

Minutes of the
Second Regular Meeting of the Third Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
October 10 and 17, 1983
Noon, KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 12 and 19, 1983
3. Acceptance of the agenda
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - J. Lantz
5. Report of the Presiding Officer Committee
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 83-2) - J. Haw
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 83-1) - J. Haw
 - c. Rules Committee (Senate Document SD 83-3) - S. Hollander
 - d. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 83-4) - W. Bruening
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 83-5) - J. Haw
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - Rules Committee (Senate Reference No. 83-3) - S. Hollander
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Session I
(October 10)

Senate Members Present:

D. Bialik, K. Bordens, D. Bowers, J. Brennan, W. Bruening, J. Bundschuh, D. Cannon, J. Carnaghi, F. Codispoti, V. Coufoudakis, M. Crill, M. Downs, R. Emery, N. Fincher, L. Fox, W. Frederick, J. Giusti, E. Goebel, J. Haw, J. Heine, L. Hess, S. Hollander, W. Kolb, J. Lantz, E. Leonard, J. Lichti, M. Lipman, D. McAleece, G. McCullough, M. Miller, J. Moore, E. Nicholson, M. Nusbaumer, J. Owen, R. Pippert, M. Richeson, S. Rickert, J. Rodriguez, W. Schlacks, S. Slack, J. Smulkstys, J. Stauffer, J. Sunderman, D. Switzer, J. Ulmer, R. Wall, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

R. Barrett, S. Beering, T. Guthrie, E. Haglund, G. Leddick, J. Ryan, C. Steeg, J. Violette

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Attachments:

- "Amendment of Senate Bylaws (Calendar Subcommittee Composition)" (SD 83-1)
- "Student Representation on the Honors Program Council" (SD 83-2)
- "Constitution of the Faculty of IPFW" (SD 83-3)
- "National Faculty Exchange" (SD 83-4)
- "Vacancy on the Calendar Subcommittee" (SD 83-5)

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser (assoc. fac.), A. Dirkes, S. Neely

Visitors Present:

J. Chapman, J. Clinton, J. Dahl, D. Gorney, L. Hamblin, T. Harris, J. Hobson, N. Newell, M. Roeger, B. Worley

Acta

1. Call to order:_The meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 12 and 19, 1983:_The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

V. Coufoudakis moved to accept the agenda. Seconded.

M. Lipman pointed out that there was a discrepancy between Senate Document numbers 1 and 2 on the Agenda cover sheet and the documents themselves. The agenda was corrected.

The agenda was accepted as corrected.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. M. Downs announced that the first meeting of the Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs would be held within the week to discuss proposals to be submitted by this campus to Indiana University for the IU Foundation fund drive. Several items have already been proposed. Faculty members may give additional suggestions to M. Downs for consideration.
 - b. J. Lantz had no report.
5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Giusti reported the following:

- a. IPFW's application for acceptance into the Great Lakes Valley Conference has been approved.
- b. The extension of Lot 10 has begun. The expansion is explained in a memorandum distributed to the faculty last week.

J. Giusti asked for questions.

J. Rodriguez asked why the advice of the Senate was not followed in regard to the expansion of Lot 10; M. Downs asked who makes and by what process decisions are made concerning physical changes at IPFW;

S. Hollander asked what kind of planning would be done to prevent future disasters; E. Leonard asked if the work had been put out for competitive bids; and F. Codisoti asked if the extension of Lot 10 was of a temporary or permanent nature.

J. Giusti indicated the decision to expand Lot 10 had been made at West Lafayette and J. Carnaghi added that they had received estimates from eight firms. He indicated there was not time for sealed bids. "The new lot is temporary. Originally I had told you the intent was to make it a temporary lot this year and turn it into a permanent lot next spring. Much has transpired since then. It is of a temporary nature now."

M. Downs: "This conclusion then was reached at West Lafayette by the President What West Lafayette normally does is concur with decisions that have been made here. . . . If we can't agree among ourselves then the decision will be made at West Lafayette."

J. Rodriguez asked if the chancellor had gone forward with a recommendation concerning the parking lot problem.

J. Carnaghi indicated the chancellor had input from several places--the Senate, the students, Physical Plant, etc.

J. Rodriguez: What was the recommendation from the chancellor?

J. Giusti: My recommendation was that we hold up on the extension of Lot 10 until we could investigate alternate sites--three other alternate sites: one by the Multipurpose Building, the lot almost in front of the circle of the Walb Memorial Union, and extension of existing lots east of the campus. I have a document in my hands that simply refers to my recommendation and said that "Per our earlier discussion of this subject and your recommendation, I have asked Dr. Ford to delay construction and to have his physical plant staff, in conjunction with Mr. Carnaghi, take another look at the site issue, taking into account such things as soil conditions, traffic flow, etc. The review has been completed and discussed with me." This is a memo from the President. "At this point,

under emergency conditions of a shortage of 150 or so parking spaces, we will proceed with the extension of the parking lot near the river, Lot 10. I am therefore authorizing Dr. Ford to proceed immediately with the award of a contract to construct a temporary parking lot. Please do everything you can to explain the need for this expanded parking area to your faculty, staff, students, and the local community so that they understand why we must proceed now. . . ."

M. Downs: As I understand it, then, it sounds as if there was a set of recommendations in which you presented him with alternatives, but then there was another request that they reevaluate the entire situation. It really seems to me as though you asked them to consider three alternatives, but to reevaluate. . .

J. Giusti: I asked them to reevaluate the aesthetics of the campus and the need to put that lot as an extension of Lot 10.

M. Downs: Then aesthetics becomes "etc." in that letter. Aesthetics was one of the major reasons for our objection.

J. Giusti: I can assure you that the word "aesthetics" was used by a number of groups, including alumni.

M. Downs: But in the reevaluation it was reduced to "etc."

J. Giusti: No specifics was made of that.

M. Downs: J. Carnaghi said that a number of recommendations came down. Yours apparently weighed no more than anybody else's--less, actually. . . . I'm not exactly sure how things work here. I think I know how it's supposed to work. After we're finished here, the chancellor makes a recommendation which may differ from all the other recommendations, but recommendations are received by West Lafayette from one source on this campus.

J. Giusti: I made a recommendation on behalf of this campus as chancellor. Other recommendations came from other parties outside of my responsibility as chancellor; namely, alumni, trustees.

M. Downs: Were they different? Did they conflict with yours?

J. Giusti: No, they were concurrent with mine.

S. Hollander: I have two questions: 1) What was the alumni reaction and 2) When is the lot scheduled to be ready for parking and will we still need the spaces it provides?

J. Giusti: I would like to call on the Alumni director, John Hobson.

J. Hobson: I briefed the alumni leaders at a board meeting. I told them of your actions here at the Senate, and they certainly agreed that we have a parking problem and that we need a new lot. I didn't know where the alternate sites were. We had a good half-hour discussion about parking. Many of our alumni leaders go back to when paid parking was instituted, and they started asking questions as to where are the parking garages that were to be built with parking fees. The alumni took no formal position; some of the alumni leaders did mention informally to the chancellor and to me that they were concerned about the aesthetics also. I know the President of the Purdue Alumni Association, Janet Weicker, told President Beering that personally because I was present at that conversation, and he said that that was not the first he had heard this sentiment and that he would factor it all into his decision.

J. Carnaghi: We expect to park cars in there a week from today if not sooner. Yes, we do need the spaces.

J. Rodriguez: It is still unclear what recommendations went d with yours. . . .

J. Giusti: The recommendations did not go down along with mine. Mine was a completely separate answer as chancellor, recommending what I did. The alumni and members of the trustees, or directors, or foundation members were separate. They had nothing to do with channeling them through me or informing me, just as individuals in their own rights.

J. Rodriguez: What part did the vice chancellor for financial affairs' recommendation play in this? Were there recommendations to West Lafayette from the vice chancellor concerning this matter?

J. Giusti: It was not contained in my recommendation. I would have to ask the vice chancellor.

J. Carnaghi: . . . As I said before, our Physical Plant here discussed the problem with the Physical Plant in West Lafayette. I had talked with Dr. Ford, not necessarily about where, but if he were willing to have this declared an emergency. After hearing the rationale, he said he would, and the next day Don Katter showed the chancellor what the thinking was. There is nothing that I have written. . . .

M. Downs: Then I perceive that there was a recommendation that came from the vice chancellor based on an assessment of what was needed and where it would be best to put down. And then there was a very different recommendation that went from you forward. And having to choose between the two recommendations, West Lafayette chose the recommendation which came from the vice chancellor for financial affairs.

D. Switzer: . . . A community friend of mine wanted to know the status of the request to the Department of Natural Resources, since we are in a flood plain, and indeed, if where we are building now is not on city property. . . .

J. Giusti: I can only answer part of that question, and the other part I will turn over to J. Carnaghi: This was brought to my attention Thursday or Friday of this past week. I requested that an answer be forthcoming. I do know that we are not on city property. We are back far enough from the river. We are in the river floodway zone. We specifically asked about a permit and approval.

J. Carnaghi: The Department of Natural Resources was consulted when we first paved Lot 10. Because of the temporary nature, they do not require that we get a permit to build the lot. . . .

D. Cannon: What procedure will be used to encourage those who are now parking illegally to use the new lot?

J. Carnaghi: I am talking with J. Chapman of the Communicator this afternoon to get the notice out that beginning at a certain time cars parking illegally will be ticketed.

6. Committee marts requiring_ action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 83-2) - J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to approve Senate Document SD 83-2 (Student Representation on the Honors Program Council). Seconded.

M. Lipman moved to amend SD 83-2 to reinstate paragraph b., "Two additional faculty members at large appointed by the Chancellor," and to relabel the following paragraphs appropriately. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

J. Brennan moved to amend SD 83-2, new paragraph c., line replace "at least one" with "both" of whom shall. . . .

Motion died for lack of a second.

J. Haw's motion to approve SD 83-2, as amended passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 83-1) - J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to approve SD 83-1 (Calendar Subcommittee Composition). Seconded.

M. Downs moved to amend SD 83-1 to give the administrative staff and the clerical/service staff members each two-year terms on the Calendar Subcommittee. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 83-1, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

c. Rules Committee (Senate Document SD 83-3) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve Senate Document SD 83-3 (Constitution of the Faculty of IPFW). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

d. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 83-4) - W. Bruening:

W. Bruening moved to approve SD 83-4 (National Faculty Exchange).
Seconded.

W. Bruening moved to amend SD 83-4 to read: Resolved, That the IPFW Senate endorse faculty participation in the National Faculty Exchange. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

W. Bruening's motion to approve SD 83-4, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 83-5) - J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to approve Senate Document SD 83-5 (Vacancy on the Calendar Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

7. New business:

J. Smulkstys moved the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Senate support the development of a physical-facilities master plan for IPFW in order to conform to the existing and forthcoming campus academic plans and in order to support the efforts of the Chancellor to preserve the aesthetic aspects of the campus; and

Resolved, that the responsibility for developing a physical-facilities master plan for IPFW be assigned to a group in which Instructional Faculty has adequate representation; and

Resolved, that the recommendations of this group and be submitted to and be subject to Senate review by the Fort Wayne appropriate IPFW administrators.

Seconded.

M. Downs moved a substitute resolution:

Resolved, that the Senate support the development of an master plan for IPFW; and

Resolved, that the Senate support the development of a physical master plan for IPFW, to foster implementation of the academic master plan and to enhance the efforts of the Chancellor to improve the aesthetic aspects of the campus; and

Resolved that responsibility for developing the academic and physical master plans for IPFW be assigned to groups among which the Instructional Faculty has substantial representation; and

Resolved, that the recommendations of these groups be submitted to and be subject to review by the Fort Wayne Senate.

Seconded.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 p.m.

Session II
(October 19)

Senate Members Present:

D. Bialik, K. Bordens, W. Bruening, J. Bundschuh, D. Cannon, J. Carnaghi, F. Codispoti, M. Crill, M. Downs, R. Emery, N. Fincher, L. Fox, W. Frederick, J. Giusti, E. Goebel, E. Haglund, J. Haw, J. Heine, S. Hollander, W. Kolb, J. Lantz, G. Leddick, E. Leonard, J. Lichti, M. Lipman, D. McAleece, G. McCullough, M. Miller, J. Moore, E. Nicholson, M. Nusbaumer, J. Owen, R. Pippert, M. Richeson, S. Rickert, J. Rodriguez, W. Schlacks, S. Slack, J. Smulkstys, J. Stauffer, J. Sunderman, D. Switzer, R. Wall, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

R. Barrett, S. Beering, D. Bowers, J. Brennan, V. Coufoudakis, T. Guthrie, L. Hess, J. Ryan, C. Steeg, J. Ulmer, J. Violette

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

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

Visitors Present:

J. Chapman, J. Clinton, J. Dahl, N. Newell, M. Roeger

Acta

J. Giusti called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

7. New business (cont'd):

The Smulkstys resolution and the Downs substitute resolution were on the floor.

W. Frederick moved to amend the Downs substitute resolution, to change the word "enhance" to "support." Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

M. Downs' motion to substitute a resolution passed on a voice vote.

The Downs resolution, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That to implement the Downs resolution, the Presiding Officer meet with the two Vice Chancellors, the Agenda Committee, and the Nominations and Elections Committee to determine three matters:

- a. the scope of the master plans;
- b. the developmental process for the master plans; and
- c. the Instructional Faculty membership on the bodies charged with developing the master plans.

Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

8. Committee reports "for information only" - Rules Committee (Senate Reference No. 83-3) - S. Hollander:

The Senate accepted the Rules Committee report on "Ad-hoc membership on the Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee."

9. The general good and welfare. of the University:

- a. M. Lipman thanked the Secretary of the Senate for sending out copies of the Smulkstys and Downs resolutions prior to the Senate's meeting at which the resolutions were to be discussed.
- b. J. Owen asked if the Senate is expecting a report concerning student athletic eligibility. J. Giusti responded that the faculty has received information from the Athletics Office concerning student athletes and their academic status.

- c. E. Goebel asked for an update on parking. J. Carnaghi indicated the new lot opened at 8:00 a.m. that morning and that the lot was filled. He said approximately 100 parking tickets had been issued that morning.
- d. M. Lipman asked that the study which was mentioned in the Chancellor's memorandum dated October 5 and concerned the study undertaken by West Lafayette to determine the best location for the new parking lot be made available to the University Resources Policy Committee
- e. J. Giusti reported that until Wednesday of the previous week, with the exception of a meeting on August 10, no one from the administration had heard officially from anyone connected with New Pride, from the County Commissioners or from anybody, really, about the stadium proposal. "What we have learned, we have learned from the news media. . . . On Wednesday a letter was delivered by messenger from the Board of County Commissioners asking that negotiations be opened with the university for the return of that land. At approximately 2:00 that afternoon I received a letter signed by the Allen County delegation of legislators that they wished to hold a meeting at 3:00 p.m. on Saturday afternoon at the Chamber of Commerce to discuss the issue. . . . I did attend that meeting, and at that meeting the representatives were there, not all of them, a few members of New Pride, . . . and the media was there, and we proceeded with discussion. . . I wanted to get on the record that we in the university were not being obstinate, we were not being stubborn and that we did have community interests at heart. . . . For the record, I wanted it known that no one officially, other than on August 10, had contacted the university, and that it was on Wednesday that we received the two letters. . . . I also said that the issue is an issue between two local groups: the Indiana-Purdue Foundation and New Pride. . . . I indicated to them I would be willing to be the facilitator on behalf of the Foundation, but I made it perfectly clear that I am not a member of the Foundation, and that this is not an issue for the Presidents of the universities or for the chancellor. . . . [I indicated to them] that a detailed proposal would be in the best interests of everyone, and I specified a detailed proposal which would speak to the issue of funding as well as the other issues which would be to the university's benefit. If that proposal came to me or through me, [I said] I would see to it that it did get before the Indiana-Purdue Foundation and also that it would go forth from there.

For our own information here, whatever action the Foundation would take on any matter would then have to go before the boards of trustees. Last Friday and on Sunday, I was in communication with President Beering because he is directly involved with the physical plans of the campus here, and in discussing these matters with him, he stands apprised of the situation as you know it here today. If there are any specific questions regarding this, I would be happy to answer them so that we are in communication, and so that you know as much as I do about what is transpiring."

J. Smulkstys asked if J. Giusti's request that they furnish sane indication of how they plan to finance and develop this facility also includes other details affecting the campus, such as aesthetics, traffic, and parking on campus facilities?

J. Giusti responded that he "suggested that they cam? up with a detailed proposal and that they would address all of these matters to the best of their ability because no one can deal with concepts, we must bring it down to dealing with the issues and that the issues should be written as a study so that we can discuss them and all be on the same wave. I would envision a detailed proposal. I cannot speak for the trustees or for the foundation. . . ."

In response to a question by J. Bundschuh, J. Giusti said he would be pleased to keep the faculty informed of the plans for the stadium when and if they develop.

J. Giusti added that "on Channel 21, Mr. Metcalf did take a stand on the stadium and he is promoting the stadium. We have requested from Channel 21 the five-minute interview I had with Dean Pantazi, and also we have requested a copy of Mr. Metcalf's statement so that these can be held for our records and also transmitted to our presidents and the Foundation. Things are changing: we learned Saturday that it is not a 3500-seat stadium at \$3 million but, at a minimum, it would be a 5000-seat stadium and that realistically it should be a 7000-8500 seat stadium, but this brings the price tag to \$4.5 million. We're still dealing in generalities and concepts. I think New Pride and/or the County Commissioners should detail a proposal and put the proposal through the proper channels."

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt, Secretary