

Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Twelfth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
February 8, 1993
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 11, 1993
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Switzer
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - S. Hollander
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 92-18) - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - Educational Policy Committee (SD 92-15) - B. Bulmahn
7. Question time - (Senate Reference No. 92-19)
8. New business
 - University Resources Policy Committee - S. Argast
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-20) - B. Bulmahn
 - b. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-21) - D. Legg
 - c. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (report by R. Barrett)
 - d. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 92-23) - S. Hollander
10. The general good and welfare of the University
 - Management Agreement Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-24) - M. Downs
11. Memorial resolution - John Loessi (Senate Reference No. 92-22)
12. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: S. Harroff

Sergeant-at-arms: R. Barrett

Senate Members Present:

S. Argast, F. Borelli, B. Bulmahn, A. Chatterjea, D. Cox, A. Dirkes, J. Dunlap, A. Finco, E. Foley, J. Haw, S. Hollander, R. Jeske, A. Karim, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, D. Kruse, L. Kuznar, J. Lantz, C. Lawton, D. Legg, P. Lin, D. Linn, M. Mansfield, D. McCants, L. Meyer, J. Meyers, R. Miers, R. Pacer, R. Ramsey, A. Rassuli, J. Scherz, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, C. Sternberger, J. Switzer, W. Tsai, W. Unsell, E. Waters, L. Wootton, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

E. Blumenthal, W. Branson, J. Brennan, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, S. Dhawale, J. Grant, R. Hawley, A. Pugh, S. Sarratore, W. Utesch, W. Walker

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, M. Downs

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, R. Suri

Attachments:

["Academic Calendars for 1994-95 and 1995-96"](#) (SD 92-15)

"Committee report 'for information only'--Protection of the rights of IU employees at Fort Wayne" - (SR No. 92-23)

"H.B. 1806" - (SR No. 92-24)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 11, 1993: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Switzer moved to accept the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

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

S. Hollander: I read in the newspapers over the weekend that Purdue University had taken some action on approving sexual orientation as a protected status for the university. I have gotten hold of two documents: one is the Purdue Trustees' document dated February 5 which reveals that their Academic Affairs Committee asked the President to prepare a letter on the subject that would go to all Purdue employees. He has done so and it contains the oft stated position that sexual orientation, like any other kind of discrimination, will not be tolerated at the university. The committee of the Purdue Trustees received that letter, passed it on to the Board for information and declared in their last sentence "that they extend the appreciation of the entire board and to all who have helped bring this matter to a successful resolution." The policy of the university as written is unchanged and, at least as far as I am personally concerned, no successful resolution has yet been reached.
 - b. Purdue University: The Intercampus Faculty Council will meet on Wednesday, February 17. The major item of business on the agenda is the question of transfer credit between campuses of junior and senior engineering courses. If any of you can provide me with information that will help me be better informed on the issue, I would appreciate your seeing me by Monday.
5. Report of the Presiding Officer: W. Frederick presented SR No. 92-18 (Report on the Status of Senate Documents) for information.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document 92-15) – B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 92-15 (Proposed Academic Calendars for 1994-95 and 1995-96). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. Question time:

Q: Despite measures already taken during years of expressed concern, the latest (Nov. 1992) air-quality survey of the Liberal Arts Building shows that, in more than two-thirds of the areas measured, key pollution levels are above those defined as acceptable by Purdue University. Significant numbers of IPFW employees required to work in this building report symptoms they attribute to the poor air quality. Does IP have a plan and a timetable for solving this problem? Is IPFW ready to specify a date which workers in the Liberal Arts Building will enjoy a safe environment?

3

A: J. Lantz: I discussed this with Vice Chancellor Branson. On February 2 he met with a group of people who are CM building occupants who expressed their concerns about the air quality in Liberal Arts. He plans to review the problem with staff at IPFW and West Lafayette to determine what action needs to be taken. He will report any developments as they occur, and he expects to give some kind of an update at the next meeting.

8. New business:

S. Argast moved to approve the appointment of L. Wootton as a replacement member for J. Brennan for the remainder of the academic year on the University Resources Policy Committee. Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-20) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn presented SR No. 92-20 (IPFW Campus Calendar Subcommittee Academic Calendar Formula) or information only. She said that someone had brought to her attention that the first line of the document is violated slightly by the Martin Luther King recess, but because this is an internal document for that committee no action is called for.

b. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-21) - D. Legg:

D. Legg presented SR No. 92-21 (Results of the elections of the Presiding Officer of the Senate and Speaker of the Purdue University Faculty) for information only.

c. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee - R. Barrett:

R. Barrett: Things are going to happen shortly in Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS). This year the Senate may want to pay closer attention to our recommendations. As you know, from the very beginning the BAS has made recommendations, to the Chancellor on budget matters, whether it was in the biennium or in the in-between years. In the past we have been able to be positive because there was lots of money-or relatively large amounts of money. As you know, a couple of years ago we stuck our noses in the library situation to make a recommendation about some money for them. The recommendation was received nicely and was done. This year we face a different task. I want to bring you up-to-date on things that we have looked at already this year, e.g. the \$6.6 million equity request that was forwarded to West Lafayette along with the budget. It died quietly down there. We have gone over that in some detail. It really lends impetus to what our needs really are. We have looked at Purdue and IU benefits; we have looked at the entire process that is going on this year. We have tried to get a good understanding of what the Legislature and the Commission and the Budget Agency are doing or are planning to do to us, etc. We all know where we are at with the one line in the Purdue budget.

We are now seriously considering recommendations for this year. We have one in the works right at the moment dealing with the \$175,000 shortfall in this year's budget due to the drop in enrollment from the original budgeted figure of enrollment. We are looking strongly at that as I am sure the Chancellor will have to do eventually. Purdue is going to ask how we are going to cover \$175,000. We're looking at different alternatives, plus the real use of contingency funds which were originally set aside to cover these kinds of things. I would think, after our next meeting in two or three weeks, we will have some recommendations going forward to the Chancellor on how she might want to consider covering it from a faculty perspective. That will definitely get forwarded up the line to here. It's something you may want to review. We expect to have our recommendations by April 1.

Currently each member of the committee is meeting with departments, meeting with faculty, asking the departments to consider the one question that the Chancellor has asked the committee to answer-and it is a key question: At what point, at what value, at what cost do we give raises for faculty and staff? That is not an easy issue this year. As you have heard, we are likely to get only enrollment-change money of a little over

a million dollars and, of course, then they plan to take that back immediately, if we get a 4 % student increase, they take that money immediately off that. We have two unavoidable costs--one that impacts all of us directly which is the \$300,000 add-on in health care so our health costs don't go up; the other one is unavoidable costs of about \$300,000 just in heating, lighting, gasoline, etc. for the campus. There are probably 18 to 20 alternatives that float around out there that faculty are going to be giving us input on versus getting raises. Out of all that information we are going to gather, we are going to try to make some priority recommendations that impact raises for faculty and staff--cuts in services, cuts in other things. We are going to have to address the issue of increased productivity which, if we do, we may come forward with a direct recommendation for the Senate to take action by at least referring a topic back to a committee for further study that would not be in our committee's purview.

This is a very interesting time for the members of the BAS. When we finally get our recommendations out, we ask you to remember that while we worked hard to try to understand all the issues, we are going to be at least 30 days in front of the Legislature being done. They may not make it by April 30. They may push it into May or June. They could go all the way to July 1 we have heard. We hope not. You would then have an opportunity to see our recommendations. You may want to add, subtract, reprioritize, add emphasis, make your own. We think this is a year the Senate should look closely at our recommendations. The only reason we are going to try to get it out by early April is so that you will have April and May to know what is transpiring. We don't like the decisions we are going to have to make, but we are going to try to make them on behalf of the faculty.

J. Smulkstys: Bob, I have suggestion #19 for you to consider. You may recall two years ago West Lafayette had a budget shortfall and the President decreed that we at the Fort Wayne campus had to help them out by not having any increment that year, or by receiving a token \$500.0 increment. So maybe this time when we have a budget shortfall West Lafayette could do something about it. I am serious. I suggest your subcommittee take that into consideration.

R. Barrett: We have been very fortunate this year. Dick Ritchie was with us until he left. Phil Grote has been with us all along. Walt Branson will be joining us at our next meeting and I will certainly ask about how that all worked and what happened and we'll go from there.

J. Lantz: First of all, Bob made a statement that two years ago we had plenty of money. In my years where I have had direct input into the budget, we have never had plenty of money. I don't think Julius said this, but I don't want anyone to have the impression that we took money from our budget to give to West Lafayette. We did not.

J. Smulkstys: Joanne, I think that it may have been that we didn't take our money to give to West Lafayette, but West Lafayette did not give us money that otherwise they would have given us.

J. Lantz: West Lafayette gives us no money; we give them no money. West Lafayette never gives us money; we never give them money. I don't know where you ever got the impression that West Lafayette ever gave us money. They do not.

d. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No 92-23) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander presented SR No. 92-23 (Protection of the rights of IU employees at Fort Wayne) for information only. He said that SR No. 92-23 will go to the IU University Faculty Council. The document asks the President and the Trustees of IU not to agree to any new management agreement for this campus unless such an agreement guarantees that IU faculty and students and other employees here enjoy the same basic human rights as those given to IU faculty and students and other employers on all other campuses.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: Bob is going to give you a copy of the names and addresses of the various representatives from this area, the area that is served by this campus. Please write H.B. 1806 at the top of the sheet. H.B. 1806 (See Senate Reference No. 92-24 attached) has been introduced by Representative Phyllis Pond, a Republican, and Representative Winfield Moses, a Democrat. I am going to read the digest at the top of the bill. I just received a final copy of this bill on Friday. I had hoped that things would move more slowly and I could give--perish forbid--a longer report at the next meeting.

H.B. 1806 provides that a qualified regional campus of Indiana University or Purdue University or a joint campus of Indiana University and Purdue University under the administration of Purdue University will be administered by: (1) a chancellor and vice president; and (2) a vice chancellor for financial affairs and treasurer, who are directly responsible to the board of trustees of the university for the fiscal and academic operation of the campus. Specifies that the campus and university will develop a method for transferring financial responsibility for the campus to a board of finance. Sets forth the membership of the board of finance and the procedure for appointing members of the board. Makes conforming amendments concerning the commission for higher education.

The bill closely parallels the report of the Management Agreement Committee that was accepted unanimously by this body last fall and the resolution put forward by the faculty membership of that committee calling for the investigation of the feasibility of the establishment of fiscal agency on this campus to assume financial responsibility for this campus budget. Right now the draft bill would affect the Fort Wayne campus only. The bill establishes a threshold of maturity that must be achieved before a campus can be considered as qualified for the provisions of the bill. There must be a certified enrollment

of in excess of 10,000 full- and part-time students. Our enrollment is now in excess of 11,000. It has to be authorized by the Commission for Higher Education to offer more than 100 degree programs at the campus. Various publications of this campus set the number of degree programs for which work is available on this campus at somewhere between 150 and 200. The campus must have received state appropriations totaling more than \$20 million.... Our budget request is in excess of \$26 million. No other campus except Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis meets these criteria. It is specifically excluded from the bill because it is not administered by Purdue University; it is administered by Indiana University. A five-year period is established as the outside limit during which the setting up of a mechanism to transfer purely financial administration from Purdue University to a local board of finance which would be composed of nine members (our document said eight), but I am given to understand the legislature thinks that eight as an even number is an invitation to grid lock. We know that's not always true, but increasing the size of the board by one seemed a not unreasonable standard to meet.

We can compromise. The provision that would enter into effect once we are recognized qualified campus tilts the landscape from what it is now to what we think it should be. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs on this campus would report directly to the Purdue Board of Trustees; in other words, the attachment to Purdue University would remain intact, but what we would do is to create an opportunity, if the legislation is passed, for the Chancellor to present our views and our problems directly to the Board of Trustees of Purdue University instead of having them filtered and perhaps eliminated or ignored by the President of Purdue University or any of his designated appointees. Likewise our budgetary considerations would be heard and discussed in a different arena. What the legislation really hopes to do here is to create an opportunity for matters on this campus not to be discussed just in the president's office or the vice president's office, but in front of the entire Board of Trustees where our arguments will carry more weight. The five-year period would be used to investigate the best way to transfer financial responsibility from Purdue West Lafayette to this campus. Over a period of time a kind of devolution, a kind of divestiture would occur in which each year this campus could do more for itself, would have more leeway to let contracts, to establish procedures, and, at the end of five years, the board of finance would be able to assume full responsibility; The academic tie to Indiana University and Purdue University would remain intact under this legislation. All matters concerning the quality of our degree programs would continue to be not just the responsibility of those of us here who teach in those programs, but also both Indiana University and Purdue University and the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

We moved to do this because each effort at recourse to authorities at Purdue University to discuss our proposals, to use what I call sweet reason, failed. President Beering has not come to this campus to discuss these matters with us nor has he sent anyone to do so. On two occasions when he has addressed the Chancellor's Community Advisory Committee it was very clear there would be no movement in the Purdue position concerning these matters. Even when President Beering was confronted with the possibility of legislation he said he would not change his mind. We move, now, to the next level of activity. What

I hope you will do is relate your own personal experience with the situation as it exists here in letters communicating your support for House Bill 1806 to the legislators whose addresses are here before you. The bill has been assigned to the House Ways and Means Committee. Most of you have been here long enough to know that the House Ways and Means Committee is the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives. The Chairman of that committee, Patrick Bauer from South Bend, has promised us that our bill will get a hearing in that committee. Both of these are extremely positive steps for us.... Purdue University has promised to oppose the bill and in that should be expected. I also expect that part of this process will entail misrepresenting what it is that we are really after here. I t k we are all realistic enough to know that having a budget developed here locally is not automatically going to result in higher faculty salaries. What it does mean for us is that what we do here will fit better with what is wanted and needed here. That's what the problem is in the relationship we have now. That is the problem that has to be solved and that is what this legislation intends to solve. Remember, if we are not successful this year, we'll be back next year....

B. Bulmahn: I know that a lot of us in the room forget which district we are in. Would it be possible to have some maps with the geographic subdivisions found so we know which of our people we directly lean on?

M. Downs: I will make a suggestion. With the system of single-member districts this has become much more complicated. It is true that if a legislator knows that you are a voter that that carries some weight and I will see that everybody gets that kind of map. But what is going to carry the most weight right now is a well-stated position in support of the legislation. Don't be shy about writing a legislator outside your district. Make the argument a good one, make it cogent and make it forceful. To the degree that you can personalize your letter to the legislators do so because they abhor anything that looks like a form letter. Use your own private stationery; use your own stamps. I have written to each of the legislators circulating a copy of the budget indicating the degree to which Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne is slighted or ignored or deemphasized in these publications.

F. Kirchhoff: Last year this body passed two pieces of legislation. One dealing with the tenure stop-out and a second dealing with research misconduct. I heard rumors to the effect that either or both of these pieces of legislation are running into some difficulty being implemented because of pressures from Purdue University West Lafayette. I don't know if this is true or not, but I would appreciate a report on the status of these two documents.

W. Frederick: I forwarded those documents to West Lafayette. I know they are having problems, but I don't know what the present status of the documents is.

J. Lantz: I would be prepared to report at the next meeting.

11. Memorial resolution - John Loessi:

Joseph Meyers read the memorial resolution for Professor John Loess. A moment of silence was observed.

12. The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty