

Minutes of the
Third Regular Meeting of the Eleventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
November 11, 1991
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 14, 1991
3. Acceptance of the agenda - W. Unsell
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Rules Committee SD 91-3 - S. Hollander
 - b. Rules Committee (SD 91-4) - S. Hollander
7. Question time (SR No. 91-10)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 Agenda Committee (SR No. 91-11) - W. Unsell
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: S. Harroff

Senate Members Present:

F. Borelli, E. Blumenthal, J. Brennan, A. Chatterjea, J. Clausen, P. Conn, D. Cox, S. Dhawale, M. A. Dirkes, M. Downs, J. Dunlap, J. Eichenauer, A. Finco, E. Foley, J. Haw, R. Hill, S. Hollander, R. Jeske, F. Kirchhoff, D. Kruse, J. Lantz, D. I-egg, D. Linn, M. Mansfield, D. McCants, L. Meyer, J. Meyers, R. Miers, D. Oberstar, J. Owen, R. Pacer, G. A. Pugh, R. Ramsey, A. Rassuli, R. Ritchie, S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, J. Sunderman, J. Switzer, W. Unsell, E. Waters

Senate Members Absent:

J. Chandler, R. Hawley, N. Kelley, J. Klotz, P. Lin, A. Shupe, W. Walker

Representative from Medical Education: D. Bell

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser

Visitors Present: K. Beery, J. Dahl, K. Frazier-Henry, N. Newell, J. Scher, R. Steiner

Attachments

"Amendment to the Bylaws of the Senate (SD 81-10)--Membership on the Academic Appeals Subcommittee" (SD 91-3)

"Amendment to the Bylaws of the Senate (SD 81-10)--Membership on the University Resources Policy Committee" (SD 91-4)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 14, 1991: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

W. Unsell moved to accept the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

M. Downs: First I wanted to call everyone's attention to the fact that a review is being undertaken of President Ehrlich's performance. Faculty can still send letters to the Presidential Review Committee regarding his performance. Letters should be sent to the IU Board of Trustees Office. I believe it would also be possible, since this campus is represented on the evaluation committee by the faculty secretary, Barbara Blauvelt, to give any formal or informal evaluations you have of President Ehrlich's performance to her.

After the last meeting Steve Hollander called to my attention the fact that a good deal of change of an unfortunate kind is being made in premiums that Indiana University faculty will be paying for their health insurance. He thought I ought to call that to everybody's attention so it wouldn't be a particularly unpleasant surprise. But during his meeting with the faculty here last week, President Ehrlich, in response to an inquiry, said that the increase in premiums for IU faculty will be paid this year by Indiana University in keeping with the increment -decision made by Purdue University regarding IU faculty. So, yes, the premiums are going up--that's the bad news; the good news is that they will be paid by the university and not by the faculty.

- b. Purdue University:

A. Finco: Pat Collins and I have met with the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to discuss the report of the Purdue University TIAA-CREF Retirement Task

Force that was sent to President Beering and the President's letter of response. It is our hope that the FAC will review the report and the letter of response and send their reactions to President Beering.

I have asked the Educational Policy Committee to discuss and react to a draft of the IPFW Vision 21 proposal.

The Committee on Institutional Affairs has forwarded to the Chancellor a letter of support for a candidate for an honorary doctorate from Purdue University.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

W. Frederick: President Beering will be here for a faculty convocation on December 10 from 3:30-4:30 p.m. in Walb 224-226-228. He will be, at that time, responding to questions from the Faculty. I urge you all to attend.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Rules Committee (Senate Document SD 91-3) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 91-3 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Senate [SD 81-10]--Membership on the Academic Appeals Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Rules Committee (Senate Document SD 91-4) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 91-4 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Senate [SD 81-10]--Membership on the University Resources Policy Committee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 91-10):

a. *Please describe the roles of administrators, IPFW deans through the two presidents, in the process determining IPFW faculty salaries for the 1991-1992 and 1992-1993 academic years.*

School of Education

Lantz: First of all, for 1991-92 we had discussions about budgetary items with the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee. If you will remember, at the very beginning of last year we had put forward a lot of ideas that had to do with budgeting.... We had talked about enrollment change money; we had talked about inflation and unavoids; and we had talked about quality improvements. We had discussions with the executive staff--and each vice chancellor discussed with his staff (I assume

that deans and directors and chairs and so forth were informed) as it went out to all those concerned. We sent forward, then, from all the discussions, several budget scenarios looking at how much we would get from the state. The highest level budget scenario we sent forward factored in 6% for faculty/staff raises to 0⁰/0. In fact, on two different occasions we even put in alternate kinds of things: if "x" then "y" kinds of things. We sent these forward, of course, to West Lafayette because they are the fiscal agent. During the course of the year--in conversations with the chancellors from the regional campuses at IU and at various times with President Ehrlich--we do discuss salary issues and so forth. All of those times I was forthright about what we were doing. I also note that President Beering and President Ehrlich discussed the salary policies at IPFW. You are aware that each IU campus last year was permitted to do something that was not tied to the other IU campuses.

In 1992-93 we have already started our discussions. Dick Ritchie and I met with the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee. We have also started discussions in executive staff. I am sure the executive staff already discussed this with their respective staffs. On the 4th of December, Dick Ritchie and I will go to a system-wide meeting to have a discussion of budget parameters. That meeting will be with the chancellors and financial affairs vice chancellors from Calumet, North Central, Fort Wayne, and the president and executive vice president for financial affairs at West Lafayette. Every year we build the budgets in exactly the same way. When we know how much money we have and the policy is established, we separate out the amounts and give them to vice chancellors, who in turn make decisions about sending the budget on to deans, directors and so forth.

b. *We understand that Purdue University faculty are paid for summer classes based on next year's salary, while Indiana University faculty are paid based on last year's. When will this inequity be corrected?*

School of Education

J. Lantz: That is not quite true. Let me explain it to you. Purdue faculty are paid for Summer School II based on the upcoming year salary. IU's are not paid on that, and I will address the inequities or the corrections in total if you will read question three so that I can respond to that as well.

c. *When will the discrepancy end between Purdue University and Indiana University faculty concerning TIAA/CREF contributions determined for summer employment?*

School of Education

J. Lantz: Purdue University faculty are paid TIAA/CREF on their summer salaries, and Indiana University faculty are not paid TIAA/CREF on their summer salaries. One other discrepancy that you may not be aware of is that faculty members who were hired after January 1, 1989 are paid on a different TIAA/CREF schedule. The Purdue and IU people who were hired before that -

were paid a percentage and the number varies. It is \$7800 or \$9900. For IU it is a percentage of \$7800 and then 15% of everything over and above. For Purdue it is 11% of \$9900 and then 15% after that. The IU employees who came after January 1, 1989, are paid a flat 12% TIAA/CREF on their salaries. I, and John Carnaghi and people in personnel, became very concerned about these discrepancies because it does not appear to be exactly fair. We listed all of the differences including the IU faculty who were hired to 1/1/1989 and the 18/20 which is a program that allows you to retire early. We put these all together. I have discussed these concerns with Speaker Downs; I have discussed them with people in West Lafayette and Bloomington; I have proposed that all new hires be put on one system, and that those who were hired before could opt for the new system or stay with the current system. Each person would have to decide financially which is best for them. I did, while President Ehrlich was here last week--and this did come up for conversation during his visit--suggest to him that in fact the benefits committee of IU could make an exception so that Fort Wayne people were all together, and I didn't get a tremendous or affirmative response. I cannot correct or change the difference in the benefits. I can only address what it is that we might change here.

d. *At last month's Senate meeting, the chancellor responded to a question about having proposed the establishment of a new Purdue University rank of lecturer. This rank would bring two innovations to IPFW (1) It would result in the appointment of full-time Faculty who would serve indefinitely without earning credit toward tenure, and (2) it would mandate that these new lecturers in IU missions be employees of Purdue University.*

In part, the chancellor's response was that she proceeded with this proposal, in the absence of advice from appropriate Senate committees, because a document about these appointments had been referred to Senate committees three years ago and had never been reported out of committee.

The document in question is Senate Document SD87-28, referred to the Educational Policy Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee in February 1988. That document presents a number of very specific recommendations, but nowhere does it mention appointing full-time Faculty indefinitely to nontenure-track positions, nor does it foresee appointing Faculty in IU departments as Purdue employees. It does mention the establishment of a new Faculty rank--senior instructor--but explicitly defines that status as being tenure-track.

Now that the Faculty has learned of the administration proposal, does the administration plan to request its review by the Faculty Affairs and Educational Policy Committees, or is it the administration's position that such review would be useless since the proposal has already been transmitted to Purdue University at West Lafayette?

Steven Hollander

J. Lantz: The proposal first of all did not suggest that these people be hired as employees of Purdue University. The suggestion was that they be hired with the academic procedures of IU, but that they could be put under a fringe benefits package at Purdue as we do with clerical, service, and administrative staff. I have withdrawn the proposal, and Dr. McCants and Dr. Cox and I will be meeting later this week to discuss ways of handling this. We hope to institute these appointments on tenure track--instructor or lecturer positions, whichever is appropriate. I would also like to refer to SD 87-28 and I am quoting from the bottom of the first page of it. It says:

Recommendations:

- 1) create new full-time positions to replace some full-time faculty in low-level courses:
 - a) instructor. a non-research appointment, 12-hour load
 - b) senior instructor (promotion status)

If placed on tenure-track, these instructors would advise students, participate in departmental decision-making, and serve on the faculty Senate and other campus committees. In promotion and tenure decisions they should serve only on committees dealing with decisions about their other instructors. Schools or departments might pose other restrictions on participation in faculty governance.

I want to go back and reiterate the beginning of the sentence of the last paragraph: "If placed on tenure track..."

You might be interested to know that we have had some support from other campuses who are very interested in discussing the procedure, the idea of a non-tenure track teaching appointment. I would be happy to have the Faculty Affairs Committee and Educational Policy Committee in discussion for future consideration.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

W. Unsell presented SR No. 91-11 (Documents under deliberation in Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

A. Finco: Without revealing any sensitive information, I wonder if anything is being done to catch the culprits who are calling in these bomb threats? That has really turned out to be a disruption for our classes.

R. Ritchie: We have been working with GTE. There are some problems in trying to track numbers specifically. We have tried to take other measures. Unfortunately, we can't predict where the call will come. That presents a problem. We are working with GTE.

A. Finco: Are there any outside police agencies involved? I find it hard to believe that our gendarmes are trained well enough to address such a situation. I wonder if we might even enlist the students in keeping their ears to the ground.

R. Ritchie: We would welcome student support in that area. We have talked with the local police department. They did appear during at least one of those incidents. They can certainly give us advice for searching and assist in searching buildings, and they have done that. There are some technical problems with us having our own telephone system. You no doubt are aware of advertisements on television about how one can call back, but that doesn't quite work when you have your own telephone system.

J. Lantz: There are two things I would like to mention: One has to do with the payment of the additional increase in premiums for health insurance, and I would like each of you to know that the money to pay for those comes out of the IPFW budget. It does not come out of an Indiana budget or a Purdue budget, it comes out of an IPFW budget. In fact, we will go into the payroll system and override as we write the checks for the IU faculty so that amount is not deducted out of their paychecks; and then when we issue the check to cover their paychecks, we will also issue a check to Indiana University to cover the increase in their health insurance. We do it differently with Purdue people because it is not added in. We simply pay the bill for them. So it comes out of IPFW money, not out of anyone else's money.

The second item I would like to discuss, or at least present for you, is that there has been a lot of discussion over how we have not increased the library budget. I asked for the budgets of the library for the last eight years, and I hope you will bear with me because I would like to give you some figures. I am going to give you two figures for each budget year: 1) the total budget for the IU-Purdue Library and 2) what has been paid out of the foundation account. There at least was a suggestion that the only amount of increase was what had been added out of the foundation account.

	IPFW Budget	Paid out of Foundation
1984-85	\$679,126	\$49,000
1985-86	725,659	\$54,400
1986-87	796,375	\$45,000
1987-88	790,290	\$51,244
1988-89	838,828	\$51,628
1989-90	912,317	\$61,954

1990-91	946,273	\$60,165
1991-92	989,599	\$62,000

From 1984-85 to 1991-92, the increase in the foundation contribution was \$13,000. Twice the foundation contribution went down, and that depends on how much we make from foundation accounts. From 1984-85 to 1991-92 the total library budget has increased \$310,473. That is an increase of 45.72% in that length of time, and only once in 1987-88 did the library budget decrease at all. That time it was a little less than \$6,000.

M. Downs: The figures provided to the Library Committee from the director of the library didn't address the total library budget, which of course includes salaries and increments to those things and a number of other matters, it addressed the amount by which the acquisitions budget has increased each year. And what those figures show is that in three out of the last five years there was no increase in the acquisitions budget, an area which inflation is eating away at the library's ability to provide not just access and services, but books and monographs as well. Here is a fact: this year the library director said there will be little if any money for the purchase of books and monographs: Here is another fact: chemical abstracts and other scientific research support services have been cut. Those are facts. Another fact: those acquisitions budgets--three out of the last five years--have not shown an increase. Another fact: the chancellor, when President Ehrlich was here on campus, said that if the faculty is concerned about the acquisitions budget, there is \$350,000 in non-recurring money which they can recommend be allocated for this purpose. These are the facts and those are the figures provided by the director of the library. To talk about the increase in the total library budget which includes increments, new hires, technical improvements, and so forth, is misleading. It is good that the total budget has increased, but it is a bad thing when the acquisitions budget is allowed to languish to the point where a university library cannot allocate money for books. That's a fact. I don't care how we got here, I am much more interested in seeing how we are going to get away from here--not just in 1993-94 with a fund drive for the library, but this year. Because to lose a year in which books are not going to be purchased is to suffer a serious setback in the ability of the library to provide what we think it needs to provide.

J. Lantz: I might also comment that I hope that no chancellor or vice chancellor ever gets into micromanagement, and that indeed heads of units can make recommendations to their respective vice chancellors. I cannot tell the library--would not begin to tell the library--how to manage their money. And I am concerned, as is Senator Downs, that, in fact, the amount for books has stayed exactly the same in the last three years. I suggest, however, that the library has to make some priorities of how it chooses to spend the increases that come to it. I do not think we have had any other unit on campus that has had a significant increase of that nature. I realize that prices have gone up. They may have gone up well beyond anything that we could possibly match, unless we took all of the money that the legislature gave us last year and then keep compounding that to put back into the library budget.

M. Downs: At the first meeting this year the Senate withdrew its endorsement for the student code. It withdrew that endorsement along with the student senate because the

protection for sexual orientation had been removed from the document. Two months have passed now, and I am not aware of any positive action that has been taken. At the meeting with President Ehrlich he referred to this and other matters when he said that there is a cost that must be paid in order to be members of two university systems. There are many costs which I am willing, as an individual at least, to bear in order to maintain that association, but this is one which I am not willing to bear. The spectacle of a university that has a student code of conduct that is not endorsed by either the students or the faculty should be an embarrassment which stimulates those directly concerned with the matter to take remedial action, and I urge and hope that they will do so.

Another item I wish to mention is the apparent use--I say apparent based on the figures provided by the director of the library--of endowment interest not to supplement an increasing acquisitions budget, but to replace money which- has been allocated elsewhere. I think this is a bad management practice. I also think that it breaks faith with those of us who contributed money to the endowment and the last library drive. The understanding certainly was that endowment money would be used to supplement regular increases, not just in the total library budget, but in the acquisitions and services and access budget as well. If this practice continues, it will make it extremely difficult for us to look forward to a successful library fund drive for the purpose of increasing the endowment.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty