

Minutes of the
Second Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Fourth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
October 18, 2004
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 13, 2004
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – E. Blakemore
 - b. Indiana University – B. Fife
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 04-4) – J. Tankel
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 04-5) – J. Grant
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 04-2) – N. Younis
7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 04-2)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 04-3) – M. Codispoti
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 04-4) – J. Tankel
10. The general good and welfare of the University
Chancellor’s remarks – M. Wartell
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: G. Bullion

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen

Secretary: J. Petersen

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, R. Bean, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, W. Branson, J. Brennan,
M. Codispoti, S. Davis, P. Dragnev, C. Erickson, B. Fife, L. Fox, R. Friedman, J. Garrett,
P. Goodmann, J. Grant, T. Grove, S. Hannah, L. Hess, S. Isiorho, A. Karim, L. Lin,
G. Moss, G. Mourad, A. Mustafa, E. Neal, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Perez, D. Ross,
J. Tankel, S. Tannous, S. Troy, L. Wark, M. Wartell, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

D. Erbach, D. Goodman, P. Iadicola, L. Kuznar, Z. Liang, M. Lipman, N. McFarland,
L. Meyer, M. Montesino, R. Murray, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Toole, G. Volland

Attachments:

[“The Honors Program” \(supersedes SD 00-5\)](#) (SD 04-4)

[“Approval of replacement members of the Developmental Studies Subcommittee, General Education Subcommittee, and Graduate Subcommittee” \(SD 04-5\)](#)

[“Revised Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Business and Management Sciences \(amends SD 95-4\)” \(SD 04-2\)](#)

[“Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Business and Management Sciences” \(SD 95-4\)](#)

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, S. Sarratore

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, K. Kilbane, P. McLaughlin, K. Stockman

Acta

1. Call to order: G. Bullion called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of September 13, 2004: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Grant moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University:

E. Blakemore: You may recall last year that we decided to send a representative to the Purdue University Senate in West Lafayette. Those of us who voted in that election elected Frank Paladino, from the Biology Department, to represent us. I have been in contact with Professor Paladino. He has already attended one meeting of the Purdue University Senate that he thought was just an organizational meeting. He said the major issues focused on at that meeting were things like new buildings at Purdue, etc. However, the health benefits package was on the agenda of the first meeting and was tabled and will be discussed in the future. He does intend to be attending the meetings regularly. If the time comes when he has significant input to give to us about those meetings, we will ask that he be given speaking privileges to address the body. I will keep in touch with him throughout the course of the year.

There is a body called the Purdue University Intercampus Faculty Council. Last year I attended that meeting in the fall with David Erbach who is the other representative. We have not yet heard whether that body will be meeting this year, so I have nothing to report about that.

For the past few years there has been a regular meeting of the faculty leaders, which for this year are Brian Fife, George Bullion, and me. We meet once a month with Chancellor Wartell and Vice Chancellor Hannah to talk informally about issues related to the campus community. If there is anything anybody would like us to talk about that impacts faculty issues on campus, please let either Brian, George, or me know about your issues so that we can have that informal discussion. Last year one of the things we did talk about was the closing of campus with respect to weather delays. We had some spirited discussions

about that which led to a memo that came out on campus around February from Vice Chancellor Branson.

b. Indiana University:

B. Fife: As celebrations that focus on the 40 years of IPFW's existence continue, another issue logically presents itself. That issue is: "What is the future of our university?" An essential starting point in any enlightened discourse on the subject is the existing management agreement between the trustees of Purdue University and Indiana University. I encourage all members of our diverse community to read it. It is in effect until June 30, 2008 unless terminated mutually by Indiana University and Purdue University before that date and is available at www.ipfw.edu/senate.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion: There was no report.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 04-4) – J. Tangel:

J. Tangel moved to approve SD 04-4 (The Honors Program). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 04-4 passed on a voice vote.

b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 04-5) – J. Grant:

J. Grant moved to approve SD 04-5 (Approval of replacement members of the Developmental Studies Subcommittee, General Education Subcommittee, and Graduate Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 04-5 passed on a voice vote.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 04-2) – N. Younis:

N. Younis moved to approve SD 04-2 (Revised Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Business and Management Sciences [amends SD 95-4]). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 04-2 passed on a voice vote.

7. Question Time:

1. **What percent of total faculty increment money was withheld for special equity awards?**
2. **What percent of increment monies was withheld for merit awards?**
3. **What was the total number of faculty receiving each type of award?**
4. **What was the maximum award given in each of the above categories?**

S. Hannah (Questions 1 and 2): In total, \$175,088 (or 1 percent of the faculty salary base) was distributed for merit or equity. The other 2 percent on the total 3 percent increment increase was allocated by departments and schools according to their own criteria and procedures, as in the past.

The deans recommended faculty for exceptional merit or for equity in rank order. Equity awards went to those with strong performance records whose salaries were at least 15

percent below the national averages for their rank and discipline. Approximately 71 percent of the funding went for merit and 29 percent went for equity. This compares to a roughly 50-50 split in the last couple of years and reflects the fact that we are making progress, never fast enough, against our equity goals.

(Question 3): There were 68 faculty who received merit awards and 21 faculty who received equity awards, for a total of 89 faculty.

(Question 4): The maximum merit award was \$3,000. The maximum equity award was \$4,000.

If you have any specific questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

S. Davis: Where do these special equity funds come from?

S. Hannah: They come from the general fund. It is part of the 3 percent total increment for salaries, which is divided into 2 percent (given to schools and departments to allocate) and 1 percent (held centrally to respond to merit and equity awards). The percentages have been consistent for the last three or four years. So, it is all general funds.

S. Davis: So even the special equity awards?

S. Hannah: Yes, there is a 3 percent total increment pool. One percent is held back centrally. The other 2 percent is distributed. Each dean gets 2 percent of their faculty salary base which they then award according to their own criteria.

S. Davis: Are these one-time awards?

S. Hannah: No, these are recurring salary increments.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 04-3) – M. Codispoti:

M. Codispoti presented SR No. 04-3 (Proposal for a Minor in Religious Studies) for information only.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SR No. 04-4) – J. Tankel:

J. Tankel presented SR No. 04-4 (Status of SD 03-21, IPFW Diversity Component for All Baccalaureate Degree Programs) for information only. (Handout of SD 88-33)

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Nusbaumer: Given Elaine's invitation, I would like for the leadership committee to consider the possibility of building into the regular Senate activities a beginning fall report

of increment practices for the past year. I think it is a good, healthy practice for everybody, and if there is a way we can institute that, it would be nice.

My second concern is this: I am concerned about what I feel is a declining respect for the opinion of others on campus. I have had numerous colleagues who have had things on their doors defaced and ripped off. We have also had departmentally sponsored posters removed and/or destroyed. It is my reading of both the Indiana and Purdue Faculty Codes of Ethics that this is inappropriate behavior. It is my understanding of the Student Code of Conduct that this is unacceptable behavior. I think it is crucial for this university, as for all universities, to respect free and open speech, and anything that can be done to further that free expression would be greatly appreciated.

E. Blakemore: About a month ago, department chairs were asked to make recommendations for one-time bonus awards through a policy put in place by the Purdue University Board of Trustees. I would like to have information about when we will hear when those awards are being made. I think that is a question for the chancellor.

M. Wartell: At this point the recommendations have gone to West Lafayette, and as soon as we hear, you will hear. I do not have a quick answer for that.

E. Blakemore: That is a satisfactory answer to me in the sense that at least we know what is going on.

C. Erickson: Are these bonuses just for Purdue faculty?

M. Wartell: No, all faculty are eligible.

G. Bullion: How many of you are unfamiliar with the topic which is being discussed?

M. Wartell: I imagine many are, and I will talk about it when I speak later in the meeting.

M. Wartell: The 5th Annual IPFW Alumni Legislative Issues Luncheon will occur on October 26, in the Walb Ballroom. About eight of our local legislators will be there. That is a very important meeting. Students can tell them how they feel about our priorities; faculty, also, are welcome. Please think about coming because your input to our legislators is very important.

The legislative priorities for next year include three items:

- 1) Ensuring that our enrollment-change funding comes through. Last year, you may remember, we received only 90 percent of the formula funding that we would have gotten had the formula been applied totally. That was good because we were threatened with only 50 percent at one point.

2) Appropriation for the Student Services Building which will connect Gates Center to Walb Union to Helmke Library. We would possibly move the bookstore into that area and create a great deal of collaborative learning space and an indoor track.

3) Repair and Rehabilitation funding which has not been funded recently. We need full Repair and Rehabilitation funding if we are to keep the campus in the condition that it is in now.

The issue of equity is always on our minds. We will continue to talk to our legislators about our inequitable funding with respect to other campuses – the per capita funding. We remain, as far as I know, 14th out of 14, although Jack Dahl does not have the newest data yet. It will be forthcoming relatively soon. That is not one of our legislative priorities. It is, however, something that is always on the minds of our legislators, and we always point it out as we talk to them.

With respect to non-recurring salary increments, we were given the opportunity through a Purdue Board of Trustees policy to allocate up to 1 percent of our total budget for one-time increments for faculty and staff. One percent of the total budget is about \$400,000 to \$450,000. We could not afford to allocate the full 1 percent. We allocated \$200,000. We were very careful to ensure that the distribution of those funds, on a salary-percentage basis, was equal over faculty, administrative staff, and clerical and service staff. The recommendations came from department chairs and deans, also from directors and the clerical and service areas. The awards that we recommended were in increments of \$1,000, \$2,000, or \$3,000. Those recommendations have been sent to West Lafayette, and we are awaiting their response. We understand that differing amounts were allocated at other campuses. Individual schools at West Lafayette did their own allocations of funds. I do not know exactly what they did.

M. Nusbaumer: Is this new money or were you simply given a right to take it out of “old” money?

M. Wartell: This is one-time money – it is non-recurring money. It is not built into the base.

M. Nusbaumer: So, it is just a one-time increment – it is not added to the base. Can you give us some insight in terms of whether this is likely to be a continuing policy?

M. Wartell: The policy will continue. The policy is a Purdue Board of Trustees policy. Of course, realize that Purdue is our fiscal agent, so that policy applies to all of us.

B. Fife: As I understand it, with regard to Question Time, one-third of the 3 percent was taken centrally.

M. Wartell: Yes, that is a totally separate pot of money. This \$200,000 is completely separate. The 3 percent is recurring funding that is always built into the rest of the campus. The \$200,000 is non-recurring.

B. Fife: Is the one-third that was centrally set aside for merit and equity consistent with what has been done in the past?

M. Wartell: Yes, it is exactly the same as what has been in the past. Just for your information, the acronym for this is EMME (Exceptional Merit and Market Equity).

E. Blakemore: Department chairs were given specific criteria to consider in recommending people. I wonder if there might be a brief remark by you or Susan Hannah on the specific criteria.

S. Hannah: The criteria that we asked department chairs and deans to follow in Academic Affairs were that we were looking truly for one-time bonuses for project-based achievements. We were looking for a way to separate it from promotion and tenure criteria, which are used for the annual merit process.

We were looking for projects that were one-time, project-based, and above and beyond the call of duty. These would be exceptional achievements that were accomplished during the last fiscal year. In most cases, the department chairs were asked if they had anybody who fit that category. Some examples might be the following:

- 1) People who had worked on developing a new degree program
- 2) People who had written and brought in an exceptionally large grant
- 3) People who had worked on an accreditation process
- 4) People who developed an extraordinary program such as the Freshman Year Experience program

Those were the kinds of one-time bonuses that we were looking for. There were quite a few faculty, administrative, and clerical and service staff who were recommended. Often people would recommend a whole team; for example, CAPP (Curriculum, Advising, and Program Planning). Faculty, clerical staff, and administrators worked on that project to work with Banner's program. So, often there were whole teams that were recommended for achievement.

C. Erickson: Are those groups of people recommended automatically put in a pool and then you choose from them, or do they go ahead and get the bonuses if West Lafayette deems it so?

M. Wartell: To date, West Lafayette has made no subjective judgment about the list that we provide. In fact, I cannot think of any situation where our recommendations are not accepted, especially on salary. This came up very quickly, by the way. I cannot say that we would do it exactly the same way next time, but we will have more time to think about and gather input before the next time.

S. Hannah: We will appreciate some input.

S. Davis: What about the technology fund? How is that going to be made up?

M. Wartell: We basically make that up out of the general fund pot. We are very careful to make sure that we are replacing computers, for example. At the beginning of this fall, we managed to make a significant (\$300,000) fund available to Academic Affairs for distribution.

S. Davis: Is that on the legislators' plate at all?

M. Wartell: Our appropriation request did not include technology specifically.

S. Troy: Does a department pay for new technology or upgrading of computers, or does the university, on some other level, pay for that?

M. Wartell: It comes from both sources. For some departments, more comes from central funds than from departmental funds.

R. Friedman: With respect to the student housing, what is the maximum percent population of the student body that can live in student housing?

M. Wartell: There is a policy promulgated by the Indiana Commission of Higher Education that said 10 percent of our student body could live in housing. It is going to be interesting to see how that will change over the years. Realize that we have 11,800 students. We have a 568 occupancy capability. We are nowhere near that percentage.

S Troy: If we want to do some kind of group activity with our class, may we use the common areas of the student housing, or do we need to rent them?

W. Branson: You can schedule it through the housing people over there.

S. Troy: Would they charge us money for that?

W. Branson: No, not for an academic activity.

E Blakemore: I know we had a memo on this earlier, but can someone enlighten us about what is going on with respect to the search for a replacement Affirmative Action Officer?

M. Wartell: We have many applicants. We have narrowed the list down to about 13. That will in turn be narrowed down to three or four who, we are hopeful, we will be bringing to campus within the next couple of weeks. Everybody will get a chance to talk with them.

E. Blakemore: Who is the search committee?

M. Wartell: Personnel did the first screening, then the vice chancellors and the head of personnel were next. That was just to cut them down to a reasonable number of candidates who fit the criteria.

E. Blakemore: So, the search committee is the vice chancellors and Jim Ferguson.

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

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty