

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Twentieth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
December 11, 2000
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 13, 2000
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - J. Silver
 - b. Indiana University - B. Fife
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - L. Wright-Bower
6. Special business for the day - Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 00-6)
7. Committee reports requiring action
IU Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 00-7) - B. Fife
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 00-8)
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: L. Wright-Bower

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Njock Libii

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Bingi, E. Blakemore, W. Branson, J. Brennan, G. Campbell-Whatley, C. Champion, M. Codispoti, S. Davis, L. DeFonso, W. DeMott, M. Downs, C. Drummond, B. Fife, L. Fox, J. Grant, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, L. Hite, B. Hume, N. McCroskey, J. Nichols, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Pugh, D. Ross, B. Salmon, R. Sedlmeyer, J. Silver, W. Skoog, J. Tinkel, M. H. Thuente, J. Tok, M. Wartell, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

H. Abu-Mulaweh, F. Borelli, H. Broberg, V. Coufoudakis, C. Erickson, B. Harwood, M. Kimble, D. Marshall, K. O'Connell, Z. Shipchandler, K. Squadrito
Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, G. Bullion, D. Cannon, J. Clausen, T. Guthrie, P. Iadicola, J. Jones, A. Shupe
Visitors Present: J. Dahl, M. Gruss, R. Kostrubanic

Attachment:

["Results of the election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review"](#) (SR No. 00-9)

Acta

1. Call to order: L. Wright-Bower called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 13, 2000: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

M. Downs moved to approve the agenda
The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University: J. Silver had no report.
 - b. Indiana University: B. Fife had no report.
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - L. Wright-Bower:

L. Wright-Bower: I want to thank Jim Silver for presiding at the last Senate meeting in my absence. I hope you enjoyed it. I saw that the meeting was very brief, so I'm sure your colleagues did.

Please keep in mind the February 14 date for the trip to Indianapolis to speak to our legislators.

Finally, the following notice was posted by Jack Dahl today concerning the weather:

There have been several calls already this morning about final exams and the bad weather forecast for the next few days. There are plans in place to address the issue. In general, if the campus has to be closed, Saturday and Sunday times will be designated for final exams that are displaced. If this does happen, a specific announcement of the plans will accompany the announcement of the campus closing. Some individual students may be unable to attend the scheduled final exams. Faculty members are encouraged to make

arrangements for administering exams for these students.

6. Special business for the day - Memorial Resolution (SR No. 00-6):

M. H. Thuente read the memorial resolution for John Leonard Modic. A moment of silence was observed.

7. Committee reports requiring action - Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SR No. 00-7) - B. Fife:

B. Fife and J. Grant conducted the election for the IU Faculty Board of Review. The results are attached. (See SR No. 00-9)

8. New business:

M. Nusbaumer moved that SR No. 00-8 be referred to the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) for recommendations to be reported back to the Senate no later than the March meeting. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

9. Committee reports "for information only": Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (SR No. 00-8):

SR No. 00-8 (Report Regarding Division I) was presented for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Brennan: Has the announcement about the exams been posted widely?

L. Wright-Bower: I read it on one of the bulletin boards. I can ask Jack Dahl to speak to that.

J. Dahl: The intention was that it was to be sent by email to everyone on campus. I'll check immediately after the meeting to make sure that has been done.

M. Downs: Given the interest that has been expressed in the recommendation by the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, it would be prudent and advisable for the University Resources Policy Committee to hold a public hearing or two on the document so that it gets the wide circulation that this body wants it to have before we take it up in March.

P. Iadicola: Sometimes when we refer things to committee they often get lost. This issue is a very important issue and I would like to make some comments to my colleagues about it. Linda has told me to be brief and I'm well aware of being perceived as abusing rights of free speech. At one time we had email that was available to everyone on campus and I was perceived as abusing my freedom of speech by using the email. At one time I was perceived as abusing the privileges of my Senate position by offering legislation and not having it go through committee and my seat was reapportioned. So I'm well aware of the dangers of abusing freedom of speech. I do have some comments. To be brief I have written them down, so please bear with me in terms of reading some of this.

a. For the good and welfare of the university, the faculty must play a key role in determining the direction of the development of the university. This is not being done. I know it wasn't done in the case of making a decision about Division I. Even when faculty were poised to consider this issue, the decision was made and presented as a supposed fait accompli. When the faculty are silenced, this is not for the good and welfare of the university.

b. For the good and welfare of the university, decisions to commit large amounts of resources for the development or expansion of a program must be carefully made after an investigation of the costs and benefits of this development. This is done in academic programs, although, rarely are we talking about committing large amounts of resources. In most cases here at IPFW new academic programs are funded with no additional resources. On the other hand, when we are speaking about non-academic programs where large amounts of resources are to be invested--in this case at least \$1.5 million--there is little or minimal investigation of costs and benefits.

This is the case of Division I athletics where we are talking about the committing of at least \$1.5 million principally on soft money, if not student fee increases. There is no data collected or serious analysis of pre-existing data to support such a move. Instead, what is presented to us as data are anecdotes from athletic boosters, from student athletes, from athletic directors, and anecdotal comments from those people at institutions that have just gone to Division I. They have instituted their own public relations campaign for the move. There is no analysis of comparable schools. During the site visit two or three weeks ago, I spoke to one of the people on the team who is from Youngstown State University. They also moved to Division I. It might be important to talk about that particular example.

c. For the good and welfare of the university, the Senate must take a stand against further movement in the implementation of this plan for moving to Division I. The faculty senate must go on record and state that it has not made a decision. The faculty senate must go on record and state that a serious analysis must be done of the cost and benefits before we commit such large amounts of university resources and, lastly, the faculty senate must go on record and state that it is wrong for the university administration to continue the commitment of university resources to the implementation of a program before a serious analysis and faculty consultation have been made. Thank you very much.

B. Fife: I quite agree with Professor Iadicola on many fronts. I think one thing we should all focus on is this comparison of IPFW and IUPUI as being peer institutions. Clearly, according to the Carnegie Foundation, we are not peer institutions at all. IUPUI's budget is 10 times higher than ours. Even if you accept that comparison, according to the NCAA president, right now IUPUI spends 0.4% of its operational budget on athletics. It said that the only way IUPUI would be able to compete is to spend more than 0.4%. In other words, athletics will impact academics, and I think that analogy does hold true here and it holds true here in an institution that is quite dissimilar to IUPUI. I think the burden of proof as far as spending millions and millions of dollars is a high one and should not be based on anecdotal evidence at all.

M. Downs: The secretary of the Senate does not have the right to speak from the floor, but the secretary is in charge of the reapportionment of Senate seats. I don't think anybody has ever suggested that she exercises this power so as to punish somebody that may have been perceived as having spoken at too great a length or inappropriately. In my experience, she takes the job of reapportionment very seriously and, if a seat is ever moved from one unit to another, it has been based on a mathematical formula that the Agenda Committee has given to the secretary to apply. I'm sure that Professor Iadicola was speaking in jest when he suggested that it has ever been otherwise, but since she cannot speak for herself it is important to realize that seats are not ever apportioned on the basis of whether somebody says something unpopular.

E. Blakemore: I just want to support that remark. Actually, the secretary of the Senate, for Arts and Sciences Senator seats, passes that responsibility on to the School of Arts and Sciences Nominations and Elections Committee. I was the chair of that committee during the time that Sociology's seat was otherwise reassigned and it was done so on the mathematical formula that Senator Downs speaks of.

P. Iadicola: I do wish to apologize. It was in jest. I'm sure it was a coincidence. So, in terms of any offense taken, I am sorry. I don't want to deflect the discussion to that particular issue because I am not raising it as an issue.

L. Wright-Bower: If you won't mind my sharing this, I asked you to brief and to prepare your comments in writing so that it would be easier for our secretary to take care of the business of recording.

M. Nusbaumer: Given the concerns that have been expressed to me about running the "for information only" document through URPC and, since I am chair of URPC, I would also like to note that the URPC will also be dealing with the issue of the shift in bulletin boards and the policy implications therein.

S. Davis: If we do have to cancel classes, will the administration consider moving the date that grades are due by one day from the 18th to the 19th?

S. Hannah: We can look into it. This is a Kevin Browne (Registrar) question.

M. Nusbaumer: On this topic, that issue becomes real crucial given your prior comments about if students can't make it. It establishes what options we have to deal with those folks.

S. Hannah: I'll try to respond to that soon.

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

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty