

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Second Senate Indiana
University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
January 17, 1983
Noon, KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 6, 1982
3. Acceptance of the Agenda
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. New business
7. The general good and welfare of the University
8. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

R. Barrett, L. Beineke, J. Bell, K. Bordens, D. Bowers, W. Bruening, J. Bundschuh, D. Burrows, D. Cannon, J. Carnaghi, F. Codispoti, E. Coufoudakis, M. Crill, J. Dalphin, W. Davies, M. Downs, R. Emery, A. Ferri, A. Finco, L. Fox, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, H. Gibbons, J. Giusti, E. Goebel, T. Guthrie, S. Harroff, J. Haw, J. Heine, L. Hess, S. Hollander, W. Kolb, G. Leddick, J. Lichti, W. Ludwin, D. McAleece, G. McCullough, M. Miller, E. Nicholson, S. Rickert, J. Rodriguez, J. Roncelli, J. Smulkstys, J. Stauffer, C. Steeg, K. Stolba, J. Sunderman, R. Svoboda, K. Wakley

Senate Members Absent:

E. Cowen, W. Erbelding, J. Hicks, E. Leonard, P. Provost, J. Ryan, J. Ulmer, J. Violette, R. Wall, P. Zonakis

Parliamentarian: D. Onwood

Faculty Member Present: L. Balthaser (assoc. fac.)

Visitors Present: J. Chapman, C. Hany, B. Zlatos

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Giusti called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of December 6, 1982: The minutes were approved as distributed.

Attachment:

"Documents under Deliberation by Senate Committees and Subcommittees" (SR No. 82-6)

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

W. Frederick moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. M. Downs had no report.

b. A. Finco reported on the following:

"The Board of Trustees of Purdue University has approved three modifications in the insurance and retirement plans provided for the faculty and staff of Purdue University: 1) qualified, voluntary employee contributions are now available to university staff who participate in the TIAA-CREF retirement plan; 2) the paid-up life insurance plan has been changed from mandatory to voluntary with three options: a) to continue with the paid-up life insurance; b) to discontinue and have the paid-up life insurance level frozen as of January 1; or c) to discontinue the contribution and withdraw the cash value; and 3) the structure of the medical security plan has changed in relation to deduction, co-insurance and psychiatric coverage while also achieving a plan that is simpler to understand and administer. . . . It is my understanding that none of these changes is to affect the premiums paid by the university or the employee."

5. Report of the Presiding Officer: J. Giusti reported on the following:

a. Spring semester enrollments compared with the last two years are as follows:

	Spring 1981	Spring 1982	Spring 1983_
Headcount	9,465	9,572	9,746 (1.8% increase)
Credit Hours	80,318	81,790	83,361 (1.91 increase)

(Reported for internal information to the university at this point.)

b. "The academic appeals policy, Senate Document SD 82-2 approved by the Senate on November 8, has been making its way through the system at the present time. It will be on the agenda of the Indiana University Academic Program and Policy Committee for consideration at its January 24 meeting, and then it will move to the ADCOM (Administrative Committee) meeting. I will keep you informed of the document's status. Cliff Travis, Indiana University's legal counsel, went over the document and pointed out some areas which need to be brought into alignment with some of Indiana's policies and, in fact, it gives us a chance to take a look at some of the things that need dusting off the shelf down there [Bloomington], too. I don't perceive any problem, but I will keep you posted."

c. "We have two faculty members, Bill Teoh in Computer Technology and Bob Locy in Biological Sciences, who have completed their last semesters at IPFW. Bill has taken a position at the University of Alabama, and Bob has taken a position with private industry in Salt Lake City. I would, just for the record, like to extend our appreciation for their services to the campus and our best wishes for the future. I would also like to pay special tribute to Werner Manheim in Modern Foreign Languages. He retired at the end of last semester after 24 years of dedicated service to IPFW."

d. "Are there any questions for me at this time?"

R. Svoboda: "You informed us how the grade appeals document was being activated in the IU system. What is happening on the Purdue side?"

J. Giusti: "There is nothing of any consequence there. No problem."

R. Svoboda: "Will that eventually go to the Board of Trustees?"

J. Giusti: "Right now we have to clear with IU because we are a little at variance with what now stands as the IU policy."

E. Nicholson: "Indiana University must approve it through the Board of Trustees because the current policy is a board-approved policy. The policy on the Purdue side indicates that the president may approve it. The most difficult task, I believe, would be to change Indiana University's policy. I think that is what it is going to take. They may approve a variance for this campus, but I think what is under discussion is the entire Indiana University policy."

R. Svoboda: "I gather from what you say that you will not bring it up to the Purdue president until it has traversed the IU system."

E. Nicholson: "I can't speak for the Chancellor, but what I would do is, once we saw the direction it was going and the likelihood of its being approved, take it before the president of Purdue and see if there is any problem with the document on that side prior to its going to the Board of Trustees."

M. Downs: "The document itself does require for its implementation here that it be approved by both boards of trustees."

J. Giusti: "Yes, it states that, but what it is seeking is approval from both universities."

M. Downs: "Then that is what it should say."

J. Giusti: "It specifically says trustees, doesn't it? As it is now, with Indiana University, the document is coming up for discussion next week. Why don't we see how it fares there. . . . What we're looking for is what is in line with our objective here. If necessary

with Purdue, in order to obtain what we want we may have to amend to 'university approval' from 'trustee approval.' Right now, I don't see any particular red flag of any consequence. I may learn something next Monday night after discussing the document in the meeting, but as it stands right now, university counsel and university officers look at our document as a very favorable document.

M. Downs: "I expect that before it's implemented here there may be amendments that are suggested, minor amendments one hopes, by both Purdue and Indiana universities in the document."

J. Giusti: "There is no real indication of anything of any consequence."

A. Finco: "Am I to understand that, if changes are made, this body would have to determine whether we accept it?"

J. Giusti: "It would have to be amended here by the Senate."

E. Nicholson: "I think we need to be careful on that because the advice we got was that there are two ways to go [with the document]: one, we can suggest that this be approved for this campus only, and two, we could propose to look at all of the Indiana University policies and make changes. I think this Senate is going to have to deal with some system-wide committees, or at least members of the Senate will have to deal with some system-wide committees. What may come out of those committees might not be identical to, perhaps not even similar to, what we have out of this Senate."

A. Finco: "I guess I don't know what you're saying."

E. Nicholson: "I am saying we can't simply make some recommendations for change in order to attempt to get approval throughout the IU system. I am not sure this Senate can effect it directly by its vote here. It must make its way through other system-wide committees."

J. Giusti: "As it stands now, Art, the document went from my desk to IU's legal counsel because there is some variance between what is now on the record with IU and what we are proposing here Our document appears to be a good document and it may well be time for IU to take a look at their document in the light of our document, or ask for a variance on our document and not touch theirs."

A. Finco: "I understand what is going on. I am just a little concerned about what could happen. We have another document coming forth, namely, academic regulations for this campus, which if IU cannot compromise, or Purdue for that matter, then we're whistling in the dark. We could argue for a year about our document, send it forward, and someone say 'Hey, no way.' I have spun my wheels for 17 years on many issues and it is a matter of concern with me, that's all."

J. Giusti: "This has been in the hopper for how long? These two documents have histories of years behind them, don't they?"

M. Downs: "There is only one practical and acceptable strategy, and that is to ask for a variance for this campus."

J. Giusti: "It may be."

M. Downs: "My suggestion would be that if there is a policy that is acceptable to this body, that we move forward and act according to it until somebody tells us not to."

J. Giusti: "I should have a report by at least the next Senate meeting."

A. Finco: "I guess where I am coming from is that we find a certain thing acceptable. We send it forward and they say, 'That's fine. The only thing wrong with it is that it doesn't jive with what we've got.' That is not enough of a reason for me."

J. Giusti: "I understand. Any other questions?"

6. New business: There was no new business.

7. General good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: "About a year ago I was given to understand that Purdue University was considering a proposal which would allow Purdue faculty members to be paid during the second session of summer school at or according to the salaries recommended for them for the next fiscal year. I heard a rumor just recently that that had been approved and that henceforward faculty members teaching in the second session of summer school would be paid at their new rate of salary for the next year. Is that true?"

J. Giusti: "No, the first part of your statement is true, that about a year ago the Provost proposed that this policy be adopted by the administration and the trustees. West Lafayette, for the most part, has a great deal of grant money coming in in the summer, and they would not be affected as much financially as Calumet and Fort Wayne. We just do not have practically all of our professors on grant money at that time. We calculated the amount of money it would take if this policy were adopted, what this would then mean about trying to keep us as one body rather than as two universities with professors doing practically the same--IU and Purdue. The policy has not been implemented. It has been shelved. And as far as I know at the present time, it is not up for resurrection at the moment."

J. Carnaghi: "That's right."

A. Finco: "It is my understanding that the number of credit hours over budget is probably in the range of 2,000. I always wonder, what happens to the income above budget that is obtained?"

J. Giusti: "For the semester our credit-hour budget was 81,200. We're at 83,361. So we are about 2.6% to 2.7% above on that. We have a year to balance out. . . . It is the total picture that counts rather than the semester that goes over budget."

J. Carnaghi: "What happens is that we build our budget fully expecting to carry forward monies. This year's budget we're operating on said we would have \$200,000 excess from last year to bring to this year. This money contributes to that. That becomes a fluctuating number. The money would not be building excess. It means next year when we start our budgeting, it's an income item: \$200,000 of our \$20 million budget comes from monies we carry forward. The state has allowed us to do it. We would have to spend it if the state made us return unused money. It allows us, then, rather than haphazardly spending the \$40,000, to put it into next year's budget--if, in fact, it is excess. We don't have the same problems as other states or agencies--if you don't spend it, you lose it. If that was the case we would be running around now looking for ways to spend some amount of that \$40,000. I think we can more judiciously plan that in our 1983-84 budget. So there is excess money, yes, but that excess money goes into next year's budget.

8. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt
Secretary