

Minutes of the  
Second Regular Meeting of the Ninth Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne  
October 16, 1989  
Noon, Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 18, 1989
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Haw
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
  - b. Purdue University - K. Stevenson
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Special business for the day
  - a. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 89-3) - J. Haw
  - b. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 89-6) - J. Haw
7. Committee reports requiring action
  - Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Document SD 89-10) – A. Friedel
8. Question time (Senate Reference No. 89-2)
9. New business
10. Committee reports "for information only"
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, M. Auburn, A. Bassett, J. Bell, F. Borelli, G. Bullion, B. Bulmahn, M. Calkowski, D. Cox, V. Craig, M. Downs, J. Eichenauer, E. Foley, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, H. Garcia, J. Haw, R. Hawley, S. Hollander, K Keller, J. Lantz, B. Lingaraj, A. Mahmoud, J. Manzer, E. Messal, J. Meyers, D. Monteith, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, M. Richeson, S. Sarratore, A. Shupe, S. Skekloff, E. Snyder, K Squadrito, K Stevenson, J. Sunderman, D. Swinehart, J. Switzer, G. Szymanski, G. Ulmschneider, W. Unsell, K Wakley

Senate Members Absent:

H. Broberg, J. Carnaghi, D. Hockensmith, F. Kirchhoff, R. Miers, R. Novak, J. Owen, A. Pugh, D. Schmidt  
Presiding Officer: M. Mansfield

Parliamentarian: R. Pippert

Sergeant-at-Arms: R. Barrett (absent)

Faculty Members Present: V. Coufoudakis, D. McCants

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, N. Newell

---

Attachment:

"Election of replacement member of the Nominations and Elections Committee" (SD 89-10)

Acta

1. Call to order: M. Mansfield called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 18, 1989: The minutes were approved as written.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Haw moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

M. Downs: I have to report on only one item: Indiana University employees should have received in the mail a description of the insurance changes that have taken effect and will take effect this fall. Only one alteration has been made in that schedule, and that is that the new preferred-provider pharmacy provision, which was to take effect on 1 October, will not take effect until 1 November. There was considerable controversy over the assignment of that contract by Blue Cross/Blue Shield to Hook's Pharmacy. Bloomington Faculty Council and other faculty councils objected because, in their particular areas, the Hook's pharmacies are not conveniently situated. Hook's has responded by making some amendments and changes in their contract with Blue Cross/Blue Shield. The arrangement now is apparently acceptable to everybody at the university. You will be able to take advantage of the preferred-provider pharmacy rates starting 1 November. I urge everybody to read carefully the contents of that envelope which describes, in detail, the changes that have been made in the health-insurance program for Indiana University employees.

- b. Purdue University: K Stevenson had no report.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

M. Mansfield: The presiding officer has forwarded SD 89-9 (Report of the Ad Hoc Committee To Review the Relationship between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University) to the presidents and the Board of Trustees along with an invitation for their comments. To date, no comments have been received.

6. Special business for the day

- a. Agenda Committee (SD 89-31- J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to recommit SD 89-3 (Labor Studies Promotion and Tenure Document) back to Labor Studies. Seconded.

Motion to recommit passed on a voice vote.

b. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 89-6) - J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to recommit SD 89-6 (Division of Public and Environmental Affairs Promotion and Tenure Document) back to the Division of Public and Environmental Affairs. Seconded.

Motion to recommit passed on a voice vote.

7. Committee reports requiring action: Nominations and Elections Committee - SD 89-10 - A. Friedel:

A. Friedel moved to approve SD 89-10 (Election of replacement member of the Nominations and Elections Committee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

8. Question time:

Q: Last year, after considerable debate, the Senate approved a 1990-1991 academic calendar that included the option for a fifteenth-week reading period. That was then.

This is now. Now the IPFW registrar has been ordered not to mention the reading period in academic calendars printed in the Schedule of Classes, Bulletin, and other official publications.

Why is IPFW not informing students and employees of the provisions of the calendar approved by the Faculty? Does the administration believe that there is or is not a reading period in the IPFW academic calendar for 1990-1991?

A: J. Lantz: The reason we are not informing faculty and students is because that statement is inconsistent with the kind of parameters that are set out by our managing partner. The second question has to do with do I believe that there is or is not a reading period. I believe that faculty have both the responsibility and the authority to organize courses that they teach in a way that best meets the needs of the discipline and the students they are teaching. In fact, if you will look at many of the course syllabi that are handed out to students, I think you will find that faculty are fully aware of that. There is no question that the faculty has the authority and responsibility to organize the courses that they teach in the best way possible. I think it is important that we not confuse or limit faculty by stating the reading period as the last week of the semester. Faculty have the right, the authority, and the

responsibility to organize. If a reading period makes sense in the middle of the semester, or if a field trip makes sense at the end of the third week--whatever those things are that make the course the best that the faculty can offer--I feel that that is the important thing. I also know that the Educational Policy Committee is looking at a statement that is appropriate for this Senate to consider, which, in fact, addresses exactly the issues that I have spoken to as they relate to how each faculty member organizes his or her own course.

I do want to add one other thing, which is not a part of the question. A Senate colleague did discuss with me that some time ago we acted on a policy on faculty absences. I read the policy on faculty absences very carefully. It is my opinion, at this time, that that does not relate to what we are discussing here. There is a difference between assigning to a student an opportunity to do some special things for a class that are out of the classroom. But in fact it is not a license to simply dismiss class for a week or a week and a half, which then covers up faculty absences. I think the faculty-absence policy addressed a specific problem and perhaps we need to reexamine that issue. I don't see that what we're addressing with the calendar and the faculty-absence policy as being complementary. I think they are two entirely different things.

Q: S. Hollander: I would like to get back to the initial comment about our managing partner. What Purdue University policy prohibits a faculty, in fixing its own calendar, from putting into that calendar a week-long reading period?

A: J. Lantz: If you will go back to the documents, in fact, that you are asking about, they don't spell it out. It is a matter of practice. The practice has not been to state that. No one, including the managing partner, is questioning your ability as a faculty member to have the decision-making authority and responsibility to do exactly that.

9. New business: There was no new business.

10. Committee reports "for information only": there were no committee reports.

11. General good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: Professor Hollander had his hand up first.

S. Hollander: Speaker Downs would have been much more eloquent in expressing, I hope, his sorrow, and certainly mine, at the further limit put upon this faculty to establish its own academic calendar. The rights of a faculty member to manage her or his classroom time are substantially different from the right of the Faculty in the establishment of an academic calendar. I agree that each of us individually could declare a reading period during the fifteenth week of the semester. That would not make it a university optional-reading period. I am extremely disappointed that the will of the Faculty as expressed in the Senate and by the Senate last year is not going to be carried out.

M. Downs: I was going to refer to the same subject. I think that when this Faculty developed a calendar and specifically allowed for a fifteenth week that could be used as a reading period, it was a policy of the Faculty--that faculty who wished to do that in that way were allowed to do so, perhaps encouraged to do so. It was specifically noted in the calendar. Moreover, it may become the practice of a number of faculty to do it. In other words, it may become a popular alternative with faculty and probably with students to the usual methods that have been used here to carry on the business of the last two weeks of the semester. If that is the case, I think it is very important for students to know that that is going to happen. In some quarters, the academic calendar of the university is a contrail with the students. Certainly nobody thinks that the Faculty has the right to hold classes early or to hold them after the end of the semester as part of their rights in the classroom to conduct business the way they would like to conduct it. Certainly we can't hold classes earlier; we can't hold them later. The university restricts that as a matter of policy. This is an enabling policy that puts everybody on notice that a significant number of faculty may, in fact, not hold classes, and that it would not be the occasion for students to complain or to argue that they actually deserve fifteen full weeks of instruction in the classroom with the faculty member present.

I remember the excessive-absence policy very well. It was not an initiative that came from the Faculty; it was an initiative that came from the administration. It is on the books. A number of departments have developed policies that deal with excessive absences. They set up guidelines on when an absence is excessive and what steps have to be taken to avoid it. I can easily see a faculty member, who tries to exercise this right to hold a reading period during the fifteenth week, hearing from a department chair or dean. He or she may be asked to explain under the excessive-absence policy what is going on here. Why aren't you meeting classes? What's being done? If this is the sort of thing that is required, then it is not the right of the faculty member to do whatever they want to do pursuant to their goals in the classroom at any time.

The larger matter here, it seems to me, is the attitude of the managing partner to determine whether or not we can publish a calendar as a statement of Faculty policy because it happens not to accord with practice in the past. Every change that has been made in the calendar here at some point or another hasn't accorded with past practice. It seems to me that what we are required to meet are the written criteria for a calendar, and not to make it accord with past practice unless past practice has been written down so that it can be seen. This certainly has a chilling effect on any effort we would make to change the calendar within the written guidelines. We have to know what practice is. I'd like to ask the question, "Who determined what the practice was as it applied to this question, and who ordered the administration here not to publish the calendar?" That is not a question that has to be answered, because it is not asked during "question time," but it is an important matter, it seems to me, and for this Faculty.

J. Lantz: I would be happy to respond as much as I can to Senator Downs. There was considerable discussion in West Lafayette about our calendar. I don't know that there was a single person who said we should not publish it. Vice President Ringel is the liaison of West Lafayette with the community-based campuses, and so it was Vice President Ringel

who wrote the letter about it. I am not suggesting that it was his decision alone or in concert, I am just saying he was the person who wrote the letter. I don't believe that the intent in any way was to limit how faculty teach. I do not believe that for a moment. I think the concern is simply the fact that over many years at all of the Purdue-managed campuses that has not been included, and so they did not want it included here. But they are not limiting our ability to manage our courses.

M. Downs: Excuse me for asking another question, or making another comment. If no order were given not to publish the calendar, was there an order given to publish an amended version with that deleted? Or not to publish any calendar at all?

J. Lantz: It was only the printing of the option which was the question.

M. Downs: So it was just that one section of the calendar?

J. Lantz: One item.

M. Downs: Was there an explanation made that it was not intended in any way to limit a faculty member's right at another time in the semester to have a reading period? Was that an option? I wonder how much discussion actually took place between you and Vice President Ringel and people on this campus, or whether this was simply presented to us as an ultimatum?

J. Lantz: Vice President Ringel and I had a lengthy conversation about it after the original letter. I would not want to put words into the Vice President's mouth, but it appears to me that his great concern was that in listing it only in the fifteenth week, that we were restricting faculty rights and responsibilities. He personally, I believe, felt that that was more limiting than we should be on our faculty.

D. Onwood: Senator Downs has made some observations which may have led some Senators to believe that the calendar which we adopted was adopted as a pro-reading-period calendar. It is my understanding that, during the debate, it was really a pro-choice calendar.

M. Downs: It was a pro-choice calendar, but whenever you make it clear that people have a choice, you also encourage them to make a choice. The reason the calendar passed, of course, was because people felt that not only did the choice exist, but it should be specifically mentioned. For Vice President Ringel to say that such mention would effectively deprive faculty of that right, which everyone agrees they have, is a most disingenuous construction. Disingenuous is the kindest evaluation I can make.

K. Stevenson: My understanding was that this was an option we left with the Faculty and not with the students. Obviously, without it being published in the *Schedule of Classes*, the students will think it is their option whether or not it says specifically that. As someone who absolutely does not plan to dismiss any classes in the fifteenth week, I would rather not have students confused as to whether or not they are going to have class. Since it is a

Faculty option, I don't see anything wrong with informing the Faculty, but leaving it out of the *Schedule of Classes*.

D. Swinehart: I wonder whether we could put this to rest, at least in terms of this Senate, by instituting some sort of resolution in the sense that faculty would feel that there should be some notation--whether it specifies the fifteenth week or any other week--that the Faculty does have the option of an extra week for reading within the semester and that that should be in writing rather than left out....

S. Hollander: Two brief responses to things which other senators said. Any version of the academic calendar that reflects what this body decided would in print clearly state "instructor's option" in connection with the fifteenth-week reading period. If, when you get back to your office, you look at the *Graduate Bulletin* and at the 1990-1991 academic calendar published in it, before all of this became an issue, you will see that the fifteenth week is clearly described in print in the bulletin as "optional reading period--instructor's option." The chancellor has mentioned that she had a discussion with Mr. Ringel after she received his letter. I thought the question that had been asked by Senator Downs was, "Were there discussions between people on this campus and people at West Lafayette prior to the decision to order us not to print the reading period?" Perhaps Senator Downs wasn't asking that, but I would welcome a response about whether those discussions took place before or after the decision.

J. Lantz: Steven, I really can't answer you. There was considerable discussion about this optional fifteenth week, and I simply cannot tell you in what order they came. I am not trying to be evasive. I just don't remember.

W. Frederick: Maybe it would be best to serve the purposes of this discussion if we were just to request the chancellor to invite Vice President Ringel to a meeting of the Senate, and that might clear up any confusion about any discussion that did or did not take place and what memos were written. I frankly don't know the man and it would be nice to meet part of our management authority in West Lafayette.

A. Mahmoud: Publishing the information for the students is not just confusing, in fact, it would have put invisible pressure on everybody to let the sixteen weeks go because here we have some courses that are going to be fifteen, we have some courses that are going to be sixteen, and I think it is very confusing. I thought, as Senator Onwood pointed out, that the document we agreed to is up to the faculty member to use that week in any way they feel appropriate, and therefore I don't see really what is the burning issue of putting it on the calendar.

M. Calkowski: I would like to respond to that. One thing that I think we are ignoring here is the comprehension of our students as they are reading the calendar. If they are not aware that there is this possibility of an option, they are going to be extraordinarily confused.

A. Mahmoud: They will be even more confused if they are going to say, "Here is fifteen and here is sixteen and I don't know which way to go."

M. Calkowski: Not if they understand that it is up to the discretion of their professor.

A. Mahmoud: The professor can do that at the beginning of the semester. Nobody is going to stop the professor from announcing that at the beginning of the course.

M. Downs: The Faculty approved the calendar. In the calendar it specified an optional reading period during the fifteenth week of the semester. The past practice and the written practice is to publish the calendar as the Faculty has approved it unless it violates, in the past, at least, the written policies of the university. This one does not. It was passed by the Faculty. It should be printed as it was passed.

B. Abbott: Although I am also one of those who intends to conduct a sixteen-week class period, I would be concerned about the problem of students who are unaware that this is a Faculty option and who then attend classes in which the instructor announces that there will be only fifteen weeks, that the fifteenth week will be an optional reading period, and then come away believing that somehow they have been short-changed--that this is not university policy, but something that has been exercised at the instructor's whim. I think publishing it in the calendar would make clear to the students and the Faculty that this is a legitimate option.

D. Onwood: I move to adjourn. Seconded.

R. Hawley: May I say something on a different topic?

M. Mansfield: You may rise to a point of personal privilege.

R. Hawley: Recently I read in the Fort Wayne newspaper about an attempted rape on campus. And, although I don't read *The Communicator* as close as I do some other periodicals, I have not seen any material on campus about this. I am very concerned that I didn't see something, which is my fault if something has been printed. Also, I teach at night and sometimes class is over after 10:30 p.m. Over 50 percent of the students here are women, and I was wondering if there is some mechanism of sharing such communication?

J. Lantz: Last week I sent an information piece to each faculty and staff member. I did mention that because it was the kind of thing I felt people on this campus ought to know. In fact, that letter spells out the kind of assistance which is available to students and faculty who need to be escorted to their cars. Our university police force is very willing to give that kind of service.

Motion to adjourn passed on a voice vote.

12. The meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara L. Blauvelt  
Secretary of the Faculty