

Minutes of the
Third Regular Meeting of the Fourteenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
November 14, 1994
Noon, Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 10, 1994
3. Acceptance of the agenda - N. Younis
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - R. Barrett
 - b. Indiana University - S. Hollander
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 94-8) - M. Downs
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 94-10) - J. Clausen
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 94-11) - S. Sarratore
 - c. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 94-12) - N. Younis
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 94-9) - N. Younis
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 94-10) - S. Sarratore
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: M. Downs
Parliamentarian: M. Sherr
Sergeant-at-Arms: P. Drumm
Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

S. Argast, R. Barrett, R. Berger, F. Borelli, N. Bradley, W. Branson, B. Bulmahn, C. Champion, J. Clausen, L. DeFonso, D. Edwards, D. Fairchild, O. Freiburger, S. Frey-Ridgway, R. Gillespie, S. Harroff, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, R. Hess, C. Hill, S. Hollander, G. Kartsounes, R. Kendall, F. Kirchhoff, L. Kuznar, P. Lane, T. Laverghetta, C. Lawton, D. Legg, L. Motz, G. Mourad, H. Samavati, S. Sarratore, L. Schlager, D. Schmidt, Z. Shipchandler, J. Smulkstys, C. Sternberger, P. Stubblebine, J. Taylor, P. Terry, C. Thompson, M. H. Thunte, K. Trier, W. Utesch, M. Wartell, L. Wootton, N. Younis, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

N. Cothorn, D. Cox, J. Grant, R. Hawley, M. Lane, M. Masters, E. Waters

Attachments:

["Procedures for Promotion and Tenure: Composition of the Campus Committee \(amends SD 88-13\)"](#) (SD 94-10)

["Procedures for Promotion and Tenure" \(SD 88-13, as amended\)](#)

["Amendment of the Academic Regulations--Class Attendance"](#) (SD 94-11)

["Approval of replacement members of the Rules Committee"](#) (SD 94-12)

["Option 1-Option 2 Salary Increment Policy"](#) (Senate Reference No. 94-11)

2

Representative from Medical Education: D. Koritnik

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, J. Jones, D. Pfeffenberger

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, S. Kelley, N. Newell

1. Call to order: M. Downs called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 10, 1994: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

N. Younis moved to accent the agenda. Seconded.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University: R. Barrett had no report.
 - b. Indiana University:

S. Hollander: The University Faculty Council met last month and the sole item of business was a report on the status of the University from President Brand, who, during that meeting, announced that he was setting up eight task forces to do some long-range planning. I was pleased that when I asked for volunteers for those task forces that many people on this faculty agreed to serve. I have sent names to Bloomington. Decisions should be made in the very near future.

I have also been asked to attend and participate in an IU trustees discussion on December '2 having to do with IU's relationship to the Fort Wayne Campus--past, present and future. The request struck me as unusual and interesting. I am going. I have no further information, but may have some information when I return.

M. Downs: Does anyone have questions for Professor Hollander? Were other invitations to this meeting received by faculty here?

S. Hollander: The Chancellor was invited. Harriet Inskip, Walter Helmke and Carolyn Outman were also invited. I have asked for an invitation for the Presiding Officer and have had no response.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate-Reference No. 94-81):

M. Downs: I call your attention to SR No. 94-8 which lists documents considered this academic year. When appropriate I have forwarded the documents to the proper administrators and/or units for implementation.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 94-10) - J Clausen:

J. Clausen moved to approve SD 94-10 (Procedures for Promotion and Tenure: Composition of the Campus Committee [amends SD 88-13]). Seconded.

_____ Motion to approve passed unanimously.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 94-11) - S. Sarratore:

S. Sarratore moved to approve SD 94-11 (Amendment of the Academic Regulations--Class Attendance). Seconded.

_____ S. Hollander moved to suspend the rules so that the body could vote on the document today. Seconded.

_____ Motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously.

_____ Motion to approve passed unanimously.

c. Agenda Committee (SD 94-12)-N. Younis:

N. Younis moved to approve SD 94-12 (Approval of replacement members of the Rules Committee). Seconded.

_____ Motion to approve passed unanimously.

7. New business:

R. Barrett moved to approve the appointment of Nashwan Younis to the Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board. Seconded.

_____ Motion to approve passed unanimously.

8. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 94-9) - N. Younis

N. Younis presented Senate Reference No. 94-9 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 94-10) - S. Sarratore

S. Sarratore presented Senate Reference No. 94-10 (1995-96 Class Scheduling Patterns) for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: At the end of the meeting last time Vice Chancellor Borelli was asked to report at this meeting under "general good and welfare" concerning a question that was raised at that time.

F. Borelli: The question had to do with licensed vs. unlicensed child-care. The child-care we intend to provide initially will be structured primarily for our students. Our experience and our research clearly indicate that students want low-cost, part-time, drop-in child-care in a safe environment close to campus--if not on campus: Although we would like to provide a licensed center, we have neither the financial nor the educational resources to do so at the present time. However, it should not be assumed that lack of a licensed facility will in any way result in a substandard child-care center. In fact, state laws governing child-care are written in such a way so as to allow child-care to be provided as we have proposed. Again, the primary consideration in providing child-care for our students is to make it affordable. Licensed child-care centers have very strict staff-to-child ratios; they have educational requirements for the staff; and they have food service requirements--all of which tend to drive up the cost considerably. We learned this the hard way with our recent experience with the EduCare Center at Parkview Hospital. That facility and that care center is first-rate. And it is still available for our faculty, staff and students; however, our students can't afford to use it. It is simply beyond the reach of their means.

The universities that have licensed day-care centers also usually have very strong early-childhood-education programs. When the center serves as a lab school, it allows for general fund monies to help offset the expenses and student interns to further reduce the staffing costs. Until such a time that we have a viable program which would support the center, we will try to provide the best care we can in an unlicensed fashion.

M. Downs: Is there anything anyone would like to say in response to the answer to the question?

S. Hollander: In the past few days there has been a number of questions raised about a new salary increment policy (see Senate Reference No. 94-11 attached) brought into effect by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs as a result of last year's approval by this body of Option I/Option II Teaching "thingies." Some members of this body know what the

published policy is, some do not. Could the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs clarify a) what that policy is and b) what sorts of consultation with appropriate groups and individuals took place prior to this implementation?

F. Kirchhoff. The policy was stated as a memorandum to academic deans. The policy was developed in consultation with the academic deans and with members of the Faculty Affairs Committee of this body. The purpose of the document is twofold: 1) it is concerned with establishing the administrative mechanism by which the salary increments of Option II faculty members will be equalized with the salary increments of Option I faculty members. If you recall, the document provides for such a mechanism and I needed to spell out how that would happen. The other part of the document is to provide for the accountability of Option I faculty members who are not using the release time for research. The policy dealing with the latter of the policy establishes a ceiling of two-thirds of the average departmental increment for Option I faculty with release time for research who are reporting no research, or some kind of inadequate research. What inadequate means as far as I am concerned is something that can be defined by the schools and departments. I assume that schools and departments have standards of what they expect of Option I faculty. In the annual review that every department chair writes of every faculty member that standard is applied and applied fairly. The document involves no change in that standard. It also provides a mechanism by which deans, and then the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, hold back some money and see to it that the Option II faculty members are equalized if they have to be.

M. Downs: This is not a policy that has been distributed to the faculty?

F. Kirchhoff. It is not.

M. Downs: Is it going to be distributed to the faculty?

F. Kirchhoff. It is a policy that was distributed to the deans. I think it is the deans' responsibility to distribute it to the chairs and then to the faculty.

K. Trier: Is this something that is cast in stone? Is it a decision that is made on high that comes down to us without any kind of feedback or input from faculty members? How do departments, such as ours, that have a mechanism within the departments already drafted and basically carved out that fits the way we deal with increments, how does that fit with the current policy that is being discussed? I guess it is a little difficult to ask questions when we haven't seen a copy of the policy.

5

F. Kirchhoff. Departments that have stated policies about salary increments are going to have to review those policies this year anyway because we now have a class of faculty without release time ~ research. Presumably the department statements in most departments, I am sure that would be the case in Sociology and Anthropology, were developed with the understanding that everyone in the department has released time for research. There will have to be some changes in those departmental policies to allow for the Option II faculty, if there are faculty in that category in that department, to receive fair salaries. So some change in

departmental policies is necessary. It is my view that there is an element of fairness here in dealing with faculty across campus--both Option I and Option II faculty--that merits some kind of campus-wide policy. As far as consultation goes, I consulted with the Faculty Affairs Committee. It was the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate that drew up the original document. It has been my custom, as it has been for other vice chancellors for academic affairs, to go back to committees when they have come up with policy statements; and it is up to me to implement those policy statements and ask "Does this implementation meet what you had in mind when you originally wrote up this document?" The committee looked at the document, made some suggestions for changes--which were embodied in the final version--so that there was faculty consultation. It was not something that was issued, as you so kindly put it, "on high." I prefer to think of myself as someone in the south wing. Certainly my office is below that of Doug Townsend's.

M. Downs: It is a question also about procedures. It is my understanding of the *Constitution of the Faculty* that if there is an administrative policy that excites controversy or raises questions or strong disapproval, the body can, on its own--without having the policy referred to it--take it up, discuss it, express an opinion and make a recommendation to the administration. Such an action would be appropriate.

M. Downs: Are there other questions?

R. Barrett: I was just going to mention that our women's volleyball team did the miracle thing again and won the conference this year and may get a bid to the NCAA.

M. Downs: Thank you very much. That's good news.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty