

**Minutes of the  
Second Regular Meeting of the Sixteenth  
Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort  
Wayne**

October 14, 1996

3:00 P.M., Kettler G46

**Agenda\***

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 9, 1996
3. Acceptance of the agenda - S. Hollander
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Purdue University - J. Hersberger
  - b. Indiana University - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Professional Development Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 96-1) - S. Hollander
  - b. Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board (Senate Document SD 96-2) - J. Wilson
7. New business
  - Peter Iadicola (Senate Document SD 96-3)
8. Committee reports "for information only"
  - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-3) - B. Bulmahn
  - b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-4) - R. Barrett
  - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-5) - M. H. Thunte
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

\*As edited.

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick  
Parliamentarian: M. Sherr (absent)  
Sergeant-at-Arms: N. Younis  
Secretary: B. Blauvelt

---

Attachments:

"Approval of replacement members of the Professional Development Subcommittee" (SD 96-1)

"Changes to the Purdue University at Fort Wayne Faculty Grievance Procedures [Amends FWSD 76-10]"(SD 96-2)

"Administrative Guidelines for Deans/Chairs to Assess Option 1 Faculty on Creative/ Research/Scholarly Activities [OAA 96-10]" (SR No. 96-5)

"Steven C. Beering letter dated 9/27/96 regarding IPFW Management Agreement and Senate minutes of 9/9/96" (SR No. 96-6a)

"Michael C. Downs letter dated 2/10/96 regarding Beering letter of 9/27/96" (SR No. 96-6b)

---

Senate Members Present:

C. Aikman, S. Argast, R. Barrett, R. Berger, F. Borelli, B. Bulmahn, C. Champion, J. Clausen, V. Coufoudakis, L. DeFonso, M. Downs, D. Edwards, F. English, O. Freiburger, J. Grant, T. Hamilton, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, L. Hess, S. Hollander, C. Humphrey, P. Iadicola, R. Jeske, B. Kingsbury, M. Lane, T. Laverghetta, D. Legg, M. Masters, L. Motz, G. Mourad, D. Oberstar, K. O'Connell, D. Ross, H. Samavati, D. Schmidt, M. Scudder, J. Silver, P. Stubblebine, P. Terry, C. Thompson, M. H. Thuente, J. Wilson, L. Wright-Bower

Senate Members Absent:

W. Branson, C. Chauhan, N. Cothorn, R. Emery, S. Frey-Ridgway, P. Hamburger, R. Hess, J. Knight, H. Oloomi, M. Wartell

Representative from Medical Education: K. Redman

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, R. Kendall, W. Ludwin, D. McCants

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, J. Parrent, G. Smith,

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 9, 1996: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Wilson announced that Robert Barrett was no longer on the Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board and that he would be introducing SD 96-2.

S. Hollander moved to amend the agenda by adding an item 8.c.: a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee dealing with OAA Memorandum 96-10, which was distributed at the door. (See SR No. 96-5) Seconded.

Both announcements were accepted as editorial revisions to the agenda.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Purdue University: J. Hersberger had no report.

b. Indiana University:

M. Downs: After the last meeting the Presiding Officer, the Speaker of the Purdue University Faculty and the Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty received a letter from President Beering regarding the Management Agreement. He reminded us that the Management Agreement is negotiated between the two universities and is a contract between the two universities regarding the management of this campus. He did go on to say he would be willing to meet with us at a convenient time to discuss what our concerns and suggestions may be. I replied to the letter and said that the reason that we mentioned the Management Agreement wasn't that we misunderstood the nature of the Agreement, but because we felt we needed a sufficient amount of time to study its effect since its implementation. I thanked him for his offer to meet with us and said that we would be preparing recommendations to be submitted to both presidents and boards of trustees at the time that the Management Agreement comes up for renewal.

P. Iadicola: Is it understood that the Senate does not have a role, from President Beering's viewpoint, in making suggestions on modifications to the Management Agreement?

M. Downs: I chose not to interpret his letter as indicating that this body had no role to play. I thought that perhaps from something that somebody had said, that he thought we didn't understand that we are not a full and equal partner in that agreement. I think we know that. If we didn't learn it last time, I am sure they would be willing to teach us again that the agreement is between the two universities and only secondarily involves input from the faculty here. I did ask President Brand if he minded if we approached him directly with any suggestions that we had to make as a faculty regarding the document. He said that was alright with him. I thought it was important to make clear that recommendations from this body would go to both presidents and both boards of trustees and that, rather than reflecting the views of two or three faculty leaders, these recommendations would be developed by the entire faculty here with much consultation and participation at all levels.

W. Frederick: I will ask the secretary to attach Dr. Beering's letter and your response to the minutes of this meeting. (See SR Nos. 96-6a and 96-6b).

5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick: I will remind you, while we are preparing schedules for next fall, that the Senate meeting time will be on Mondays, 12:00-1:15 p.m.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

- a. Professional Development Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 96-1) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 96-1 (Approval of replacement members of the Professional Development Subcommittee).

Motion to approve SD 96-1 passed on a voice vote.

- b. Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board (Senate Document SD 96-2) - J. Wilson:

J. Wilson moved to approve SD 96-2 (Changes to the Purdue University at Fort Wayne Faculty Grievance Procedures [Amends FWSD 76-10]).

Motion to approve SD 96-2 passed on a voice vote.

#### 7. New Business:

- a. SD 93-9 (Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards) - Peter Iadicola:

P. Iadicola moved to repeal SD 93-9 (Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards). Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to commit the motion to the Faculty Affairs Committee and to ask the Faculty Affairs Committee to report it out no later than the January meeting. Seconded.

Motion to commit failed on a show of hands.

Motion to approve the repeal failed on a show of hands.

#### 8. Committee reports "for information only"

- a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-3): - B. Bulmahn

B. Bulmahn presented Senate Reference No. 96-3 (Cooperation between Ivy Tech State College and IPFW) for information only. She said that the task force is still working and that the completed project will be part of a booklet that will be distributed widely.

S. Hollander: The final paragraph of your transmittal memo talks about "a standing committee of some sort [that] will monitor the list and keep it current." Do we have any information about how that committee will be formed?

B. Bulmahn: That wording is mine and it is optimistic wording, but it is based on some good indicators.

T. Hamilton: Who has evaluated these courses at the departmental level with the courses at the other institutions?

B. Bulmahn: It was the case at one time that we were negotiating these agreements course-by-course just directly across the street here in Fort Wayne. And those, of course, are in effect. But in a broader stroke, SD 94-20 said that we were going to extend the courtesy to accept courses that had been accepted at our brother or sister institution statewide, e.g., a Lafayette-Ivy Tech and a West Lafayette-Purdue. So we really have two different types of agreements which have been consolidated here.

P. Iadicola: . . . Are you saying that the departments have no review over which courses are accepted, e.g., CHD which has been listed as SOC UNDI credit?

B. Bulmahn: We are saying that because it has been accepted at some other IU or Purdue campus we are accepting credit--sometimes in a less generous way than it has been on another campus. Which class are you referring to?

P. Iadicola: CHD 209. We have not had an opportunity to review that. I am wondering whether we have an ability to question that?

B. Bulmahn: The fact that we voted in this Senate to respect the decisions of our sibling campuses would indicate "no." We have made exceptions, however, when it has become clear that the conditions under which the courses were taught contrary to a statewide syllabus--which had been promised--had to be taught in a different way because of facilities being different on different campuses. So we did make some exceptions from the blanket acceptance in those cases.

W. Frederick: The chair has now recognized that it is time either to recess or to entertain a motion to postpone adjournment for five minutes.

W. Barrett: So moved. Seconded.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

T. Hamilton: A major concern of mine with the approved Senate Document, which says we will do a blanket approval of classes that have been accepted by sibling courses, is the fact that there may be only one campus, and that may be our campus, where the program is accredited and none of the other campuses are accredited. That could present a major problem.

B. Bulmahn: That explains why in some cases we have accepted them as undistributed credits instead of course-for-course transfer.

b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-4) -  
R. Barrett:

R. Barrett presented SR No. 96-4 (Suggested guidelines for use of LAN bulletin boards, 'for information only').

c. Faculty Affairs Committee - M. H. Thuente

M. H. Thunte: I asked to have the Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum 96-10 distributed for information because it had gone only to chairs and deans, and I wanted to make it clear that it doesn't in anyway change the original faculty workload policy. I think you have all heard that in the discussion today. The committee welcomes your input on this matter.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: I have two items: 1) I would like to compliment the Chancellor. I read in the last Briefings that he is going to answer questions from all comers. I think that openness and frankness is a step in the right direction. It is going to be a regular column entitled From the Top. And he has promised to answer questions in Briefings from people whether they sign their names to the questions or not. I think that is a really good move and I compliment him on it. (2) The other has to do with an initiative from the Board of Trustees of Indiana University which would create a number of awards each year for excellence in teaching. That initiative is going to be considered at the next meeting of the University Faculty Council which will determine how it will be implemented on each Indiana University campus. Implementation will result in an infusion of money to IU campuses, money which would be used to reward, on an annual basis, the best 25% of the teachers on that campus. I think we all know that we have a lot of excellent teachers on this campus that would qualify for such an award and I think we can all agree that compensation for faculty on this campus is not what it should be. I am hoping that we can persuade the Chancellor, who has this option, to take advantage of this opportunity.

J. Wilson: Would Purdue faculty be eligible for this award?

M. Downs: I don't like the idea of there being anything here that all faculty, including associate faculty, aren't qualified for. And I would even go so far as to say that if Purdue faculty weren't included, then we probably shouldn't do it.

W. Frederick: I have been a participant in the FACET program sponsored by IU for years and they don't recognize the difference between IU and Purdue faculty members on this campus.

D. Oberstar: My question has to do with the electronic bulletin-board business. Is there anyway we can have a list of just faculty that we can get to via email? I had to use the Jeff Wilson ploy for something which all of you needed to receive and I did it via [a nonfaculty employee who] caught a little hell from someone who questioned her: Was this a mistake? or Why did you do it? I couldn't do it through my machine, I had to do it through hers. I found that there was no list of just all faculty that I could get to. I would like to find out if administratively this can be done. I think we can trust the faculty not to send out notices of lost cats and dogs to all of their colleagues. I didn't want to waste a 1000 sheets of paper and a set of mailing labels to try to get this particular item in front of you. . .

S. Hollander: The Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee (CUAS) is discussing some limited means of giving certain people, probably school offices, the capability of sending mail to "all PC users." People who favor it or would vote against such a proposal might get in touch with Judie Violette, who has volunteered to chair the CUAS subcommittee which will come up with a draft.

10. The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt  
Secretary of the Faculty