

Minutes of the
Third Regular Meeting of the Twelfth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
November 9, 1992
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 12, 1992
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Switzer
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - A. Finco
 - b. Indiana University - S. Hollander
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 92-8) - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Agenda Committee (SD 92-6) - J. Switzer
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 92-7) - B. Bulmahn
7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 92-9)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 Agenda Committee (SR No: 92-10) - J. Switzer
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick
Parliamentarian: S. Harroff
Sergeant-at-arms: R. Barrett

Senate Members Present:

S. Argast, F. Borelli, J. Brennan, B. Bulmahn, J. Chandler, A. Chatterjea, J. Clausen, D. Cox, S. Dhawale, A. Dirkes, A. Finco, E. Foley, J. Grant, J. Haw, S. Hollander, R. Jeske, A. Karim, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, D. Kruse, L. Kuznar, C. Lawton, D. Legg, P. Lin, M. Mansfield, D. McCants, L. Meyer, R. Miers, R. Pacer, A. Pugh, R. Ramsey, S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, C. Sternberger, J. Switzer, W. Tsai, W. Unsell, W. Walker, E. Waters, L. Wootton, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

E. Blumenthal, J. Dunlap, R. Hawley, J. Lantz, D. Linn, J. Meyers, A. Rassuli, R. Ritchie, J. Silver, W. Utesch

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, R. Steiner

Attachments:

"Approval of replacement members of the Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee, the Graduate Subcommittee, and the Student Affairs Committee" (SD 92-6)
"North Central Accreditation Assessment Plan" (SD 92-7)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 12, 1992: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

T.. Swim moved to accept the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University:

A. Finco: On Monday, October 19, Bill Frederick, Mike Downs and I attended a Commission on Higher Education Faculty Conference in Indianapolis. The major topics discussed were budgeting procedures and issues, the 1993-95 biennial budget for higher education--I have a draft of that should anyone want to see it--, state-wide transfer of credit, and the faculty trends project which has to do with concerns about retirements and replacements of faculty on the various faculties within the state. It was an interesting meeting and it provided faculty members from many of the state public institutions of post-secondary education with the opportunity to 1) learn about the issues and 2) give the commission members present at the meeting a bit of education of their own. I might also mention that the next meeting of the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) is on Wednesday, November 18. Wayne Unsell and I will be attending so if you can think of anything appropriate for the IFC agenda, please pass them on to Wayne or me. I do intend to make the IFC aware of Fort Wayne Senate Documents SD 92-3, which has to do with our proposed revisions to the Management Agreement, and also SD 92-5, which is our expressed desire that IPFW become its own fiscal agent.

- b. Indiana University:

S. Hollander: Last month I told you that the IU Trustees were coming. They did. I took an opportunity to talk to the Faculty Relations Committee about the proposed changes in the Management Agreement and the resolution favoring fiscal autonomy. The Trustees were very attentive, interested, and seemed to

be informed. Their questions were good. Five of the seven members of the committee who drafted the management agreement report were present and all of them spoke about the changes and the reasons for them. I was given an opportunity after the Faculty Relations Committee to address the whole board and essentially repeated for that group what I had told the smaller committee session. I am hopeful there will be some kind of hearings at Fort Wayne during the process in which the two boards of trustees renegotiate the agreement. If so, I would urge all members of this body and all members of the faculty to take an active role in seeing that our interests are kept in mind. Thank you.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer: W. Frederick presented SR. No. 92-8 (Report on the status of Senate Documents) for information. He added that the two documents having to do with the Management Agreement (SD 92-3 and SD 92-5) were sent individually to all members of the boards of trustees of both universities.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

- a. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 92-6) - J. Switzer:

J. Switzer moved to approve SD 92-6 (Approval of replacement members of the Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee, the Graduate Subcommittee and the Student Affairs Committee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

- b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate SD 92 7) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 92-7 (North Central Accreditation Assessment Plan). Seconded.

Motion to approve won a voice vote.

7. Question time:

Q: The 10/14/92 memorandum in which the chancellor announces the resignation of R. Ritchie says the position "will be posted within the Purdue system only." Does this mean that applications from IU employees at IPFW will be welcome? that IU employees at other campuses are not welcome to apply? Does the IPFW administration condone continuation of Purdue University's divisive policy of ignoring the fact that at IPFW the employees of Indiana University and of Purdue University are supposed to be treated as equals? Does the IPFW administration condone an exclusionary policy at a time when the selection of a fiscal agent for the campus is subject to a scheduled renegotiation?

The above-referenced memorandum establishes no provision for involving IPFW faculty, staff, or students in the process of selecting the chief financial officer on this campus. Will those groups be consulted? How?

D. McCants (for J. Lantz): The vacancy announcement for the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs position was advertised within the Purdue system only. All applicants from the IPFW campus were welcome regardless of their main campus affiliation. While not advertised extensively, this does not mean that applicants outside the system will be rejected without consideration. In fact, it is our understanding that at least one application was received from outside both the Indiana University and Purdue University systems. The VCFA position reports to the Executive Vice President and Treasurer for functions vested in the Treasurer by law and by the trustees. The position also reports to the IPFW Chancellor for day-to-day management of business activities at Fort Wayne. Because of this dual reporting relationship both campuses will participate in the screening and interview process.

In regard to the process of selection, applications will be reviewed and candidates interviewed initially at West Lafayette by the Executive Vice President and Treasurer and a screening committee. This process will produce a short list for further consideration by the IPFW campus. Candidates appearing on the short list will be interviewed by a variety of IPFW interest groups during the period of November 17-18 and 23-24. The interview sessions will include a group of campus representatives from the faculty, staff, and students. There will also be an open session where the entire campus will be invited to participate. The Chancellor's executive staff and the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs' senior staff will also make up individual interview groups. These groups will be invited to share their comments and recommendations with Chancellor Lantz. The open-session participants will be encouraged to submit their comments on prepared evaluation forms to the Chancellor. We expect the process to be completed approximately November 24, and a selection made by November 30.

Q: Each department/unit in Neff Hall submitted requests concerning the reallocation of space to be vacated in January 1993 by departments moving to the new Engineering and Technology building. These requests were submitted through their schools to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning, Jack Dahl, in December of 1991. Departments/units were not consulted further before decisions were made. What criteria have been used to make these decisions concerning space reallocation? To what extent was the University Resources Policy Committee involved in making these decisions? Who made the decisions, what information were they based on, why has there been no formal announcement and discussion of these decisions among the departments/units effected, and will there be such discussions before these decisions are irrevocable?

J. Dahl: I need to start by giving a little bit of context. The December 1991 submission request was timed to follow completion of the plan for the proposed science building. As those of you who have been involved in the science building

planning know, we had a rather tortuous evolution since that time which did not come to a conclusion until September. From another perspective, there was a plan for renovation of Neff Hall completed when the engineering and technology building was approved by the legislature. It included a number of the departments staying in Neff Hall--not all of them. The Dean of Arts and Sciences requested, and I wholeheartedly agreed, that things be reopened and the needs of all the departments remaining in that building be addressed. It did significantly complicate the process; at the same time it was the only fair way to proceed. The December 1991 requests from those departments amounted to approximately 43,000 square feet of space, which is more or less the size of Neff Hall and far and away larger than the 25,^{space}000 square feet that the engineering and technology departments are going to vacate. None of that includes space for classrooms or other general kinds of things like computer labs or our often discussed intention to have a student lounge in that building. During the continuation of the science building revisions I was also talking with several other departments in Neff about their requests and working to reach agreement on intentions. This was proceeding rather nicely then on September 14 we got a letter from Facilities Planning in West Lafayette which said plans for the renovation of Neff Hall had to be completed by October 1. Quick calculations will lead to the fact that that was approximately two and a half weeks. It so happened I had a meeting with the business people already scheduled to talk about the Neff Hall renovation and, either that day or the following day, I told them about that and they said "Oh my gosh, that's a lot of work." I said, "Yes it is a lot of work. Unfortunately, the down side is it means the discussions with the departments are going to have to be direct and to the point." That's context.

What criteria were used in allocating space? To go from the 43,000 down to 25,000, the number one need everyone expressed was private offices for full-time faculty. The plan meets that request. Second, we had to address the shortage of classrooms on the campus. We and everybody else in the country steal classrooms when great ideas emerge: the need for another computer lab, the need for a teaching lab, whatever. Classrooms get short around a campus and then a new building has to address that shortage. Third, there was a serious attempt to meet as many of the other needs as could be done given those two primary considerations: offices and classrooms.

The University Resources Policy Committee has not been involved. There was simply no time. The approach to the renovation plan has also not included any consolidated document saying such and such a department gets such and such spaces. Those things have all been discussed with the affected departments and I don't believe there is anyone confused or lacking knowledge about what is to come. The next thing to come is architectural plans for the renovation of the building. When those arrive each of the departments will have at least one round with them. Whether it is more than one round depends. This next stage has to be finished by the first of the year. I'll be stirring up the people in West Lafayette soon to find out how soon we get those draft architectural plans. We are on a very tight time frame. Ours is the first building to come through the process of both building a new

building and doing a renovation since new restrictions on bond funding were established by the IRS in 1988 or '89 or so. It is essentially saying you have to expend funds within three or three and a half years or you start paying penalties. We're on track to avoid most penalties, not all.

Q: IPFW's withdrawal from the child care consortium (EduCare Center) was announced to parents without warning by means of a form letter in mid-October, and to IPFW faculty, students, and shin a memo from Frank Borelli dated October 19, 1992. This decision creates a great hardship for parents who have to make other child care arrangements in mid-year; in fact, Dean of Students Marian Zimmerman was quoted by the Journal-Gazette as saying "most will be able to find something else, but for some it will be a disaster." Rumors abound that IPFW knew this decision was coming as early as May 1992. Is there truth to these rumors? If so, why were parents not informed last May, which would have given them the summer to locate suitable child care? Why were parents who enrolled their children in EduCare not informed of the financial difficulties ("the escalating cost of continued membership," Borelli memo) ? Why were parents not involved in the decision? Did the administration consider the fact that most of those affected adversely by this decision will be women? What is being done to help parents find alternative child care? What plans are there to provide child care for IPFW students and staff in the future?

F. Borelli: IPFW had no intention of withdrawing from the EduCare Consortium last May. There is no truth to such rumors. The consortium members believed that the financial situation would improve based on what was learned during the first year of operation and with Parkview assuming responsibility for the management of the Center. Through parent meetings and communications from the Center staff, parents were informed of rate changes which were made to control the escalating costs. Parents were not involved in the decision to withdraw because, as per the terms of the agreement governing the EduCare Center, such decisions are to be made by the institutional representatives of the consortium. The administration did consider that women would be most adversely affected by this decision, but also knew that not all students needing child care were utilizing the Parkview EduCare Center. The Dean of Students Office has compiled a directory of area child-care providers for those who will need to make other arrangements. I have appointed a task force to study the issue of child care and to make recommendations on how the future needs of our students, faculty, and staff will be met.

8. New business: There was no new business.
9. Committee reports "for information only" - Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-10) - J. Switzer:

J. Switzer presented SR No. 92-10 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.
10. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Smulkstys: I would like to make a short comment on the first question. I know that when a vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs there is routinely a search-and-screen committee consisting of various constituencies on this campus; and I believe that when Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs Carnaghi was selected, there was also a search-and-screen committee on our campus. Now from David McCants' statement I get the impression that there will be no search-and-screen committee for the selection of the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs this time around. It is probably too late to do anything about it; I feel that is not how it should be. I fully understand how the coordinating process takes place as far as this administrator is concerned, but I think that is all the more reason for us to have more organized and effective input than would be the case when candidates on the short list will meet with various campus groups.

6

J. Scherz: I would just like to take the opportunity to let this body know that the West Lafayette campus passed a resolution to include protection of sexual orientation in their documents at their last meeting by a vote of 42/32. We will continue to monitor this as it goes through the procedure at West Lafayette.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty