

Minutes of the
Second Regular Meeting of the Eleventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
October 14, 1991
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 16, 1991
3. Acceptance of the agenda - W. Unsell
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick (SR No. 91-8)
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - Nominations and Elections Committee (SD 91-2) - J. Brennan
7. Question time
 - a. Follow-up from question time of September 16 - SR No. 91-2
 - b. Senate Reference No. 91-9
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick
Parliamentarian: S. Harroff
Sergeant-at-Arms: R. Barrett

Senate Members Present:

F. Borelli, J. Brennan, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, P. Conn, D. Cox, S. Dhawale, M. A. Dirkes, M. Downs, J. Dunlap, J. Eichenauer, A. Finco, E. Foley, J. Haw, S. Hollander, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, J. Klotz, D. Kruse, J. Lantz, D. Legg, P. Lin, D. Linn, M. Mansfield, D. McCants, L. Meyer, JJ. Meyers, R. Miers, D. Oberstar, J. Owen, R. Pacer, G. A. Pugh, R Ramsey, A. Rassuli , S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, A. Shupe, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, J. Sunderman, J. Switzer, W. Unsell, E. Waters

Senate Members Absent:

E. Blumenthal, A. Chatterjea, R. Hawley, R. Hill, R. Jeske, R. Ritchie, W. Walker

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, L. Griffin, R. Svoboda, D. Switzer

Visitors Present: A. Colbert, J. Dahl, K. Frazier-Henry, P. Grote, N. Newell, R. Steiner

Acta*

*These minutes are not verbatim. The tape recorder did not work.

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 16,1991: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

W. Unsell 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:

M. Downs: At the most recent meeting of the University Faculty Council this campus was represented by S. Hollander. Prof. Hollander asked a question concerning the student code. I would like to yield the floor to him to give a brief report.

S. Hollander: I asked President Ehrlich about his involvement in the decision to delete sexual orientation from the IPFW Student Code. He repeated what we have been told. He reluctantly went along with the deletion of sexual orientation because, he said, he felt it was better to have one code than to have two. He volunteered his support for our code and would welcome opportunities here to reinsert the two magic words. I asked if he would have taken the same position if it had been race or religion that had been removed in West Lafayette. He said he was unable to answer that hypothetical question.

- b. Purdue University:

A. Finco: Dr. Betty Suddarth, Registrar of Purdue University, has implemented at West Lafayette the revisions to the academic regulations and procedures which pertain to scholastic recognition and scholastic deficiency, which I believe originated on this campus. You may recall these regulations and procedures take into account the fact that a large proportion of our students are not full-time.

The Faculty Affairs Committee had asked that the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) consider the issue of stopping the tenure clock for just cause. I had intended to initiate a discussion on this issue at the September 25 IFC meeting. As I received the WL Senate agenda, I realized the IFC discussion of the issue was moot because the agenda for the September 23 meeting of the WL Senate, included, for discussion, document USD 91-2, which addresses the issue. The IFC agreed that the surprise appearance of the USD 91-2 on the WL Senate's

agenda points to the need for better communications between committees at the various campuses that have like charges. The chair of the IFC is going to work on this need.

There are few changes in the 1992 Purdue Health Plan. The slight changes are in the mental health portion of the package. The changes will simplify the outpatient mental health benefits process for the employees. The University will absorb the total increase in premium required to operate the medical plan and maintain employee premiums at the 1991 level.

We are being asked to approve the change to a four-point scholastic index and I asked the EPC to bring a document urging changing from the current six-point - scholastic index to the four-point scholastic index. Discussion of a policy and procedure document for accepting credit from vocational and technical or non-accredited college transfer programs continues in the IFC. We seem to be making some progress toward the preparation of a document which will be sent to the faculty governing bodies on the various campuses.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

W. Frederick: I have sent SD 91-1 (IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct - withdrawal of endorsement of code) to all members of the Purdue University Board of Trustees and to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees. I have not received any responses.

6. Committee reports requiring action: - Nominations and Elections Committee (senate Document SD 91-2) – J. Brennan:

J. Brennan moved to approve SD 91-2 (Approval of replacement member of the Nominations and Elections Committee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. Question Time:

a. Follow-up from question time of September 16 - SR No. 91-2

During the past several months, the administration has sought approval for several new initiatives at IPFW

1. *The raising of a very large endowment for athletic scholarships and the renaming of the Athletic Center;*
2. *The establishment of a \$6 million capital campaign for the campus, along with a list of items to be funded by any money raised;*
3. *The establishment of a new Purdue faculty rank, without the routine professional prerequisites;*

4. *Revision of the Code of Student Conduct as approved by the faculty; and*
5. *Implementation of a new policy on salary increments.*

These initiatives have all occurred without any consultation with the appropriate bodies within the faculty governance system.

Why were these significant initiatives taken in this irregular manner and does the administration intend to operate in this way in the future?

*Michael Downs
Steve Hollander*

J. Lantz: Let me take numbers 1 and 2 together. The contention is that I have done all the items enumerated without any input. First, when we started the capital campaign work over three years ago, I asked all vice chancellors, deans and the schools to do a lot of dreaming. You came back to me with almost \$200 million worth of ideas. Over the course of the next years we refined the ideas to about \$30 million and we did a feasibility study to test ideas and amounts. As an outgrowth of all of that, I had small meetings with community people to understand further what and how much we could expect from our community.

During this process IPFW was put on probation by the NCAA for not fielding enough teams. The Foellinger Foundation stepped up to help by giving IPFW a gift of \$180,000 and a promise to help us raise dollars in the community. We had other community people who stepped forward to help. Folks, we either had to raise athletic endowment dollars or close athletics.

The Subcommittee on Athletics has been involved all of the way--you elected them and they have served IPFW well!

4

I would also remind you that the Senate is the body that made the decision to involve us in intercollegiate athletics at the level we are today. I, as the chancellor, have tried to find the dollars to do that. This job would be a put if we had no deer, no intercollegiate athletics, and no student conduct code.

To go back to the capital campaign, we are still trying to refine what and how much. We are still using all of the data and input from before: I assume that AOC and faculty have been discussing these things. The donors truly set the priorities within the parameters of what we are willing to accept.

Item 3. We have been discussing a full-time position that protects people from three years and out. I am also concerned regarding fringe benefits for these individuals. I believe we asked the Senate for guidance several years ago. You referred a document' to two committees, I believe I've heard nothing since.

Item 4. I did not revise the student code.

Item 5. Yes, we did implement a one-year policy in salary increments. We had input, but we did not get our first choice. We are part of a system and we did follow the management partner's system policy.

Downs: Thank you for explaining the process, but we have not raised the question of any input, but rather of consultation with appropriate groups within the faculty governance system. I know the Chancellor talks with lots of people. I am satisfied with her response to question one; however, the naming of buildings is usually taken up with the University Resources Policy Committee. What remains after her answer is a fact. Five of these initiatives occurred without real consultation within the faculty governance system. Things run better when that consultation takes place.

b. Senate Reference No. 91-9

J. Lantz: Before I answer any of the questions individually let me make a general statement which I believe addresses all of the questions.

What I believe you are truly telling me is that you do not like being part of a system, that you do not want the managing partner to have any say in what we do or how we do it. The truth is, we are part of a system--and we are part of two systems--we are not autonomous. When I think how far we've come in the last twenty-five years, I'm pleased, but I cannot wave a magic wand and make either IU or Purdue go away, or make more money. We do enjoy the benefits of being IU-Purdue, but we must also pay the price for that as well.

1. *The following paragraph appears in an article entitled "Sutton Says 1991-92 a Balancing Act, " in Inside Purdue, page 2, September 16, 1991:*

As an example of this balance," he says, was the consultation by President Steven Beering and other administrators during the budget process in the Indiana Legislature. After (he budget was passed Sutton says administrators again worked with faculty leaders on how to make up for lower-than-expected funding.

My question is:

Because the salary increment policy and other budget-related policies were imposed by Purdue on all regional campuses, surely IPFW faculty leaders must have been consulted. Who were these IPFW faculty leaders and how were they selected?

*Richard Pacer, Senator
Department of Chemistry*

J. Lantz: I know that while IU gave raises last year and Purdue gave only tokens to those under \$40,000/year, it looks like we as the IU-PU campus took it on the chin. I would be very happy to have Vice Chancellor Ritchie go over the 1991

budget in detail for the Senate, if you so desire. Vice Chancellor Ritchie has already been working with the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, if you noted the minutes of their last meeting, to review the 1991-92 budget which takes me back to your first question. During the course of last year we worked with the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee and did in fact follow, where possible, their priorities. The Senate elected the members and I believe the committee did a good job. I also tried to keep all of you informed regarding the budget. I do not believe we kept any of it a secret. If you want a budget briefing, Dick Ritchie and I will do it when we can arrange a mutually convenient time. I believe a presentation will answer the questions if that is what you desire.

S. Hollander: I haven't heard a lot of sentiment from this body for not being part of a system. I think the question was whether appropriate bodies and administrators were meaningfully consulted on this campus. Appropriate people in West Lafayette appear to have been consulted. Are we part of the system only when decisions are implemented, or are we also part of the system when decisions are being formulated?

J. Lantz: We are part of the system. And we do live with the system. We told everybody what decision was made when the policy was finalized. We had input. This was not what we wanted.

R. Pacer: Were faculty leaders on this campus consulted? According to the article, faculty leaders at West Lafayette were consulted about the question. I have the impression you were the only person consulted about this budget decision.

J. Lantz: The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee was consulted.

J. Smulkstys: I would like to express my views about this decision by Purdue University concerning West Lafayette policies on our campus. We used to be told, because we are part of two systems, that we get the best of two worlds. My feeling is we get the worst of two worlds. As I understand it, in the Indiana University system the policy says that campuses can determine themselves what they will do about increments and about all kinds of other expenditures. IU campuses followed this policy for this fiscal year and made the decisions in terms of their needs and resources and after consultation with the faculty. Thus, it has been reported that some IU campuses received increments as high as 6%. In our case, it appears that the decision was made by one administrator without faculty consultation. In light of all this, it would be appropriate to reconsider the management agreement.

M. Downs: I assume that what happened was not the recommendation of this campus or the chancellor. At no point last year was the policy that was adopted seriously considered or discussed on this campus. The system is a fact of life. In face of that fact, we need to insist that the interests and desires of this campus

find a legitimate place. If the chancellor tells me that she is satisfied with the way policy was decided, I will accept that. I don't think she's going to tell us that.

J. Lantz: Are you accepting the offer to bring the budget for 1991-92 to the Senate?

S. Hollander: I would suggest the following: Budgets are not subject to Senate legislation, and all employees--not just Senators--would be interested in the current budget and the process by which it was prepared. You might ask the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee for advice on the scheduling of a budgetary-review session open to all employees.

2. *Departments on campus have been informed that there are funds available for non-recurring expenditures. What is the source of these extra funds? Given the shortage of S&E funds which departments are facing, why cannot these funds be used to buttress S&E accounts if departments so wish?*

*James Lutz
Political*

Science

J. Lantz: S&E accounts were in fact raised with recurring funds and there is and \$30%000 that I have asked Vice Chancellors McCants, Borelli and Ritchie to discuss and to have input as to what priorities we should address. The dollars to be discussed are the ones we get this year from the state, but taken away next year.

3. *According to the explanation given to faculty, the 1991 salary distribution formula was to give a \$700 increment to 12-month (\$560 to 10-month) employees with annual salaries under \$40, 000 and no increment for employees with salaries at \$40,000 or higher.*

However, there was significant more salary increment money (recurring funds) in the IPFW 1991-92 budget than was allocated in accordance with the \$40,000 formula.

a. *How much salary increment money went undistributed this year?*

J. Lantz: None. We were given only enrollment change funds. There were no salary increment dollars. We added positions to meet the needs of more students, we tried to reduce the number of associate faculty with more full-time lecturers. We also added to associate faculty the dollars to cover Social Security. We also increased S&E.

b. *Who made the decision not to distribute all of the salary increment money allocated by the Indiana State Legislature? Why?*

J. Lantz: None was allocated. However, we sent numerous proposals to West Lafayette regarding raises. The policy did not reflect our first choice.

c. *Will this undistributed, recurring money be used this year? How? Will it ever be given to IPFW employees for salary increments?*

J. Lantz: We expect to provide merit raises next year.

d. *How many IPFW employees had additional monies added to their base salary that exceeded the above guidelines? For what reasons (promotion? equity? other?)?*

J. Lantz: Academic promotions did receive the usual increment associated with promotion, and I believe three other campus personnel moved to higher level jobs and were incremented because of their additional responsibility. There was no money for equity.

I would also like to tell you that since we had such a good recruiting year we had less than \$50,000 in unfilled position reserves. We usually use \$300,000-400,000 or so from these reserves to pay associate faculty. But we have already and will use next semester over \$300,000 from operating dollars to pay for associate faculty.

Hollander: Equity adjustments are used at least in part to remedy past discrimination. About the decision that there would be no equity adjustments this year--was it a system decision or a local decision?

Lantz: It was a system decision.

Frederick

William G.

Computer Science

4. *Could the Chancellor explain why Purdue University provides unequal and inferior pension benefits for clerical and service staff?*

*C. Jack Quinn
Manufacturing*

Technology

J. Lantz: This question seems close to the "have you quit beating your wife-husband" question. First, retirement benefits are

deferred salary and we all know and understand that there are many things that determine salary. It is my understanding that all state university clerical and service people are under PERF, which contributions total 10 1/2% per year. I know that all of that does not show on the annual report form. One state university has, in fact, addressed the issue by reducing the faculty TIAA/CREF contribution to 11% for all of those hired after January 1, 1990.

M. Downs: Someone may have said that. But clerical and service staff still receive unequal and inferior pension benefits. The Chancellor is saying that everyone does it. They do in this state. But that doesn't make it fair.

J. Lantz: The decision goes back a long way. Someone decided clerical and service staff should be under PERF. I believe there was an effort to make the amounts more near the same when it went to 10¹/₂%.

Hollander: Before we leave the compensation section of Question Time, I have a question about graduate assistant salaries on this campus. At the same meeting, I think, at which they passed the new salary policies, the Purdue University trustees passed a minimum stipend for graduate teaching personnel. Under that minimum, graduate appointees at IPFW would have received considerably more money than they do. I have been told that we asked for and were granted an exception to the system policy. Is that true?

Lantz: We asked for an exception because we did not have enough money to pay them.

5. *It has been reported that this year the library budget for books will be less than half of what it was last year. What steps is the administration taking to restore the budget now, and what long-range plans for a more permanent solution are there?*

*Gary Blumenshine
History
Michael Downs
Political Science*

J. Lantz: The report is accurate. Domestic price increases for scholarly publications averaged 15% during 1991, and foreign titles increased in price an average of 25-40⁰/₀. As a result, all academic libraries are faced with the same problem. Last week

the IU Medical Library announced it was being forced to cancel 20 journal titles. IU-Bloomington has been cutting titles over the past few years; moreover, IU-B has identified nearly 2000 journal titles for possible cancellation. The University of Connecticut is cutting \$250,000 from serials. Tufts University will be cutting \$250,000. In 1990 IPFW was forced to cut approximately \$8,000 in chemistry, physics and biology journals. We have not reduced dollars to the library--the dollars do not buy what they did and decisions were made that reduced the dollars to the book budget.

Given the need we have on campus, it is not possible to increase the library book/serial budget by 15-20% each year; moreover, such increases must be recurring dollars. For example, if 40K is needed for one year to maintain a basic level, 46K of additional recurring money will be needed the following year; 52K, the year after that, etc. The library does not have less money in its recurring budget.

The time has come to review library collection policies based on our focus on a collection to support the undergraduate program and access services for graduate and Faculty research. This has been the direction the library has tried to move during the past few years, but clearly the change will need to come about more quickly, for we cannot continue to cannibalize the book budget to pay for exorbitant increases in the cost of expensive indexes, abstracts, and some scholarly journals.

This year's library committee has met twice already and is likely to meet on a bi-weekly basis throughout the year as the library director consults with them on issues such as the collection development policies and procedures, the book/serial ratio of expenditure, access approaches to buying information as needed, and allocation formulas. Please speak with Library Committee members about your concerns. This will be a critical year. Subscriptions have been paid for 1992; however, this year, we will have to make cancellation decisions for 1993. The Library director and the Library Committee have assured me that they intend to discuss the issues widely. A recent article in the Chronicle stated, "The whole information structure that has been in place since the invention of the printing press is about to change." This "problem" is not one created by librarians, administrators or faculty. It is a result of inflation, the global economy, a move toward electronic information sources, and the profit motive. Information is a commodity that is bought and sold in the international marketplace; it isn't free, and it isn't cheap.

It is impossible for any university administration to tend enough dollars to provide information on the library shelves to meet everyone's needs. We must place our scarce resources where it will give us the most value for our dollar. To do this means we all have to look at libraries in a way we certainly have not been accustomed to, and perhaps do not want to. I am confident, though, that you will support your colleagues on the Library Committee and the librarians, working with them to achieve a library resource center that will meet the immediate needs of our undergraduate students and provide good access services for the research needs of our graduate students and faculty.

M. Downs: Actually, my report is not accurate. Now the Director has said there will be "little, if any" money available for books this year. This is calamity and a scandal. The Chancellor indicates that nothing can be done now, but what about a long-term solution? Will the library be part of the capital fund drive?

J. Lantz: Yes, it will be a high priority, but no dollar figure has been set.

M. Downs: We should raise as much for the library as we will for athletic scholarships, perhaps more. If the library doesn't get a lion's share it should at least receive a panther's share.

6. *Has the Chancellor any plans to discuss restoring the protections in the IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct for sexual orientation with President Beering and the Purdue University Board of Trustees?*

Downs

Michael

Science

Political

J. Lantz: I have discussed and probably will continue to discuss the student code with President Beering. I do not know whether you are aware or not, but OSU has also not included sexual preference--I believe for the same reasons the Purdue board did not include it. The California governor has vetoed a bill passed by the state legislature for the same reasons. I, nor President Beering, personally can abide any discrimination for any reason.

S. Hollander: I sent a note in earl May about university policy on discrimination based on sexual orientation. I received a note saying I would receive a response. Do you know when such a response is forthcoming?

J. Lantz: The Affirmative Action Officer is working on an answer. I am not aware of any other documents that spell out sexual orientation as a protected class.

M. Downs: If we passed a separate resolution protecting sexual orientation on this campus, would the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor accept and enforce it?

J. Lantz: I don't know at this point that university counsel would, in fact, be in a position to support us if we had to go to court.

D. Oberstar: Would the presiding officer allow a return to monetary questions? When the increment policy was promulgated I talked to various people about why this approach. I got the message that Purdue University came down on the side of conservatism; that is why we had this meager increment policy. This conservative approach supposedly meant more funds available for a regular type of merit increase for the next year of the biennium. Could you give us any idea as to what kind of money we are talking about?

J: Lantz: 5%

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only": There were no committee reports.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Smulkstys: From the discussion today I am getting the sense as I have for some time that many decisions here on budget and such questions as student code of conduct are not made here. I would suggest to the chancellor, and I say this in a friendly manner and not on these issues alone, that you ask President Beering to come to the Senate to talk to us about some of these questions. I don't know what impact this will have, but at least he should hear how we feel about these issues.

J. Lantz: I would be glad to ask the president.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty