

Minutes of the
Second Regular Meeting of the Fourth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
October 8, 1984

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of September 17 and 24, 1984
3. Acceptance of the agenda
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - J. Lantz
 - b. Indiana University - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. New business
7. The general good and welfare of the University
8. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

R. Adams, R. Barrett, D. Bialik, K. Bordens, J. Brennan, J. Bundschuh, J. Carnaghi, J. Chandler, F. Codispoti, V. Coufoudakis, M. Crill, J. Davis, A. Dirkes, R. Emery, N. Fincher, L. Fox, . Goebel, T. Guthrie, J. Haw, L. Hess, R. Hess, S. Hollander, W. Klemme, R. Kovara, J. Lantz, J. Lichti M. Lipman, C. Maile, D. Mauritzen, D. McAleece, D. McGee, J. Moore, E. Ni:cholson, M. Nusbaumer, J. Owen, R. Pippert, M. Richeson, W. Schlacks, S. Slack, J. Smulkstys, M. Souers J. Stauffer, J. Ulmer J. Violette, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

S. Beering, C. Butler, L. DeFonso, M. Downs, M. Kubik, M. Miller, R. Ramsey, J. Ryan, J. Sunderman, K. Wakley

Parliamentarian: D. Onwood

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser (assoc. fac.), F. Kenworthy, R. Shin, R. Svoboda

Visitors Present:

J. Dahl, G. Haynes, I. Patter, B. Worley, D. Worthley

Attachment:

["An Inquiry Into 'Giusti: The First Five Years'"](#) (Senate Document SD 84-6)

Acta

1. Call to order: E. Nicholson called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of September 17 and 24, 1984: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

V. Coufoudakis moved acceptance of the agenda. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. J. Lantz:

At the last Senate meeting we discussed proposed changes in the Purdue University Code. The Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs is going to recommend the wording "one faculty member from each school of Purdue University at Fort Wayne as approved by the Fort Wayne Senate." So if this is approved, we will come back with the document [SD 84-41 to the Senate. We discussed the role of the Inter-campus Faculty Council and feel it is simply a channel for communication rather than a deliberative or decision-making body and are, therefore, going to favor the inclusion of the North Central Campus.

The Committee on Institutional Affairs also made the nominations for Panel D and discussed the development of graduate programs on this campus. There will be more information about graduate programs for Purdue University faculty at a later date.

b. M. Downs was not present and therefore had no report.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

E. Nicholson:

The United Way Campaign is underway. I urge you to pledge early rather than later.

Let me give you some enrollment statistics as of the end of the first week of classes. Our total headcount was down 2.8%, and total credit hours were down 5.8%. President Ryan did announce a total decline for the system. Of the regional campuses, except for Indianapolis, we were probably down less on the IU side than other IU regional campuses. I have not seen the statistics for Purdue regional campuses, but, from what I have heard, we are down about the same that they are down.

I was not intending to include this in my report today, but after last night I think I'd better. The athletics office, as you know, sponsors a game between the Pistons and the Pacers as a fund-raiser for the athletics office. The game was to begin at 7:00 p.m., and shortly after 7:00 the NBA officials canceled the game. There was condensation on the

floor that had been forming since about noon, making the floor too slippery for the game to be started. It was very slippery. The teams hated to cancel the game and so did we, but I think it was the proper decision to make. After some hurried meetings among the officials of the box office, the teams, John Carnaghi and his staff, and the athletics staff and several others, we announced there would be a refund for those who purchased tickets. Refunds will begin Wednesday through the end of the month. We are covered by contracts and thank John Carnaghi and his staff for very fine contracts. We have fulfilled our obligations under the contracts. I don't have a complete financial picture, but I don't think we stand to lose more than \$2,000.

I attended the Indiana University Board of Trustees meeting this week: The HMO plan for the Fort Wayne campus was approved. Personnel will be providing information about HMO alternatives to Indiana University faculty and staff.

Dr. Giusti has asked me to read a letter to you, as follows:

"Please convey to the members of the Senate my thanks for the sentiment expressed in '[Resolution of Appreciation: Chancellor Joseph P. Giusti](#),' passed September 24, 1984. I am looking forward to the challenge that lies ahead with my involvement in the state's efforts to provide informed and effective testimony to Congress when it considers reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Senate's kindness elicits a renewal of my pledge to serve to the best of my ability. Joseph P. Giusti."

R. Hess: I understand that the major fund-raiser of the athletics office is the Pacers/Pistons game. Are there any contingency plans to make up that loss this year?

E. Nicholson: We are beginning to assess what impact this might have on fund-raising. We don't think it is going to have a dramatic effect on the funds available, but we really don't know.

J. Moore: What were the ticket sales for that game?

E. Nicholson: I believe ticket sales were close to 3500.

6. New business:

- a. J. Moore moved that K. Wakley be approved, for a one-year term, to fill the vacancy on the University Resources Policy Committee created by the resignation of W. Kolb. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

- b. M. Lipman moved the following resolution:

WHEREAS the publication "Giusti: The First Five Years" appears to be an official publication of IPFW; and

WHEREAS the production, publication and distribution of this booklet represent a considerable expenditure of university resources; and

WHEREAS this publication, appears devoted to personal aggrandizement rather than promotion of the university; and

WHEREAS the Faculty, through its Senate, has the responsibility to present its views concerning any matter pertaining to the welfare of the university;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Presiding Officer of this Senate obtain the following information, without prejudice, for dissemination to the Senate:

1. The source(s) of university funding for this publication;
2. An estimate of the publication's total cost to the university; and
3. The name(s) of the person(s) who authorized its production, publication, and distribution:

Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to delete the third WHEREAS clause.

Motion passed on a show of hands.

Motion passed, as amended, on a voice vote.

7. The general good and welfare of the University:

E. Nicholson: I would like to have John Carnaghi speak to the points in the Lipman resolution.

J. Carnaghi: Professor Lipman did come to me to request access to public documents. (1) The source of the funding was from our general fund, from the Community Relations budget. (2) The cost of printing the document was \$1365. There were also \$51.41 for mailing and \$69.00 for typesetting, for a total of \$1485. These are costs against the budget. They do not include cost for staff and whatever other items might be involved. (3) The name on the document as far as having actually made commitments against the budget for the publication was Rosemary Steiner's.

R. Barrett: Was there a work estimate for the amount of time people spent on this one document?

J. Carnaghi: Ms. Steiner estimated that about 50 people-hours from her office went into the project. This would not include the time associated with the Chancellor's involvement or Gabe DeLobbe's.

A. Dirkes: What was the extent of the distribution?

S. Hollander: The publication went to two of the three Intercom lists. The two lists include regular IPFW employees and about 1250 community names.

R. Adams: How was it decided that this would be the best form for distributing this kind of information?

E. Nicholson: I don't know.

E. Goebel: How many copies were printed?

E. Nicholson: I believe 2500.

J. Lantz: Because I am Speaker of the Faculty, faculty have come to me reporting that this document was received by people in our community virtually hours after the presidents spoke in Fort Wayne about the desperate need for funds to operate this campus. In addition to that, questions have been asked about how much more of our campus budget is being put into the work that has been assigned by the two presidents.

J. Carnaghi: An account is being established at IUPUI, paid for by, as I understand it, the Purdue Research Foundation and the Indiana University Foundation to support those activities. He is on our payroll now. The foundation-based account would be to cover the costs associated with his activities. And that is paid for jointly by the Purdue Research Foundation and the Indiana University Foundation.

J. Lantz: Are we to understand that that is the only money that comes out of our operating budget?

J. Carnaghi: No, the salary, the secretarial help, and the automobile.

R. Barrett: Where does the secretary work?

J. Carnaghi: She has space here in the Chancellor's secretarial area.

R. Hess: There are several people in Neff Hall and several departments affected by a grand shift of offices: all of philosophy, all of audiology and speech sciences, all of construction technology, all of consumer and family sciences, and several people from education. As I have tried to unravel this, as a faculty person who is not directly concerned, I found that the deans, in June, were talking about reallocation of space with the chairs. In August, the chairs suggested that some of the people might be moving, and in late August people were told they were moving. I checked with the University Resources Policy Committee to see if they had been consulted at all for faculty and staff input, and they said they hadn't been. Some people have been inconvenienced, to say the least. There is one person, for instance, who has been in an office for twelve years and who is moving next door. There is another person who had a private office, is engaged in extensive student counseling, and is now in a two-person office. He has

resigned from this Senate, I understand, because of the way in which the whole thing has been handled. The timing of it was such that people have been literally trying to do their daily work out of boxes. I think that this Senate ought to consider at some point what role the University Resources Policy Committee ought to play in such moves in the future. Certainly in the past it has had an active role.

E. Nicholson: Let me answer you. I don't think your chronology is correct, but there have been continuing problems with shared secretaries and the nearness of secretaries to the faculty they serve. I asked Dr. Dahl to look into the situation to see if he couldn't come up with a proposal that would try to solve some of those problems. He came up with several iterations of that same proposal as he discussed it with the administrative heads in charge of the divisions that were affected. We finally got a consensus that this was a better approach than the existing approach that we had. As you might imagine, getting that kind of consensus takes a lot of iterations of a proposal. Unfortunately I think that is what happened. I think we took too long in getting agreement and we got into the first of the semester. When we were nearing the first of the semester we thought it best not to put the plan into effect during the first week, but to move as quickly as possible after the beginning of classes. We also had to coordinate the moves with Physical Plant and to make telephone changes.

I must confess that the last item you mentioned, I had heard about. One faculty member, because of the change, thinks that his space is inappropriate. I didn't realize he had resigned from the Senate. Frankly, I didn't feel that that had anything to do with the other change that was made. This happened to be in education. Education had the opportunity to get an additional faculty member late in the year. They also had some additional problems with space because of the illness of the chair. I think that that is what has happened in that case. We have, as of this morning, temporarily resolved this problem. The office-space problem will not be resolved permanently. The desire to have single offices, and one person in single offices, or one person in the available double offices, is certainly something we should hope for. I think it is a vain hope, given the space situation that we have. . . As we expand our faculty, and as we change the distribution of faculty from department to department, I think we are going to have to reconsider the use of double-person offices and put two people back into some of the double-person offices. I don't see any other way out of it, frankly: The University Resources Policy Committee, four years ago, put forth a policy that is still in existence which determines the criteria by which one moves from single-person offices to double occupancy, or who ends up in double occupancy. As far as I know that will be followed.

R. Hess: I appreciate your comments. I think that that policy is an indication of the desire of the faculty and staff to be consulted in such matters.

There was a second surprise this fall. I was amazed, when I went into the faculty/staff lounge in Neff Hall to watch the Cubs in their first playoff game, to find the faculty/staff lounge had been halved by a wall for a new office. That didn't disturb me as much as the fact that the television half had been included in the half I couldn't get

into. The point is not just me, the point is also that the janitorial staff uses the faculty/staff lounge every night to have lunch or to have a break, and the point is that that committee is composed of faculty, students, and staff, and they ought to be consulted.

J. Lantz: I was called last week with a request that I change my spring schedule of classes because there were no classrooms for a class scheduled in the morning, for a class scheduled in the middle of the day, and for a class scheduled in the evening. Is the University Resources Policy Committee, is long-range planning, is anybody paying attention to the fact that we need to have classrooms to teach these students in?

E. Nicholson: Yes. I believe class scheduling is a perennial problem. The administration has been directed to jawbone on the problem in the sense that you and other faculty members want all courses in a very confined time-frame--the most convenient to them and the most convenient to you. I see nothing wrong with that if we had the space. But all of you seem to converge on the same time-frame instead of spreading it out more evenly through the day. At one time there are a lot of empty classrooms, and at other times we'll have more requests than we have classrooms available. We have to be constantly negotiating these things so that we distribute the available courses through appropriate time-frames, because if you move one class that might affect six or seven others. I really don't have much of a solution. If another committee would like to be formed, and that committee would like to take on the assignment of how to better allot the classes, I'd be very pleased to let them do it.

J. Lantz: I was fascinated that there was one class early in the morning, one in the middle of the day, and one late in the afternoon. We did distribute them across the time-frame. I wonder if you have ever looked at the students' schedules. I hear comments such as "You ought to teach classes in these low times because we have classrooms available." We have at various times offered classes when there are classrooms available, and there are no students available at that time. Have we ever looked at the flow of students on and off this campus as a part of this?

E. Nicholson: I think we have, and I would be happy to ask Dr. Dahl to give a report at the next Senate meeting. It is a problem, it has been addressed, but none of it has been addressed successfully.

J. Bundschuh: I sent a memo to all of the chairs last year about utilizing the entire day for scheduling, and I might point out one successful occurrence: Ken Stevenson rescheduled my 11:00 a.m. for 8:00 a.m.

J. Carnaghi: I feel like I owe an apology to Rosemary Steiner, or at least, a clarification on the Lipman resolution. I surely left the impression that, in item #3, she authorized production of the publication and distribution. All I can say is that if you look at the requisition order being placed, it has Ms. Steiner's name on it, as it would any of you who have authorization to spend money from your account. I may have done someone some

injustice. You need to ask Ms. Steiner who directed her, who authorized her to produce this publication for distribution. Public records show Rosemary's name for authorization.

S. Hollander: The information distributed recently from the library indicates that there is less money from the library endowment available this year for acquisitions than there was last year, and I wondered' why that was in view of the fact that the endowment should be growing even though interest rates may have come down the last year. Are we behind schedule in the collection of pledges, or has a change in philosophy about the growth of the endowment been made which reduced the amount allotted?

E. Nicholson: I am not certain of this, and that is a surprise to me. I don't think we made a distribution from this present endowment last year.

J. Carnaghi: I am speaking from memory, but we spent some \$49,000 last year which was the remaining funds from the fund drive of the '60's, which was not endowed. The authorization which the library now has, and they will be spending from the new funds, is some \$60,000. The Library Committee submits its request for funds to the two presidents, and it gets approved. To the best of my knowledge nothing was stricken from the request. We do project when they spend the money in the spring they will have ample funds: We have taken in \$483,000 as of the end of June. That is about half of the million dollars we expected. At this juncture, based on our projection, we're within a few thousand dollars in the collection process of where we thought we would be. We told the Indiana-Purdue Foundation members that, at this point, we could be so fortunate as to have a 2-3% default. That is far below the normal rate. Everything right now looks very positive. If more monies weren't requested, it is because that is the choice of the group that put the request together.

S. Hollander: The sheet I saw had a figure more like \$40,000.

J. Carnaghi: That may have been through June 30. Don Grose tells me he'll spend it in the spring. I think we told him that by then we will have \$60,000 plus, but I can't remember the figure he requested. Nothing can happen to those funds. They're endowed and are strictly for the library:

S. Hollander: Philosophically, do we keep the endowment at roughly a million dollars and make all of the earnings available on it, or do we plow some of them back to increase the size of the endowment?

J. Carnaghi: At this juncture, strictly the principal, not the earnings, is going to be endowed. I think that will be the philosophy unless we are earning \$100,000 and we are spending only \$50,000. Then we would want to reexamine our philosophy, and that would be with the Indiana-Purdue Foundation's consent. Right now the earnings are available to be spent at the Library. There has been no talk of changing that; there would be no reason to change that.

8. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt, Secretary