

Minutes of the
Third Regular Meeting of the Eighth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
November 14, 1988
Noon, Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 10, 1988
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Owen
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - K Stevenson
 - b. Indiana University - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Professional Development Subcommittee (Senate Document SD 88-7) - D. Oberstar
 - b. Student Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 88-8) - K Wakley
 - c. Rules Committee (Senate Document SD 88-9) - D. Onwood
 - d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 88-10) - S. Hollander
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 88-11) - S. Hollander
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 88-5, Circulation of "matching" course requests) - S. Hollander
 - b. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 88-6, Documents under Deliberation in Senate Committees and Subcommittees) - J. Owen
 - c. Ad hoc Committee To Review IPFW's Relationships to IU and PU - F. Kirchhoff
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

M. Auburn, J. Bell, K Bordens, F. Borelli, J. Carnaghi, V. Craig, M. Downs, P. Flynn, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, J. Hersberger, S. Hollander, A. Karna, K Keller, F. Kirchhoff, J. Lantz, M. Laudeman,
B. Lingaraj, M. Lipman, J. Manzer, E. Messal, J. Meyers, R. Miers, D. Monteith, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, J. Outland, J. Owen, J. Rivers, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, S. Sarratore, D. Schmidt, R. Sedlmeyer, A. Shupe, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K Squadrito, K Stevenson, J. Sunderman, D. Swinehart, J. Switzer, G. Szymanski, G. Ulmschneider, W. Unsell, S. Usman, K Wakley

Attachments:

["Election of replacement member of the Professional Development Subcommittee" \(SD 88-7\)](#)
["Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate--Student Membership on the Student Affairs Committee" \(SD 88-8\)](#)

"Amendments to the Constitution" (SD 88-9)

"Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate--Addition of Curriculum Review Subcommittee; supersedes SD 85-17" (SD 88-10)

"Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate--Addition of Graduate Subcommittee" (SD 88-11)

"NCA Self-Study Progress Report" (Senate Reference No. 88-7)

Senate Members Absent:

H. Broberg, E. Foley, H. Garcia, L. Graham, J. Haw, D. Hockensmith, A. Mahmoud, A. Pugh, P. Zonakis

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis

Visitors Present: D. Benson, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, A. Montgomery

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Lantz called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 10, 1988: The Secretary of the Faculty made two corrections to the minutes: S. Sarratore should have been listed as present and the McKay Farm is 152 acres (not 250). The minutes were accepted as corrected.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

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

The agenda was accepted as distributed.
4. Reports of the speakers of the faculties:
 - a. Purdue University:

K Stevenson: I have been relatively silent for the last couple of meetings. Today I have a lot of things to do. The first thing I want to mention is the somewhat ominous remark that was in the Purdue University Senate minutes of October 17. A member of the Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs suggested I bring it to your attention. It concerns the medical benefits and the problems that we have been having. It is in Appendix A of the report by Gunnar Kullerud. The last sentence of that says: "It now seems probable that the total cost of the group medical insurance program will increase by 12% each year in the foreseeable future, and the cost to the faculty may increase as much as much as 20-30% each of those years." So, what we have to keep in mind is that what we have done in terms

of putting together a program for this next year is just a stop-gap. The medical insurance cost is going to continue to go up in the years to come.

J. Carnaghi: May I interject? Dr. Ford was on campus on Friday and we asked him about that statement. He said it just has to be an error. We couldn't quite understand why it would go up 12% for the university and 20-30% for the faculty, unless there is going to be a shift in the practice and go the other way this year. As the Purdue people know, the shift this year is that the university is picking up a greater portion--a higher percentage--of the cost. He didn't know what the source of that was.

K Stevenson: Some correspondence came my way between Professor James Farlow and Presidents Beering and Ehrlich following the October 4 convocation, when the two presidents came here. I thought perhaps you might like to hear this correspondence. You will recall, I think, Professor Farlow asked a question of the two presidents about the distribution of salary monies. Following the answers by the two presidents, Professor Farlow wrote the following letter to both Presidents Beering and Ehrlich:

Although I appreciated yesterday's opportunity to meet with you, I was very disappointed with President Beering's remarks about the reasons for the differences in faculty salary increases between the parent and the regional campuses. If I understood him correctly, he attributed greater percentage increases at the parent campuses to larger pools of local money generated by overhead from external research grants and suggested that the only way that comparable increases could be made possible at the regional campuses would be through similar efforts at grantsmanship.

As a researcher who has received external grants, I have no problem with the expectation that faculty members at the regional campuses make every effort to obtain such outside funds. However, given the differences between the regional and parent campuses and academic mission, number of faculty members, teaching loads, and facilities (President Beering expressed consternation at the difficulty of obtaining start-up funds of \$100,000-\$200,000 for new faculty members; I'm sure you can guess how much start-up money I received when I began at IPFW!) is it reasonable and fair to expect that the regional campuses be able to generate outside grants at the levels seen at West Lafayette or Bloomington?

If the contributions of faculty at the regional campuses are truly considered to be as valuable as those of faculty at the parent campuses, it would seem more equitable for Purdue University and Indiana University to take a system-wide, rather than a campus by campus, approach to the use of grant overhead money in adjusting salary increases beyond what is made available by the state legislature. That is, all grant overhead funds should be thrown into a common pot, and percentage salary increases made possible by those monies distributed uniformly among the campuses in the university system. The only alternative to this kind of approach, if those of us at regional campuses are expected--and permitted--to seek parity in

percentage salary increases with our counterparts at the parent campuses through our own efforts at grantsmanship, would be to change the academic missions of the regional campuses such that our teaching loads and research facilities would be equivalent to those at the parent campuses, and that does not seem fiscally or politically realistic.

I would like to feel that my efforts at teaching and research are appreciated as much as those of my counterparts at the bigger campuses, and that I am not a second-class citizen in a state university system, but until the time that statements to that effect are expressed in a more concrete--perhaps I should say quantitative--fashion it would be difficult for me to take them seriously. Sincerely, James A. Farlow

I received a copy of a letter addressed to Professor Farlow from President Beering. I am not aware of any correspondence between President Ehrlich and Professor Farlow. The letter from President Beering reads as follows:

Dear Professor Farlow: Thank you for your recent letter addressed to President Ehrlich and me concerning faculty salary increases. I regret that I did not make myself more clear. In answer to a question, I referenced the added flexibility that a school with a large research program has because direct salary support from grants offsets the use of general funds. By our policy such funds remain in the school and can be used at the discretion of the dean within established guidelines. Overhead charges (indirect costs) defray direct operating support costs and, therefore, cannot be returned to departments for other purposes. As to your second point of sharing monies among campuses, let me reiterate that your campus has its own budget and neither university is at liberty to co-mingle or transfer funds in any category.

Finally, let me reemphasize what I said at the meeting--namely, that all salary adjustments at both universities are based on merit as determined by the individual professor's department. I hope these answers clarify the issues you raised. Sincerely, Steven C. Beering.

The third item I want to report is a meeting that was held Friday of last week between President Beering and campus representatives. It was held in the Union Building and there was, apparently, equal representation from both the IU and Purdue faculty on this campus. There were staff people and community people also in attendance. The purpose of the meeting was to ask advice of people on our campus and in the community about the process for selection of a permanent chancellor. I will say that the meeting was cordial, frank, and very collegial. Dr. Beering opened the meeting by outlining what he felt the qualities of a good and effective chancellor ought to be; he asked for our opinions on how well the transition has been from the previous chancellor to the current interim chancellor; and he asked our advice on how we should proceed to search for the permanent chancellor. First of all, I can say that, there seemed to be unanimous feeling of relief for Dr. Beering's selection of Professor Lantz for the interim chancellor position,

and genuine satisfaction with her performance so far. We all agreed that there should be some kind of search involving faculty and others in the university and local community. A majority seemed to suggest that the search ought to be limited to some extent--possibly to a university-- or system-wide search as opposed to a national search--since such national searches for chancellors have not been very successful in the past. I should point out that you may have read a news account of this meeting in the evening paper suggesting that it is already cast in stone--that there is going to be a limited search. I didn't get that feeling from the meeting. I think that that is still yet to be determined. We did talk about a timetable for the search. It hasn't been decided yet how that timetable will proceed, but I think we can say fairly confidently that a permanent chancellor will be chosen by July 1, 1989. It was a very good meeting. I think we all agreed that there needs to be a process involving everybody's participation in this search. There was a lot of give and take. Those are my views. I think when Mike has a chance to speak he can maybe elaborate on or refute anything I said.

b. Indiana University:

M. Downs: I'll begin where Ken left off about the meeting with President Beering. His characterization of it is accurate, at least so far as my recollection is concerned. There are others who were there at the meeting who may wish to extend or elaborate on what we have said. I think President Beering went away with the idea that for the first time in a long time sentiment on this campus concerning the office and person of chancellor is unanimous and positive. I can barely remember the last time when, perhaps, people felt that way; it was when Dwight Henderson, also very much a person of this place, was the chancellor for a year. I think there is a pattern there--a cause-and-effect relationship that we should all bear carefully in mind when we consider what we are going to do about that office in the future.

There are other matters that I have to report to you on concerning fringe benefits at Indiana University. You should all be aware that the compromise that I mentioned last time concerning the 18/20 plan for Indiana University faculty was accepted, with only one abstention, by the University Faculty Council and, with only one negative vote, by the Board of Trustees. The compromise will be placed in effect after the first of January. It will mean a relatively substantial change for new hires at Indiana University. That's the down side of the compromise. It will mean relatively little change for the overwhelming majority of Indiana University employees who are already vested in the plan. It is far from being an ideal solution to the problems posed by continuation of the plan, but it is a nearly ideal compromise in that it was reluctantly, although nearly unanimously, accepted by both the faculty and the Board of Trustees, and, at each point, staff members who participated in the plan were involved in negotiations and discussion. I should mention, at this point, that I, too, have received a letter, and I should acknowledge my own part in negotiating this compromise. There were two faculty members who negotiated: I was one of them, and the other was Professor Keith Moore from Indianapolis. I received a note this last week that members of the faculty on the

South Bend campus were not so satisfied as most of the rest of us were, and a motion to declare those of us who negotiated the compromise from the faculty side "morally reprehensible" failed 14 in favor of finding us morally reprehensible, 14 opposed, and 34 abstentions. I immediately submitted a question to my own assembly, which declared this action to be both stupid and cowardly, and it passed by a vote of one to nothing. I have gotten some angry letters and I have gotten one or two nice letters, most from people who owe me favors, but, anyway, there it is. It is finished and it is complete, and we move on now to a reexamination of the Indiana University medical benefits plan; and I expect that the news there will not be as happy even as the compromise concerning the 1820 plan. When Ken mentioned the stunning news contained in the minutes of the Purdue University Faculty Senate, they didn't sound so out of line with what we face in the area of medical benefits and medical costs. The cost of medical care is rising much faster than inflation, and certainly much faster than the rate of increment in our salaries. The alternatives are all unattractive, although not equally unattractive, and we are trying to sort them out. We are due to report to the president in January. At this point, at least, we have decided to attack the problem by making options possible to faculty and staff to make the approach to medical insurance on the part of the individual faculty member and staff employees very much like automobile insurance: By selecting different deductibles you may balance the monthly cost against the amount of risk that you assume. And there are some other wrinkles that we are adding to the plan that will, at least for employees at the lower end of the wage and salary scale, buffer the effect of this on them. I don't think that I am going to be able to offer you an extremely or even a slightly optimistic view of what is going to happen to the share of the cost or the risk which is borne by the individual employee or faculty member. I wish it could be otherwise, but the way of the world has shifted and it is important for us to shift with it. I think that it also means that medical benefits plans will be reexamined and adjusted every year instead of waiting for five years until they are hopelessly out of sync with what it going on in the medical field. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

J. Lantz: Mike, the South Bend group may find you morally reprehensible but the President of Indiana University and the Board of Trustees were very complimentary and appreciative of your leadership.

5. Report of the President Officer:

J. Lantz- I would like to ask Fred Kirchhoff to give us a report on the North Central Association Study.

F. Kirchhoff yielded the floor to Linda Balthaser (see Senate Reference No. 88-7).

J. Lantz: I would like to announce "World AIDS Day." There will be a video shown on campus entitled "Too Little, Too Late," which examines the psychosocial aspects of AIDS on the families and loved ones of persons with AIDS. Following this 45-minute video, discussion will be led by the AIDS Task Force, including individuals who have had a family member die of the virus. This will be held December 1 from 9:00 to 10:15 a.m. and

from noon to 1:15 p.m. in the Walb Union G21. I would encourage you to do everything you can about this problem that afflicts us.

The next item I would like to report is an update on the United Way. There will be a memorandum which will come to you, probably not until tomorrow or Wednesday. We had 264 faculty and staff contribute to the United Way. They pledged \$20,741, which was an average of \$79.00 per person. As I said, more details will be in the memorandum. Thank you for your interest and concern about the United Way.

The Fall Faculty Convocation will be held December 7, 1988, at 3:30 p.m., and will feature a panel discussion regarding the acquisition of the McKay property. The panel will consist of Mrs. Carolyn Outman, Stephen Williams, Esq., and Walter Helmke, Esq. Mrs. Gutman was the person who led the charge in acquiring the property; Steve Williams was the attorney who put it altogether; and Walter Helmke is a member of the Foellinger Foundation board who was very instrumental in us getting this. It should be an interesting meeting, and I encourage you all to attend.

I just received, dated October 14, from the Higher Education Commission, a status of requests for new academic degree programs. I have had this terrible feeling that there was this great hole and that every academic degree program that was ever put out from this campus was dropped into the hole never to be heard of again. I am setting up a procedure where we will be monitoring the degree requests as they leave our campus. Let me tell you what the Higher Education Commission thinks is there now: the M.S. in Educational Counseling is, they say, awaiting additional information from IU. I am trying to follow that through. The Master's in Liberal Studies is under review. The M.A./M.S. in Professional Communication is under Higher Education review, and the associate's in Chemistry and associate's in Chemical Methods are also under their review. I did think that our B.A. with a major in Economics would be on the November board meeting for IU; it was not. I have been promised it will be on the December board meeting agenda. I will keep you posted as we go on as to where everything is.

The Purdue University Board of Trustees will meet this Friday. I will be there, and I will also be attending a planning meeting President Ehrlich is having next Tuesday on the planning for the emphases that he has outlined in his planning document, which you all have seen copies of.

Thanksgiving holidays will be Thursday, November 24, and Friday, November 25. Please be aware of what times the buildings will be closed. If you have special needs on campus, you will need to make arrangements so that you can get in.

The Purdue University Panel D will meet here on this campus on Tuesday, December 6. Our nurses' pinning ceremony will be December 16 at 7:30 p.m. in the Walb Ballroom. Our Christmas holidays are Friday, December 23, and Monday, December 26. Also, the university will officially be closed on Monday, January 2, for the New Year's Day holiday. Any questions?

M. Auburn: Chancellor, the M.S. in Educational Counseling that is on the agenda of the Higher Education Commission is there in error. I have followed up on that, but I didn't have a chance to tell you. The program has been approved.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Professional Development Subcommittee (SD 88-7) - D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 88-7 (Election of replacement member of the Professional Development Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

b. Student Affairs Committee (SD 88-8) - K Wakley:

K. Wakley moved to approve SD 88-8 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate--Student Membership on the Student Affairs Committee) with one editorial correction: to change the words Dean of Student Services to Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Seconded.

Motion passed on a show of hands.

c. Rules Committee (SD 88-9) D. Onwood:

D. Onwood moved to approve SD 88-9 (Amendments to the Constitution).

Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 88-101- S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 88-10 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate--Addition of Curriculum Review Subcommittee; supersedes SD 85-17). Seconded.

Motion passed on a show of hands.

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 88-11) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 88-11 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate--Addition of Graduate Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a show of hands.

7. New business: There was no new business.

8. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 88-5) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander presented SR No. 88-5 (Circulation of "matching" course requests) for information only.

b. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 88-6) - J. Owen:

J. Owen presented SR No. 88-6 (Documents under Deliberation in Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

c. Ad hoc Committee To Review IPFW's Relationships to IU and PU - F. Kirchhoff:

F. Kirchhoff. The ad hoc committee divided itself and created five subcommittees to deal with five separate areas: the administration, students, faculty concerns, program concerns, and the university's relationship with the community. The ad hoc committee has received reports from four of those subcommittees. We are awaiting a report from the fifth subcommittee: the subcommittee that dealt with the community. That subcommittee prepared a very fine questionnaire and got a good response from the community, but there was some delay in simply getting it into a database. I understand now that those things have occurred, and the subcommittee is now in the process of coming up with its final report. When the committee receives that report we will be able to put together our final report, which I had hoped to get to the Senate by this fall. Obviously, it won't be this fall, but early next semester.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

W. Frederick: I'm somewhat concerned about the meeting that took place with President Beering, and the representation at that meeting of the faculty. How was it determined who would represent faculty and/or this body at that meeting? Who were the representatives at the meeting?

M. Downs: I know that in Ken's case and mine, it was the faculty who decided who would represent them at the meeting, since we are the speakers of the faculty and it is a determination made by popular election. The rest of the guest list I don't know about.

W. Frederick: Why I bring the matter up is that the last time President Beering had an ad hoc meeting it had long-term effects for this campus, as we all know. I am not questioning the representation by either speaker being at that meeting, but there were other members of the faculty present. I am wondering if this body shouldn't take it under advisement to consider who should represent the faculty at such meetings.

Maybe we should have only two voices there--the speakers--and/or senior faculty members from either side of the house?

J. Lantz: I cannot answer your other question. J. Owen: Some units weren't involved at all.
10. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty