a new situation than an old situation. Secondly, I agree with the Chancellor that the priorities that came from the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee are going to have to be looked at again. While it is important that the chairs respond to this situation creatively and imaginatively, I think that the voice of the faculty as a whole expressed through the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee is an important voice to hear and register on these considerations as well. I think, too, that when we start talking about actually cutting things, priorities change a great deal. In the past, I think, not always but quite often, during budget exercises deficits haven't received anywhere near the kind of attention and emphasis that increases have. I think this time when we consider these things, we are going to have to take a very different attitude. What everybody thought would never happen, might be happening and a reconsideration of past projections in light of current reality is needed.

11. Memorial resolutions:

a. Lloyd Wilson Smith (SR No. 90-14) - R. Kendall:

R. Kendall read the memorial resolution for Lloyd Wilson Smith. A moment of silence was observed.

b. Edwin A. Haglund (SR No. 90-15) - R. Pacer:

R. Pacer read the memorial resolution for Edwin A. Haglund. A moment of silence was observed.

12. The meeting adjourned at 12.45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty