

Minutes of the
Third Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Second Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
November 11 and 18, 2002
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 21, 28, and November 4, 2002
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – P. Hamburger
 - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – R. Sedlmeyer
6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (SR No. 02-14)
7. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Executive Committee (SD 02-5) – J. Grant
 - b. Student Affairs Committee (SD 02-6) – L. Fox
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
Executive Committee (SR No. 02-15)
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: R. Sedlmeyer
Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed
Sergeant-at-Arms: D. Marshall (absent)
Secretary: J. Petersen

Attachments:

- “[Amendment to the Constitution: Definition of Voting Faculty,](#)” as amended. (SD 02-5)
“[Proposed Amendments to SD 89-28](#) (IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct)” (SD 02-6)
“[IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.](#)” (SD 89-28, as amended)

Session 1
November 11

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, R. Barrett, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, M. Bookout, W. Branson, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, C. Carlson, C. Chauhan, S. Choi, M. Codispoti, C. Erickson, R. Friedman, J. Grant, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Johnson Hartman, L. Hite, P. Iadicola, A. Karim, M. Kimble, L. Kuznar, L. Lin, M. Lipman, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, J. Purse-Wiedenhoeft, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, K. Squadrito, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

J. Brennan, L. Fox, J. Hrehov, S. Isiorho, J. Knight, D. Marshall, A. Mustafa, E. Neal, B. Parke, A. Perez, W. Unsell, M. Wartell

Faculty Members Present: L. DeFonso, C. Sternberger

Visitors Present: S. Alderman, J. Dahl, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Sedlmeyer called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 21, 28, and November 4, 2002: 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:

P. Hamburger: At our October 21 meeting, I raised the question about the Purdue health-benefits package to the administration and to President Jischke. Our administration explained to him that even though it looks on paper that the packages at other regional campuses of Purdue University are better, in fact, ours is much better than theirs. The reason for this is not because of our great administration, but because the market at Fort Wayne is better than anywhere else in the state, and better than in Indianapolis. Actually, the packages in Calumet or West Lafayette are really bad because they do not have choices. The other thing they told me is that we are absolutely autonomous and we can do whatever we want in Fort Wayne. They decided to not have an HMO in Fort Wayne because the Fort Wayne HMOs ask too much from us. They want us to guarantee at least

50 members in order to give us a reasonable package. They promised to me that this year they will go out and try to find whether there is any other HMO that will give us a better rate. The PPO is very good.

The other question I raised with the president is that it looks like we are subsidizing other campuses because the deductions and premiums are the same for the same packages. In fact, because the market is so good in Fort Wayne, we are paying less. So the university pays less for the service that they would pay. I raised this question and the president was very open and said he would investigate the situation. I told him the campuses are different so they should not have the same premium and the same deduction. If the market is better here, then they should give us the benefit.

On Friday Linda Hite and I went to a meeting of the Intercampus Faculty Council. Prior to the meeting, at the request of Jack Dahl, I raised the question about the plus/minus system. We are going to move to the plus and minus system at some point. The answer that I got from the Registrar and from the University Council is that they do not have any idea when this will happen. It will definitely not be next year as planned. They expect that the West Lafayette leadership will make a final decision in January whether they are going to buy a new system. We were informed that the system that we are using is from 1968. When they tried to change it a little bit, it took them about 800 working hours to change it. They are still planning to change it, but there is no deadline set. They asked us to be patient.

Another issue which I raised with the Intercampus Faculty Council came from the Department of Computer Science. That department informed me that they were informed recently that they cannot accept foreign students into their graduate program. It turns out this is not university policy; it is only one person who wants to push that. This person tried to put this on Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, but failed. Because Indiana University Purdue-University Indianapolis challenged this policy, the person tried to tell the regional campuses that our mission is to serve only our area, not **primarily** our area. So I will talk to the leadership in Computer Science Department, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellor and, with their help, they can probably clear when we can accept graduate foreign students. . .

R. Barrett: I have a point of clarification. That did not come from the Department of Computer Science and it has not been discussed in the department at all. I am the acting chair of the department. I can verify that.

K. Squadrito: I think Purdue health benefits are just really shameful. You get better health-benefit policies working at Meijer. I would like to know when we are going to get dental insurance because you can certainly get it there and almost anywhere else you work in this city. As a big university we surely can have some dental insurance or at least some flex pay, which I used to use, which we do not have now. It is even more shameful. We do not have that \$300 flex pay unless we pay into it. I would like you to see when we can get some dental insurance.

P. Hamburger: I can answer this. Unfortunately, I know much more than I wanted to know about health benefits. Walt Branson and Jim Ferguson gave me a 1 ½ hour-long information session. I disagree with you. We have very good benefits. If you compare the Purdue benefits with Indiana University benefits, which includes dental insurance, it is not really great. Then you will see that you have to trade between some benefits and other benefits. The Indiana University benefits pays (and I don't want to be wrong so, Walt, please correct my numbers,) 10.9% to TIAA/CREF. Purdue pays 14.7%. That is a big difference. So, if you change that and you compound it over the years for not-so-good dental benefits, then you will lose on the Purdue side. The PPO benefit is much better than the previous 800, 500 or 300 benefits that we had before – especially if you use the network system. Almost every doctor or every lab in Fort Wayne is in the network system. It is really hard to find someone not in the network system. Now you will not pay lab work and many other things. The expense of health care is growing everywhere, not just at Purdue. Purdue increased the benefits that the university pays by \$10 million this year. They know that they cut some of the benefits like artificial insemination because it is so expensive. So they had to look at the balance and decide whether to increase premiums, increase deductions much more, or just try to make a balance. This is a judgment call. Everybody says that this is more expensive. We have good benefits here, but they could be better. If you want to socialize, it will be worse. You have to pay for that. That is my opinion.

K. Squadrito: Why do you compare Purdue University to Indiana University? I was comparing Purdue University to Meijer. I could work part-time there and get better benefits.

P. Hamburger: I have a very short response. I am the speaker for Purdue University, and I am working in an academic setting. Maybe there are hundreds of different companies that even I do not know about. I am not willing to spend my time looking into other places than other academic institutions in Indiana. That is too much. It takes from my teaching and from my research. I am willing to do this much. I am not willing to look into any other companies.

b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: If you have missed the news, current Chancellor Bepko will be the interim president of Indiana University when Myles Brand leaves January 1. He will serve until a permanent replacement has been selected. We have one regional campus representative on the search committee. That person is Chris Bjornson from Indiana University-Southeast. He asked for my input. If you have any comments, let me know and I will be glad to forward those to him.

Also, it appears as though the search committee is planning to visit with the faculty at each campus so that we can express our concerns and have input into the hiring process.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

R. Sedlmeyer displayed on the screen a tombstone and the following inscription: “No greater love has a man than to lay down his life for a friend. Beneath this stone rests a soldier of Washington’s army who died to give you liberty.” I am sure you are all aware that today is Veteran’s Day, and I would encourage each faculty member to take some time today to reflect upon the sacrifices of many of the soldiers -- men and women -- who have defended this country and who have given the ultimate sacrifice of their lives so that our liberty might be preserved. This has a special impact on me this year. Many of you might be aware that there has been a call up of reservists and National Guard members. I am sure there might have been students in your classes who said they had to drop all of their classes because they have been called up. Well, it turns out that my daughter’s brand-new husband was called up, and he is leaving this morning for Camp Atterbury. From there he will go to Fort Knox, and they said they were going to issue light-colored fatigues. I would anticipate he will be in the desert somewhere in about six months. So I would just like to encourage you, because my daughter is also attending class here along with many other students in your classrooms who may have spouses or other loved ones who have been called up, to extend to them compassion, sympathy, and encouragement as they might need it.

6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 02-14):

P. Hamburger read the memorial resolution for Jack D. Cook. A moment of silence was observed.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Executive Committee (SD 02-5) – J. Grant:

J. Grant moved to approve SD 02-5 (Amendment to the Constitution: Definition of Voting Faculty).

S. Hannah moved to suspend the rules and grant speaking privileges to Carol Sternberger. Seconded.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

R. Barrett moved to refer SD 02-5 to the Faculty Affairs Committee for their review and further input. Seconded.

Motion to refer SD 02-5 to the Faculty Affairs Committee failed on a voice vote.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 until November 18.

Session II
November 18

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, R. Barrett, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, M. Bookout, W. Branson, J. Brennan, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, C. Carlson, C. Chauhan, S. Choi, C. Erickson, L. Fox, R. Friedman, J. Grant, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Johnson Hartman, L. Hite, J. Hrehov, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, M. Kimble, L. Kuznar, M. Lipman, A. Mustafa, E. Neal, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, B. Parke, A. Perez, J. Purse-Wiedenhoef, D. Ross, H. Samavati, K. Squadrito, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, N. Younis, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

M. Codispoti, A. Karim, J. Knight, L. Lin, D. Marshall, G. Schmelzle, W. Unsell

Faculty Members Present:

J. Clausen, E. Foley, L. Graham, J. Jones, N. Mann, K. O'Connell, S. Sarratore, C. Sternberger

Visitors Present: S. Alderman

Acta

R. Sedlmeyer reconvened the meeting at 12:03 p.m. on November 18, 2002

SD 02-5 was on the floor from the previous session. R. Sedlmeyer asked for permission to suspend the rules to allow M. Wartell to speak on the budget recommendations from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

P. Hamburger moved to suspend the rules. Seconded.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

M. Wartell: You are all aware of the budget process in the state, but let me remind you of it. A proposal is made by IPFW as part of the Purdue University budget for the next biennial budget. This will be a long session in the legislature. It will be a very long session! The budget then goes to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education which makes a recommendation. That recommendation has just come out. The budget then goes to the state budget committee, to the legislature, to conference committee, and then, finally, a budget is passed or not passed. The news from the Indiana Commission is really quite positive for us. There are three fundamental parts of our request.

1. Enrollment Change Money. Enrollment change results from use of a formula which takes into account our increases in enrollment, and they use that for our budget. The good news is that they are funding enrollment change this year. We were worried about that because of the state budget condition right now. We asked originally for \$3,342,500. They actually recommended \$2,818,200 for us. That is a slight decrease. It is because they have reduced the amount of money that they are granting for each new FTE student. And, actually, they are also spreading it over two years in order to make the budget work out on a state level. They are trying to make it easier on the expense side. A \$2,800,000 increase is not a bad increase for us. We would have liked the extra \$500,000. We will talk about that with our legislators and will try to get that part

restored. I do not hold out much hope for it. The irritating aspect of it is that the minute we are in line to get a real chunk of money out of enrollment change, suddenly the whole thing gets reduced.

2. **Quality Improvement:** You may remember that our request consisted of a request for research funds, the first two years of which would be used in conjunction with the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center. That was for \$600,000 in the first year, and another \$600,000 in the second year, for a total increase of \$1,200,000. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education recommended \$500,000 in the first year and \$500,000 in the second year, for a total increase of \$1,000,000. We are the only regional campus that got any quality-improvement money recommended. And not all the main campuses got quality-improvement money recommended. So we did very well in that regard, and it amounts to \$1,000,000. After the first two years we would get that money for research and attempt to support research in general. And we will try to continue to support faculty members who want to work with the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center as well as other projects.
3. **Music Building/Performing Arts Building:** The Music/Performing Arts Building was not recommended. Only a total of eight projects were recommended. That is something we have to solicit the support of our own legislative delegation anyway. Whether any individual capital project is in the budget or out of the budget by the end of the session is really the result of individual delegation interaction. So it really is at an interim point in the whole budget process. The good news is the enrollment change money and the quality-improvement money. The not-so-good news, but not-really-bad news, is the music building.

One other point that I would make to you is that they also recommended a base restoration, as they called it. You may remember they cut us last year. The base restoration is \$803,084. That would be put in the base; no longer will we have the technology funded, for example, but a good deal of that came back in the base of our budget. Actually, that is very good news for us, especially compared with other institutions. We are not where we would like to be yet. We will work on it.

D. Oberstar: Is that \$800,000 that is going to be part of our recurring budget money that we can dig into for technology?

M. Wartell: Or anything else. It makes it more flexible for us. There were a lot of individual accountability rules that they placed on the technology budget. Now it is just put into our base.

M. Nusbaumer: How has the enrollment-change formula been changed?

M. Wartell: Here is an example: If the formula were used as it stood, we would get \$3500 per student. Now we are getting something less than that. Actually it is two different numbers. In the end the total is \$3,300.

M. Nusbaumer: But that kind of reduction applies to the other campuses as well?

M. Wartell: Yes. I think that, if I remember the numbers correctly, the absolute amount of money coming to us will be larger than any other campus because we had such a large increase in students. By the way, for those of you who do not happen to get the weekly enrollment numbers, for spring we are up 9.8 percent. That is where we should be for next spring because we were up 8 percent in the fall.

R. Sedlmeyer: If the legislature fully funds all requests from all campuses, will our situation improve with respect to funding per student?

M. Wartell: No. Our situation will improve with respect to funding per student with the quality improvement money. Excuse me, I answered that question incorrectly because I forgot about the quality improvement money, and that was not recommended across the board. The quality improvement money will increase our per-student funding relative to other campuses. But realize we have not actually calculated the numbers for this year because we do not have final numbers but, with the increase in enrollment that we had this year, we have probably dropped to 14th out of 14 in terms of per-capita support. That million dollars may raise us to 13th again. We are still not where we should be, obviously. Remind your legislators about it.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

- a. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 02-5) – J. Grant:

P. Hamburger moved to amend the amendment to the Constitution as follows:

(1) Add the following paragraphs to the preamble:

WHEREAS, the following document:

Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers (C-48)
Purdue University
Office of the President
Executive Memorandum No. C-48
February 1, 1999

was approved by the Board of Trustees of Purdue University,

and, WHEREAS, this document states:

Any deviation by the regional campuses from the provisions of this Executive Memorandum or the Lecturer policy as approved by the Board of Trustees on September 4, 1998, require approval of the President or his/her designee.

and, WHEREAS, this document further states:

II. Definition of Terms
Lecturer – A classification of University staff consisting of Continuing Lecturers and Limited-Term Lecturers, as defined below.

III. Nature of Appointment

Lecturers are a separate staff classification at the University. They do not have faculty voting privileges, nor are they eligible for tenure or sabbatical leave.

and, WHEREAS, the following document, University Guidelines for Clinical Faculty within Purdue University, was approved by the Board of Trustees of Purdue University in May, 1994

and, WHEREAS, this document states “Non-tenured clinical faculty shall...be considered members of the University faculty and be given full voting rights as instructional faculty ...”

and, WHEREAS, academic freedom is the cornerstone of higher education, and faculty without tenure are not protected against infringement of academic freedom,

(2) Substitute the words “Are tenured or hold tenure-track appointments” for the words “Hold appointments” in Paragraph I.C.1.

(3) Substitute the words “Are tenured or hold tenure-track appointments” for the words “Hold appointments” in Paragraph I.C.2.

(4) Substitute the words “Hold the rank of Assistant, Associate, or Full Clinical Professor” for Paragraph I.C.3.

(5) Strike the word “clinical” from Paragraph I.D.

Seconded.

R. Barrett moved to limit the discussion. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

R. Sedlmeyer called for a motion to approve the amendment to the amendment to the Constitution. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 02-5, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

b. Student Affairs Committee (SD 02-6) – L. Fox:

L. Fox moved to approve SD 02-6 (Proposed Amendments to SD 89-28 [IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct]). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

8. New business:

There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only” - Executive Committee (SR No. 02-15) – J. Grant:

SR No. 02-15 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) was presented for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Nusbaumer: Sue Talbot will be here December 2, 11-12:30 p.m., the place to be announced. She is an Indiana University Board of Trustees member on the 8th presidential search committee. They want Indiana University faculty input on the direction of Indiana University, not only for the presidency but the university. I encourage all Indiana University faculty to attend.

P. Hamburger: I encourage all of you to participate in homecoming week. I will be there in a toga tomorrow. Picture taking is free. Everything is free, except for basketball. If you participate and dress up in a toga, you will get free pizza.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Jacqui Petersen
Secretary of the Senate