

Minutes of the
Second Regular Meeting of the Tenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
October 8, 1990
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 10, 1990
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Switzer
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - A. Finco
 - b. Indiana University - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 90-3) - J. Switzer
 - b. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 90-4) - J. Switzer
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 90-5) - F. Kirchhoff
 - d. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 90-6) - J. Switzer
7. Question Time
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

M. Auburn, J. Blakemore, E. Blumenthal, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, B. Bulmahn, J. Carnaghi, A. Chatterjea, P. Conn, D. Cox, V. Craig, M. Downs, J. Eichenauer, A. Fineo, E. Foley, A. Friedel, J. Haw, R. Hawley, R. Jeske, A. Karim, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, D. Kruse, J. Lutz, M. Mansfield, J. Manzer, R. Miers, R. Novak, J. Owen, S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, D. Schmidt, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, J. Sunderman, J. Switzer, G. Szymanski, M. H. Thuente, W. Unsell, K. Wakley, W. Walker, E. Waters

Senate Members Absent:

F. Borelli, S. Dhawale, J. Klotz, J. Lantz, J. Meyers, D. Oberstar, A. Shupe

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: S. Harroff

Sergeant-at-Arms: R. Barrett

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, A. Bassett, J. Beard, V. Coufoudakis, S. Hockemeyer, D. McCants, D. Pfeffenberger, M. Souers, J. Violette

Attachments:

["Replacement of SD 88-40 \[Criteria for Librarian Promotion and Tenure for Librarians\]"](#) (SD 90-3)

["Amendment to SD 89-4 \[Procedures for Librarians' Promotion and Tenure\]"](#) (SD 90-4)

["Amendment of the 1990-1991 Calendar \[SD 89-15\]"](#) (SD 90-5)

["Academic Calendar for 1990-1991"](#) (SD 89-15, as amended)

["Approval of replacement members of the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee, the Honors Program Council, the Professional Development Subcommittee, the Student Affairs Committee, the Academic Appeals Subcommittee, and the Transitional Studies Advisory Subcommittee"](#) (SD 90-6)

Visitors Present: G. Applegate, R. Brown, J. Dahl, N. Newell

Acta*

*The minutes of this meeting are not verbatim due to a malfunction of the recording equipment.

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 10, 1990: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Switzer moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University:

A. Finco: The University Senate is considering University Senate Document 90-6, University Code D 3.00: Bylaws of the University Senate, items 2.00 and 2.01, which has to do with apportionment of senators. It recommends one senator each from the IPFW, IUPUI, and Calumet campuses and four senators from the North Central campus. The item was on the September 24 meeting of the University Senate for discussion. I presume it will be passed at the next meeting of that body.

As Don Schmidt mentioned at our first meeting, the Purdue Health Plan Advisory Committee has made its recommendations. Each of the Purdue University faculty members at IPFW should have received a copy of the proposed benefits package in the Benefits Bulletin. A couple of weeks ago there was a meeting on campus to discuss the recommendations. I don't anticipate many, if any, changes of the published recommendations.

The President's TIAA-CREF Retirement Task Force has agreed in principle that several recommendations and options should be presented to focus groups and to campus committees for reaction and input. When we receive a printed version of the recommendations and options, Pat Collins and would like to discuss them with

the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Purdue CIA and an administrative committee or two. It is my impression that the focus group or groups selected are stratified random samples. So if you are called to serve on one of these, please do so; I'm sure you will find it an interesting experience.

I can tell you that the Task Force is recommending that the recently created CREF bond and social choice funds be made available to Purdue CREF participants, that transferability from CREF to the funds of at least one outside mutual fund vendor and at least one insurance company vendor be permitted, and that some form of cashability, most likely over a period of n years, where n=3, 4 or 5 years, be permitted for those retired and over 55 years of age. Another, perhaps more controversial, question that was discussed was the three-year-waiting period most new administrators must wait before they can start to receive TIAA-CREF benefits. The resolution of that one could affect new faculty lines in the future.

Bill Frederick is faculty chair of the United Way campaign which runs from October 15-27. I encourage you to contribute to this worthy cause.

b. Indiana University:

M. Downs: Indiana University is going through the same process as Purdue University regarding CREF options. We are encountering the same phenomena that Art referred to last month. New CREF options being proposed will probably be accepted. Other mutual funds will be available for faculty with some kind of counseling services. Some cashability at the time of annuitization will be permitted.

The University is making serious recommendations concerning early retirement programs for new hires. Early retirement programs--the 18-20 plan for current faculty -will either remain unchanged or improved. I will hold a meeting of IU faculty about the new early-retirement plan.

The Board of Trustees has proposed a salaries and compensation initiative for IU faculty. The Board of Trustees, following study of comparable institutions, are asking every campus to, develop proposals.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

W. Frederick had no report.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Agenda Committee (SD 90-3) – J. Switzer:

J Switzer moved to approve SD 9(1-3 (Replacement of SD 88-40 [Criteria for Librarian Promotion and Tenure for Librarians])). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Agenda Committee (SD 90-4) – J. Switzer:

J. Switzer moved to approve SD 90-4 (Amendment to SD 89-4 [Procedures for Librarians' Promotion and Tenure]). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

c. Educational Policy Committee (SD 90-5) – F. Kirchhoff.-

F. Kirchhoff moved to approve SD 90-5 (Amendment of the 1990-1991 Calendar [SD 85-15]).

Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a show of hands.

d. Agenda Committee (SD 90-6) – J. Switzer:

J. Switzer moved to amend SD 90-6 by adding parallel sentences which would approve the appointment of Cheryl Sorge to the Academic Appeals Subcommittee and Nancy Cothorn to the Transitional Studies Advisory Subcommittee.
Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice.

Motion to approve SD 90-6, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

7. Question time:

Q: It was brought to my attention by a number of faculty members that as of the fall semester of 1990 IPFW no longer has any resident counseling for students in need of such services. The previously existing program was terminated, notwithstanding the oversubscription for the limited number of hours available and a 3 to-4 week waiting period for an appointment. Given the size of the IPFW student body, the general availability of professional counseling services on even smaller campuses, and the utilization of the services that were available in 1989-90, what was the rationale for terminating the counseling arrangement? Is there any chance of reinstating this necessary service?

Given that there is limited information as to how or why this decision was made, I assume the appropriate administrator, whomever that is, will respond to the Senate.
J. Lutz

A: For the past several years, psychological counseling services were provided through an arrangement with Park Center. Dr. Vivian Hernandez, an employee of Park Center, provided counseling to our students on a part-time basis in the Dean of Students office.

In July, 1990, Park Center gave us thirty days notice of their intent to terminate the agreement with IPFW citing a reorganization at the Center which would no longer enable them to provide on campus counseling for us.

Dr. Marian Adair and I have since written a position description for a new counseling position and recently received approval for the proposed classification from West Lafayette. The position is being advertised, and a search is now underway. We hope to have a counselor in place by November 1. The new counselor will be employed on a three-quarter-time basis for the remainder of this academic year. I plan on seeking funding to make it a full-time position next year in order to meet the needs of our students. F. Borelli

Q: Last spring the faculty of the School of Business and Management Sciences passed a motion of no confidence in that School's current administrative leadership. Does the Chancellor accept responsibility for restoring confidence in the School and, if so, what specific steps is she taking to accomplish this? *M. Downs*

A: First, I want to apologize for my absence at this meeting. Professor Downs has asked the questions that you see in the agenda before you and I want to respond by this memo that I have asked Vice Chancellor Auburn to read. Let me begin by quoting two memoranda:

The first, dated April 20,1990; to the faculty of SBMS; from David A. Dilts and I
quote:

"The following resolution was passed by the faculty of the department of Management and Marketing:

At its April 30 meeting, the Management and Marketing faculty unanimously passed a resolution to have Dave Dilts convene a meeting of SBMS faculty on Thursday, May 3, 1990, for the purpose of taking a vote of confidence regarding our current Dean.

I am therefore convening such a meeting at noon on May 3, 1990 in Room B-37 in Neff Hall. There and then a secret written ballot will be taken concerning whether or not the faculty has confidence in the current Dean and whether he should continue to serve in that capacity."

The second, dated May 3,1990; to Mark Auburn and George Bullion; from Max Laudeman, Balloting Coordinator, School of Business and Management Sciences and I quote:

“At noon on May 3, 1990 a SBMS Faculty meeting was held. At this meeting faculty cast secret written ballots in which they indicated either yes, I have confidence in the Dean or no, I have no confidence in the Dean. Thirty-four ballots were cast, five by absentee ballots, one by proxy, and twenty-eight in person. Four eligible faculty did not vote. The procedures were observed by Jack Bell and Mary Helen Thuente from other Schools in the University. The results were as follows:

Yes, I have confidence in the Dean	16
No, I have no confidence in the Dean	18

A copy of both the memo calling the faculty meeting and the ballot are attached.”

The Vice Chancellor shared the memorandum with me. I did not receive a copy of either memo. It appears to me that 18 of 38 eligible voters voted no confidence.

The circumstances surrounding the action of the faculty of the School of Business and Management Sciences in its vote concerning “confidence” in the dean at a meeting called on two days’ notice following the end of classes and without a bill of particulars have been the focus of much discussion among myself, Vice Chancellor Auburn, the dean, and our respective staffs. I have met with many faculty members from SBMS, and I know that Vice Chancellor Auburn has done the same, in an effort to discover the nature of the dissatisfaction or the “particulars” behind that vote. I accept responsibility for maintaining confidence in the School. I am pleased that the School has formed, for the first time, a Faculty Affairs Committee, and that this committee is examining governance. I understand that other specific steps are being contemplated and am pleased to see the School of Business and Management Sciences working on its concerns. *J. Lantz*

8. New business:

There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

There was nothing mentioned under this item.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Auburn: In our last meeting, Senator Downs expressed concern about the Indiana University Board of Review process. I share that concern. It should not take an inordinate amount of time for a grievance to be heard by a panel of peers. But I think we all need to make a distinction between “grievances,” of which Senator Downs said there were over two dozen extant, and “complaints.” One

dictionary teaches me to regard a "complaint" as "an expression of pain, dissatisfaction, resentment, discontent, or grief," and I assure you that my present duties give me more opportunity than I like to recognize "complaints." The same dictionary instructs me to understand a "grievance" as "a protestation based upon an actual or supposed circumstance regarded as just cause for protest." We "complain" about the weather, the food at The Fort, our salaries in general, or the parking, especially here at IPFW; but we "grieve" or protest specific actions or decisions by persons in authority. We have an informal system to deal with complaints, and we have a formal system to adjudicate grievances, be they over denial of tenure, the setting of our salaries, or the violation of our academic freedom. A "complaint" does not become a "grievance" just because someone can't or won't offer relief. A grievance is a formal protest. A "Complaint" grows into a "grievance" when it is reduced to writing, together with the proposed relief to remove the protest, and presented for a formal response to the last person in a position to provide that relief, in our case the Chancellor. To my knowledge, since the resolution of a grievance from a Purdue faculty member some fifteen months ago, the Chancellor has received exactly one grievance, to which she responded in writing more than seven months ago. Unable to offer the desired relief, she has been waiting all that time for an opportunity to explain her reasons to a Board of Review and to receive its advice.

I don't know how many complaints have been brought to the Board of Review--I guess I should say "Boards of Review." It may be the "over two dozen" that Professor Downs referred to. I do know that there are lots of complaints that I cannot relieve and that the chancellor cannot relieve. If we err in not offering relief to a complaint, then we should be so, advised by our colleagues, and that means first turning the complaint into a grievance. If the present procedures of the Board of Review do not facilitate turning a complaint into a grievance, then we should examine those procedures.

M. Auburn (for J. Lantz): I would like to report to the Senate our planning for new efforts for lobbying for the university budget requests for the 1991 Indiana Legislature.

In late August the seven state university presidents toured the state of Indiana and held press conferences to announce their plans for a unified request to the Indiana General Assembly for funding for all of our state universities. They have called their effort "Commitment to Quality." Their efforts were rewarded not only by television and print coverage, but also in the rare spirit of collegiality and common purpose that was apparent among the presidents.

At the recent meeting of the Higher Education Commission the seven presidents presented the unified budget request. I was not there but understand that, all persons involved felt that it was well received and that productive discussion followed the presentation.

Since then, all regional campus chancellors, the State Relations Vice President, and the Purdue President have met to plan a strategy as part of a statewide effort to address the "Concerns for Quality." It's my understanding that all of the other six presidents are

planning locally based information sessions so that the entire state will be covered by these efforts.

I, Mark Auburn, Frank Borelli, John Carnaghi and Judith Clinton have had two planning meetings. We will prepare printed information, speeches, and video tapes to use with local legislators, community groups and other citizens to explain our needs. We will also be coordinating a scheduled way of getting this information out to all.

Last week Professor David Oberstar, Chairperson of the Senate Budgetary Affairs Committee, had an appointment with me to talk about the Committee's role in the process. Dave is interested in having the Committee and the faculty also take a significant role in the process. I volunteered to present the facts and make information available. It is my understanding that the Budgetary Affairs Committee will plan to host open meeting(s) so that all of the material can be distributed and discussed.

I'm so excited and pleased that the Budgetary Affairs Committee is taking significant leadership in this matter and look forward to the process. I will also be sending to all faculty members on campus a brochure that was prepared by the seven state universities regarding our Commitment to Quality.

I believe we have great potential to make a significant difference and I'll do everything that I can so that we can "all sing from the same song sheet

These are truly exciting times!

M. Downs: In yesterday's paper there were accusations regarding our parking problems here. The article suggests that ticketing is so important a means of revenue for this campus that we would turn down an effective means for parking at this campus. Can anyone address this?

J. Carnaghi: About a day or two into our first semester, Bob Morton called to say he understood we had a parking situation on campus that he would like the PTC to resolve. He talked about a shuttle service. I said our problem is lack of parking spaces, not movement once vehicles are parked. He had no alternatives to allow off-campus parking. I told him to check back in a few weeks. Recently, we checked on parking and there are plenty of spaces available. It's my personal belief that a shuttle service won't do anything for us. I walked from the free lot to Kettler Hall today. It took about nine minutes. I said if students wanted to pursue it, I would set up a meeting and let Students' Government meet with Bob Morton. Then the article appeared over the weekend in *The Journal-Gazette*. Because of this, I invited Morton and an assistant over this morning. They had not been on campus previously and said they nearly had three wrecks. He asked if the University would be willing to subsidize a shuttle service. I don't believe it will offer relief and rejected the idea. But our students may want to offer student activity fees. I asked PTC to calculate what it would cost. He concluded they would have to move about 60 people an hour to break even. The parking garage will make service less attractive, I trust. PTC already has reduced service to our campus. As far as generating money from

parking fees, permits and meters, the police have no quota. They just issue the tickets. They don't decide who pays them. It's making much of nothing. We have met with PTC. They will meet with the students. They say they would like to try it if the students are willing to help subsidize the cost.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty