

**Minutes of the
Second Regular Meeting of the Eighteenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
October 12, 1998
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46
(<http://www.ipfw.edu/senate>)**

Agenda

- 1. Call to order**
- 2. Approval of the minutes of September 14, 1998**
- 3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Vollmer**
- 4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties**
 - a. Purdue University - J. Wilson**
 - b. Indiana University - M. Downs**
- 5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 98-6) - R. Hess**
- 6. Committee reports requiring action**
Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Document SD 98-5) - D. Weakley
- 7. New business**
- 8. Committee reports "for information only"**
Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 98-7) - J. Wilson
- 9. The general good and welfare of the University**
- 10. Adjournment**

Presiding Officer: R. Hess
Parliamentarian: J. Clausen
Sergeant-at-Arms:
Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

R. Barrett, R. Berger, P. Bingi, E. Blakemore, F. Borelli, W. Branson, M. Codispoti, V. Craig, M. Downs, C. Drummond, R. Emery, B. Fife, J. Haw, B. Harwood, L. Hess, S. Hollander, B. Kingsbury, C. Leiserson, R. Manalis, K. McDonald, K. Morrin, J. Nichols, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, D. Pfeffenberger, A. Pugh, D. Ross, B. Salmon, H. Samavati, D. Schmidt, Z. Shipchandler, J. Silver, J. Tankel, M. H.

Thuente, R. Tierney, D. Vasquez, J. Vollmer, M. Wartell, D. Weakley, J. Wilson, L. Wright-Bower, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

K. Ahern, V. Badii, J. Brennan, C. Champion, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, L. Fox, S. Hannah, M. Kimble, A. Ushenko

Representative from Medical Education: R. Sweazey

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, S. Frey-Ridgway, D. McCants

Visitors Present: A. Alesia, J. Brunts, J. Dahl

Attachments:

["Purdue Grievance Committee members" \(Senate Reference No. 98-7\)](#)

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Hess called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of September 14, 1998: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Vollmer moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

J. Wilson moved to amend the agenda by adding an item under "Committee reports for information only."

(See Senate Reference No. 98-7 attached)

Motion to amend passed unanimously.

The agenda was approved as amended.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Purdue University:

J. Wilson: I have one brief item: The Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs sought nominations for people to stand for election to the Purdue Grievance Committee. A report coming to you under "Committee Reports for Information Only" lists the names of those nominated and elected by default, as there were fewer nominees than were needed to fill all seats on the committee. I am disappointed, but not surprised, by the lack of willingness of my colleagues to serve on this important committee. I hope that the vacancies on this committee will be filled by willing volunteers in the near future.

b. Indiana University:

M. Downs: At its meeting in October, the University Faculty Council will begin consideration of a number of proposals that have been made to change the method by which 18/20 pensions is funded. These suggestions include a number of far-reaching expedients which, however, will not affect anybody who is qualified for 18/20 in a negative way. The burden for funding will fall on those who come after us. The details of the plan are on my speaker's web page. If you wish to look at them and make comments to me, I would be happy to receive those. I serve on the committee that developed the financing plan and, while it cannot be anywhere near perfect, it is driven by an absolute necessity. Nevertheless, I do want to hear from the faculty who are interested enough to make comments.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 98-1) - R. Hess:

R. Hess: First I would like to thank Jeanette Clausen for being willing to serve as parliamentarian. Mitch

Sherr has agreed to be Sergeant-at-Arms. I am sure that we all appreciate their efforts.

I have six things that I want to talk to you about in my report. Future reports won't be nearly so lengthy.

First, I want to thank those Senators and colleagues across the campus who have expressed support and encouragement to me in assuming this position.

Second, I want to thank Bill Frederick because it seems to me that Bill's dedication and his passion for faculty governance is something we all ought to aspire to if we believe in faculty governance. We appreciate his efforts on our behalf.

Third, I want to thank all of you for being willing to serve. You just heard Jeff say that on a very important committee individuals have not volunteered and have been reluctant. Faculty governance cannot be effective if we don't volunteer and your willingness to represent the faculty is to be commended.

Fourth, I have made courtesy calls on Chancellor Wartell and Vice Chancellor Hannah. They were pleasant conversations and I got a perspective on the agenda that they have for this year for IPFW.

Fifth, I have not been in the Senate for a few years, although for most of my career on this campus I have been a Senator. One of the things that has struck me is that the good and welfare section

of the agenda for

the Senate might be used better. It is a place where we can share information with one another that is for the

good of the campus and it is a place where we can raise issues of concern for all our welfare. I urge you to

use that section of the agenda very, very seriously. Of course, that means being prepared. It means knowing

the agenda for the day, knowing the minutes of the last meeting, and also being willing to discuss with the

Senate those issues that your colleagues have asked you to bring up and issues that you want to bring up.

Let's do that, please. Let's use it for the good of IPFW and let's use it for the welfare of IPFW.

Sixth, my official report, SR No. 98-6 is attached and is merely a report of actions of the Senate to date.

The seventh item is one of an invitation to a garden party. You all have received it. Please plan to attend.

Usually it is a very nice social opportunity for all of us to meet with colleagues from across the campus.

That is the Botanical Garden Party on Sunday, October 25. I think it starts at 6:00. I hope you will attend.

6. Committee reports requiring action: Nominations and Elections Committee (SD 98-5) - D. Weakley:

D. Weakley moved to approve SD 98-5 (Approval of replacement members of the Nominations and Elections Committee). Second.

Motion to approve passed by unanimous vote.

7. New business: There was no new business.

8. Committee reports "for information only": (Senate Reference No. 98-7) - J. Wilson:

J. Wilson presented SR No. 98-7 (Purdue Grievance Committee members) for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. H. Thuente: I have a question about the flu shots. There seems to be a distinction between IU and

Purdue faculty. I represent a department that is largely made up of IU faculty and the flier that came

out about the flu shots mentions that the shots are free for what are called "IPFW Purdue employees."

The question asked of me was, "Does this mean that IU employees pay?" So I wanted to ask Vice

Chancellor Branson to clarify if this is the correct interpretation and, if it is, why there is coverage for

Purdue and not IU faculty?

W. Branson: I am not familiar with the flier. I will have to look into that. I'd be happy to do that.

M. H. Thuente: My faculty would appreciate that. It is another one of these distinctions and I would

hope that if they're not covered for IU faculty, that they would be. The flier is very clear. It says: IPFW

Purdue faculty.

J. Wilson: I am saddened at IPFW's recent ranking by *U.S. News and World Report* among the lowest, or

fourth tier, of Midwestern regional universities and surprised that the university chose to issue a press

release touting this ranking. We should not be proud of this ranking, rather we should all work to ensure that

U.S. News and World Report gets it right next time and recognizes IPFW as a quality institution that offers

a first-rate education to its students.

M. Downs: I looked closely at the *U.S. News and World Report* ranking from the Chancellor and

comprehended relatively quickly, even for someone who is not very good at arithmetic, that the data was not

good. It raised more questions than it answered. I spoke to the Chancellor about it and he agreed that it is

not a solid-gold statistical report. He said that his reason for distributing it was to recruit. I don't see anything

wrong with that. The difficulty is that it tends to weaken or to undermine efforts by interested faculty to

present the following case: that is, that we are underfunded--underfunded not just in an absolute sense but

in comparison to other regional campuses. What the Chancellor is trying to do with prospective students

and what the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee is trying to do with the State Legislature touch and

complement each other. Everybody agrees that we are underfunded. I certainly haven't heard the

Chancellor say that he thought that we were funded adequately, but I also know that,

given limited

resources we do very well. There are certainly some things that we could do better if we had more money.

I think it is important for the Chancellor to make clear that this is not an attempt to weaken the drive on

this campus to gain attention to the situation in regard to underfunding. The rest of us have to understand

that the Chancellor plays on a team and that team is the Purdue campus system. That there are some

things that he might say that he is prohibited from saying because of his place on that team. I didn't think

much of the report, but I do think that for a popular audience, it might be useful in attracting prospective students.

R. Barrett: I wanted to make a couple of brief comments about the meeting with the two Vice Presidents

from Purdue and the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee. The Presiding Officer was there, a number of the

deans were there, and our Chancellor. I heard two clear messages that I was somewhat encouraged by

from Mr. Burns. The first message, that he noted three or four times, is a clear recognition by Purdue

that IPFW is underfunded and the second message is that their effort this year is just the first step in an

ongoing process for IPFW. I think we have made some significant gains in those two areas with our Purdue

West Lafayette crew.

J. Wilson: I would like to change the subject somewhat. Near the end of last year and early this year there

was some discussion about reallocation of funds or changes in the way funding is distributed on this campus,

specifically with regard to the position of the deans in that issue. I wonder if someone here might comment

on what steps are being taken either to increase or decrease the power of deans in controlling funds in their schools?

M. Wartell: It's a shame that Vice Chancellor Hannah isn't here today because she has been working with

the deans. If one of the deans feels like stepping up to speak on the interaction that they've had, then I think

that that would be appropriate, but I can't speak to that.

A. Pugh: I will attempt to speak to that. We have begun discussions. Actually when VCAA Hannah first came here we began discussions. It is an ongoing process. It is not clear exactly where they will be headed. We hope to conclude them before the year is out.

R. Hess: Are there other items for the good and welfare? I have a few questions that might reflect the good and welfare. One reverts to the earlier discussion of the response to the report of standing as an academic institution? The question is, what has been the response of the community to that report? What do we hear back from students, community leaders, and legislative representatives?

M. Wartell: I can speak at least marginally to that, but it is not the kind of data that Professor Downs would like to put in a doctoral thesis. Most people have been extremely positive. We haven't appeared in that particular publication very often, so the fact that we appeared in the first place is viewed as positive. I might also point out that you need to look at how commuter institutions are ranked versus residential institutions because commuter institutions are very often ranked lower than residential institutions--the academic issues notwithstanding. Another point, and I can't cite the specific article, but there was an article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. It essentially said *U.S. News and World Report* reports are not very good. They don't stand up to statistical analysis, but they're here to stay and a lot of comparisons made throughout the country in the popular press are based on those reports.

M. H. Thuente: We have actually been ranked going back to at least 1991. In 1992-93 we were ranked in the fourth tier. But from 1993-1996 we were in the third tier. Beginning in 1996 through 1998 we dropped to the fourth tier. So going back to Professor Downs' earlier point, . . . I am not sure the bottom line is going to be good for IPFW. We have been ranked before and we were in a higher tier for three years.

R. Hess: The last question concerns this room. I have not set here and looked at this room, but folks, it's tacky. My question is, are there any plans to refurbish this room?

W. Branson: Yes. We originally had this room as part of the Kettler renovation project. It appears at this point that we are not going to be able to do as much as we wanted to in Kettler with the original money from the Science Building, so we are looking at how much we can do with the Science Building/Kettler renovation bonding money that we have. There are no imminent plans to renovate right now, but it is part of what we're looking at.

R. Tierney: Getting back to the deans' involvement with annual salaries, for those of us who had no idea that such a discussion was even taking place, what is the nature of this discussion? Is it to encourage the deans to have more input into salary or less input into salary? If not the deans, would the responsibility lie primarily with the chairs? Is there to be a more structured criteria about how salaries will be arrived at?

A. Pugh: The major thrust of the meetings to date has been to decide how to deal with positions that become open, for example, if someone retires. We are discussing whether or not that particular position will stay within the school, will move to a different school, or if it will be used to pay for an altogether different type of thing. The deans are trying to figure out a way in which we can have more input into that process and we are slowly moving in that direction. We have not talked about salary allocation to date. That has not been the thrust of the meetings so far. It may very well be in the next semester, but as of now we are simply talking about how it is that we can allocate open positions between and within schools. The meetings have been fairly successful. Things are clearer than before.

R. Tierney: Is there some input from faculty in the department, or is this being discussed among chairs within the school?

A. Pugh: So far it has been discussed among deans only, however, most deans have asked their chairs and many of their faculty to participate in discussions.

10. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

**Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty**