

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Sixth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
December 11, 2006
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 13, 2006
3. Acceptance of the agenda – A. Karim
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – N. Younis
 - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – D. Turnipseed
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 06-8) – M. Nusbaumer
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 06-6) – J. Tinkel
 - c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 06-7) – A. Karim
7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 06-9)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
10. The general good and welfare of the University
Chancellor’s Remarks
11. Adjournment*

*The meeting will adjourn by 1:15 p.m.

Presiding Officer: D. Turnipseed
Parliamentarian: S. Davis
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen (absent)
Secretary: J. Petersen

Attachments:

- [“Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate – Graduate Subcommittee”](#) (SD 06-6)
- [“Bylaws of the Senate – Graduate Subcommittee”](#) (SD 81-10, in part)
- [“Approval of replacement member on the General Education Subcommittee”](#) (SD 06-7)
- [“Results of the Election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review”](#) (SR 06-10)
- [“Athletics Report for 2006”](#) (Attachment A)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, A. Argast, S. Blythe, W. Branson, J. Burg, S. Ding, B. Dupen, C. Erickson,
R. Friedman, L. Graham, J. Grant, T. Grove, I. Hack, S. Hannah, A. Karim, L. Kuznar,

D. Lindquist, K. McDonald, D. Mueller, E. Neal, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, E. Ohlander,
J. Papiernik, K. Pollock, L. Roberts, H. Samavati, A. Shupe, J. Summers, R. Sutter,
J. Tankel, J. Toole, S. Troy, A. Ushenko, G. Volland, M. Walsh, L. Wark, N. Younis,
J. Zhao

Senate Members Absent:

C. Champion (leave), P. Dragnev, J. Garrison, J. Hersberger, C. Hill (sabbatical), L. Meyer, M. Lipman, K. Modesitt, G. Moss, G. Mourad (sabbatical), R. Murray, A. Mustafa, R. Saunders, M. Wartell

Faculty Members Present: S. Sarratore, M. Wolf

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, E. Frew, R. Kostrubanic, J. McCormick

Acta

1. Call to order: D. Turnipseed called the meeting to order at 12:03.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 13, 2006: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:
 - A. Karim moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University:

N. Younis: I wish everybody happy and safe holidays.
 - b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: Peace on earth!
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – D. Turnipseed:

In addition to happy holidays I bring to you good cheer from your last presiding officer. I talked to George Bullion last night, and he said to please tell everyone “happy holidays” and that he misses you.
6. Committee reports requiring action:
 - a. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SR No. 06-8) – M. Nusbaumer:

M. Nusbaumer distributed ballots for the election of the Faculty Board of Review. The results are attached. (See SR No. 06-10).
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 06-6) – J. Tanel:

J. Tankel moved to approve SD 06-6 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate – Graduate Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

c. Executive Committee (SD 06-7) – A. Karim:

A. Karim moved to approve SD 06-7 (Approval of replacement member on the General Education Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 06-9) – S. Hannah:

1. **The average faculty increment last year was 3%. What was the median faculty increment?**

2. **Last year, 50% of the faculty increment was allocated by chairs and 50% was allocated by higher-level administrators. What factors affect this ratio? Is there an ideal ratio? What would it be?**

**Anne Argast
Department of Geosciences**

S. Hannah: 1) The median was 2.45 percent.

A. Argast: I think that means something. When we advertise that the average is 3 percent, maybe we ought to tell folks that the typical faculty member is only getting under 2.5 percent. I think that is a big difference, and it obviously represents a skew for several large increments to relatively few people. That may be good or bad, but I think we should acknowledge that 3 percent is not really the “average.” No, it is not the average. We talked about the average increment as being 3 percent. I think most people probably figure, OK, that is kind of the typical increment for a faculty member, but the distribution is skewed a bit.

S. Hannah: That pattern varies year to year.

J. Dahl: The salary policy for the year was a two-percent merit increment and a one-percent extraordinary merit, market and equity (EMME). So those who are trying to compare themselves to what is typical would frame it in terms of the two percent.

K. McDonald: Now I am confused. The average faculty increment was three percent?

S. Hannah: The word “average” is difficult. Three percent was allocated for faculty salaries last year. Two percent was assigned to the schools: 1.5 percent at the department level and .5 percent at the dean’s level. One percent was allocated at my level for EMME, which was divided between equity and merit. The median increase for faculty last year was 2.45 percent, which means that 2 percent was at the school level. There was more money to spread across the 372 full-time faculty.

J. Grant: Should that not then say the “potential” faculty increment was three percent? It was not the average.

S. Hannah: I did not write the question.

G. Volland: You have to cut out equity when you start talking about the potential faculty increases. Merit is one thing, equity is something else. Not everyone is eligible for equity. So I would argue that you have to take 1/3 of a percent, which is dedicated to equity. That has to be eliminated because that is from the overall pool, and only a small number would be eligible for equity in any given year. If we are talking about skewing things, that equity amount would skew things in a dramatic way. Perhaps we could think in terms that the potential pool was 2.7 percent for merit.

S. Hannah: Remember that last month we discussed possible distributions of this and that has been sent back to the Senate Executive Committee to develop a process for making recommendations to me.

G. Volland: The other thing I would argue is, if you take away the .3 percent equity, that clearly is going to adjust the 2.45 if we think in terms of merit only. We might be talking about 2.1 percent rather than 2.45. That gets it down into the equity range that people would expect.

S. Hannah: And it is compartmentalized even more, which is the second part of this question about who distributes what. Last year, 1.5 percent of it was allocated by departments according to their systems, some by committees, some by department chairs, almost always using their Promotion and Tenure criteria as the basis for merit. Chairs then recommended people to deans who had .5 percent to distribute, and then it came to me to distribute the rest of it. I distributed 70 percent on the basis of merit and 30 percent on the basis of equity. I asked the deans to send me no more than 30 percent of their faculty as eligible for that money.

H. Samavati: I only wanted to emphasize the point that Professor Argast made. The fact that the median is 2.45 percent and the mean is 3 percent only establishes that the distribution was skewed. But skewed does not mean a bad thing. Median means 50 percent got more than 2.45 percent and 50 percent got less than that. Now we do not expect that everybody gets the same average raise. Hopefully those people who had above-average productivity received a higher than the average raise.

S. Hannah: And since they are all recommended by their department chairs and the deans, one assumes that they have met some objective standard.

A. Ushenko: Perhaps it would be more productive and political to say that we investigate whether all those who got below might not have been deserving of more.

S. Hannah: 2) I am sure some of them did deserve more. This leads me to the next part of this. What are the factors that enter into this?: “50 percent of the faculty increment was allocated by the chairs (1.5%) and 50 percent allocated by higher-level administrators.” I have identified at least three factors:

1) The rules that get handed down to us from Purdue University (or if we were Indiana University, they would be handed down from Indiana University) about system-wide rules. Last year the rule was two percent and then one percent EMME. We did not control that. Those were the parameters. So then the question became, how do you decide within the two percent and how do you decide within the one percent? It would be helpful if you make your recommendations within those parameters. Do not make a recommendation on something that is impossible to do. Whatever comes down, we have to play with that.

2) A desire to spread the money to faculty who have been highly productive. If you keep the entire 3 percent at the department level, some departments have 3 people and some departments have 30 people. Reserving some for the dean allows you to reward more people in that 30-person department or everybody in the 3-person department if they deserved it. Our schools are so uneven in size. The entire business school is only 30 people. The math department has more than 20. The whole School of Education has a little more than 20 people in it. We have such uneven sizes of schools even after you get to the department level. The reason that we are trying to reserve some money at the dean’s level and at my level is to allow us to recognize faculty wherever they are in the system so they do not get caught by some artificial quota at their level. So that is the second factor.

3) By allowing, particularly, the deans who got cut out of this process for about three years to have a say. They had no say at all. And deans chafed under that, feeling that they were not able to recognize the differences in sizes of the departments for which they were responsible, or recognize the differences and reward faculty who had extraordinary years and no way to recognize that. So they asked if they could have some role to play at the school level. There they can recognize and reward up to 50 percent of their faculty by spreading the money as far as they want to. Many deans do that.

Those are three factors that affect this ratio. I could probably think of some others.

M. Nusbaumer: You said that before last year, deans did not play a role?

S. Hannah: Just for about two or three years.

M. Nusbaumer: My understanding was that anyone to be considered either for special merit or equity was required to be recommended by a chair to the dean. The dean then also participated in the recommendation process all that time.

S. Hannah: Yes. I recognize that, but what I’m saying is in their own

M. Nusbaumer: They did not have dollars to control.

S. Hannah: Correct.

M. Nusbaumer: Is it an expectation that departments have departmental increment policies?

S. Hannah: Many do.

M. Nusbaumer: But it is not an expectation that all do?

S. Hannah: No.

M. Nusbaumer: Are there some departments where it is entirely up to the unspecified decision of the chair?

S. Hannah: Right. Departments vary. It could be a recommendation of this body to departments. Some departments have committees. Some leave it up to the chair. I tell deans and chairs that whatever they do, they have to be able to defend it, in public if necessary, so be sure you have a good reason. I think folks have operated with that in mind. Be sure that whatever decisions you make you have the data you need to show why you made the decisions. Somebody else looking at it might have made a different decision – that is always true, but you have to be able to justify your decisions in a way that can be understood by other people. This is a public institution.

G. Volland: Sometimes I hear in these discussions people say, “Well, it is only two or three percent. It’s not that much money – what is the big deal?” But actually the big deal is if a person receives a little more or a little less than his/her colleagues, that does have an impact on morale. And so any type of process that we think works for our particular unit is important, and we need to return to those processes and review them periodically to determine whether it is working. Sometimes I think some people tend to shrug and say that it is not that much money involved. It does make a difference in people’s personal attitudes. I would like to know, personally, what different models there are across the campus so that we can perhaps look at those and see if in fact those would be better fits for certain schools.

S. Hannah: You mean, at the department level?

G. Volland: Yes. The school level is a little more dicey. I will say that I do appreciate your 3rd factor, where the deans actually have a little pot of money to distribute. So I thank you for that.

S. Troy: Is it the expectation that every department has these policies written down?

S. Hannah: No.

S. Troy: How would we as faculty know how the procedure goes in our department?

S. Hannah: I think that would be a discussion that you would have with your chair.

A. Argast: I would like to echo Dean Volland's comments. As a practical suggestion, I think we should advertise the median a little more aggressively because of what the dean is saying. When we hear the phrase "the average percent," a person looks at his own little envelope, and it says 2.5 percent, and that is a shock to the psyche. The person might think he did as well as the typical person on campus. I think the median number has a value to be advertised. Or maybe the dollar amount should be advertised. I am not trying to draw a value judgment on these results – I am not prepared to do that at this time. We are taking care of that upper end, but we take money away from the lower end, justifiably so, as there are clearly people who are not a productive part of the IPFW community. There are clearly people who, for a variety of reasons, deserve very high raises. But then there is the average person who is working hard, doing his job, but he is not going to get promoted to full professor in his lifetime. He is not going to rise routinely into that elite 30 percent that is going to get the notice of the dean or the vice chancellor, or the chancellor. So that person is really valuable, but he/she is not going to be even making it to the inflation rate. And I do concern myself with people like that who, after 10, 20, or 30 years, really lose a spark of vitality because we treated them poorly.

S. Hannah: I am overwhelmed by what it is you are trying to do with so little money. I just received a report on faculty salaries against CUPA this year. There are 39 full professors at this institution that make at least 15 percent below the national average for their rank. Now let's cut out everybody who has been promoted in the last five years. I still have 20 people who are around \$15,000 - \$20,000 below where they need to be. If I addressed all of those, all the money would be gone. I am overwhelmed by the size of the problem versus what I have to do with it. When I saw those numbers this weekend, I was overwhelmed. It would take every penny I have, and I still would not be able to address that group.

K. McDonald: Is there a way of parceling out the equity versus merit? I really think that would be helpful.

S. Hannah: Yes. We already do that.

K. McDonald: If I understood the conversation correctly, this three percent . . .

S. Hannah: We can take that and set it aside.

K. McDonald: It would be nice to have what was the mean in terms of merit.

S. Hannah: Minus the equity issues. Last year I only spent 30 percent. It was less because the last several years before that I spent as much as half. This problem is so huge and I am so appalled by it. I am trying to come up with something that is clear and defensible. I feel like I am going backwards. I started on this ten years ago. I am not sure I am any further ahead than I was then.

A. Ushenko: This may be a naïve question, and I have no ax to grind because I am neither extreme myself. What is the point in not paying people equally for equal service and raising people in rank for length of service? You assume that faculty are competent and productive people. Why do people need special rewards? Many faculty are ambitious, and if they are ambitious, they will get special recognition. Sometimes that brings monetary benefits within itself. Other times it brings benefits to the institution, but that is good for all of us, including faculty.

S. Hannah: You are right. Both Indiana and Purdue Universities have taken different paths in the way they dole out faculty increments. Both universities base any increment on the basis of merit. There is not anything you or I can do about it, and neither Board of Trustees would support a change.

H. Samavati: I totally understand Professor Ushenko's point of view: if everybody engages in pursuit of knowledge and we all work hard, why do only a few people have to be distinguished? They only award the Nobel Prize to one person. Suppose after you get your tenure then you decide whether you will meet your classes and go back. The few dollars that you discussed that would be allocated to those people who get more of them get more of them because pursuit of knowledge is there. However, if we give everybody the same increment, then we destroy incentive to do or not to do. Those of us who are tenured, we all have other interests, what if we decide to not work as hard?

S. Hannah: It is an interesting discussion, but pointless, because that decision has already been made years ago. That is the system that we are in.

S. Hannah: The next part of this question is "Is there an idea ratio?" I will turn it over to you and the Senate Executive Committee who, I assume, will be trying to make some recommendations on the ratio between equity and merit and between which levels do what. I want to address the basic inequity in the sizes of the units on this campus as well as the differences in performance, which Professor Samavati points out. Most of you do not give all A's.

N. Younis: Does Purdue recommend that distribution to be 2 + 1 or require the distribution to be 2 + 1?

S. Hannah: It is a requirement. It is one percent extraordinary merit and market equity (EMME). One percent is the extraordinary merit. My counterpart on the main campus does not even give that one percent to everybody. She gives it to some schools and not to others. They are responding to their particular situation.

I will refer to others how much discretion we have about at what level the one percent is distributed. I believe we have some discretion about the one percent.

J. Dahl: I would add that I believe that we have a bias toward continuing the current approach to salaries, and that is to set a merit percentage number and an EMME percentage number, but this is a decision that is reached from scratch each year depending on funds

available. There were universities in this state who had fewer funds available this year than last year. They ended up with a substantially different salary policy.

S. Hannah: We are extremely fortunate being at IPFW. Our enrollment is solid. We are not going backwards and a number of schools are. So we do have a different situation.

M. Nusbaumer: Purdue dictates, if I understand this correctly, that we have one percent EMME, and then Walt Branson said the distribution of that, however, can be at any level?

S. Hannah: He said it is not forewarned ...

M. Nusbaumer: Would it be accurate for me to say, given that situation, that what this university has done is instead of giving two percent to the departments and one percent to EMME, that really half a percent of that two percent has gone to the deans and that we are really spending one and a half percent on EMME because the deans are also giving another half percent on exceptional merit and equity, and the departments are only getting one and a half percent?

S. Hannah: I would not call that EMME, because they are trying to use their money to deal with the equity issue across their school, and also to recognize the difference in the 3-person department and the 20-person department. So that is what that money has been used for. Now you and your colleagues on the Executive Committee are going to make some other recommendations.

M. Nusbaumer: One point of clarification: the Executive committee is not working on recommendations in terms of direct salary increments. What we are working on are recommendations for a process.

S. Hannah: In the end, there is an important vote on how that will work, and that is the chancellor.

M. Nusbaumer: So now, what we have done in last year's increments, given your terminology, is we have the one percent EMME that is handled by the central administration and then there is another half percent to address exceptional merit and equity at the dean's level.

S. Hannah: No, the dean does not hand out any equity money at all. They look across their whole school and deal with that issue. All the equity money is handed out at my level. Does that help?

G. Voland: You are correct. I have no equity funds to distribute. I have been in different situations as a faculty member and as an administrator at different universities. I have been in a situation where the department chair controls all of the raise pool – we will take equity out of this. It is distributed among the faculty members in that department. The dean, vice chancellors, etc. have no role in that. There is a problem with that because the people who are making those decisions have a local view of what exceptional performance is within

their group and different departments; and faculty within those departments perform at different levels, so it is helpful to have some of the money distributed by someone who has a broader view. That is where I think the dean comes in, that is why I appreciate having some funds to distribute.

On the other hand, I have been in places where the faculty and the chairs have virtually no role in that distribution. Everything is done at the chancellor or vice chancellor level. And that is bad because they may not have a sufficiently detailed understanding of why different fields and different types of research and activities are harder to be successful in than others. They may not be able to distinguish between one area and others.

So, you need to have a balance. I wish there were a model that would just fit all sizes and work for all of us. I do not think that we are necessarily at the perfect model yet, but I prefer our model to those extremes I have dealt with in the past. The extremes do not work, I can testify to that.

S. Hannah: The more local the decision making the more likely prejudice and inequity abound.

G. Volland: But I do not know what the percentages or proportions should be.

8. New business: There was no new business.
9. Committee reports “for information only”: There were no reports.
10. The general good and welfare of the University:

L. Kuznar: I have a question about the reorganization of the Learning Resource Center and the placement especially of the photographic services that Elmer Denman typically did, and the graphic artists. Now that that has been reorganized, how do faculty still have access to those folks?

S. Hannah: The Learning Resource Center has been phenomenally successful at this institution and has made itself absolutely essential to a lot of people. As it grew and took on more and more responsibility, it was clear that more and more of those responsibilities were not directly related to the academic mission of the institution. So the decision was made – and this discussion started about eight years ago – that perhaps LRC had grown past its organizational structure. So we have been going through a process as a way to disaggregate it in order to keep for Academic Affairs those pieces that were directly related to the academic mission. The graphic artists and the photographers have all gone to Publications, so where does one call when you want those services? We will notify you once we know the contact departments and numbers. For now, you would call Publications. You did get an announcement about instructional technology: the permanent equipment. Joseph McCormick is here, and he is now in charge of all that. Permanent classroom technology has gone there. The audio visual event support will go to operations in Physical Plant. Right now you will still probably call Jane Whitcraft.

W. Branson: The physical moves probably will not happen, with a couple of exceptions, until next summer. So in the short term you can use the same numbers.

S. Hannah: We will get you where you need to go. The other pieces of it, the direct two-way classrooms and television classrooms, will stay with the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, because they are directly supportive of that instructional program.

M. Wolf: With regard to instructional technology in the classroom, Joseph McCormick has done a fabulous job updating and going to a new model. I know 50+ faculty have had input to what it is – it is a very impressive technology cart. All these external components will be put on one cart. It will be simple to use, and that will go into 21 classrooms over this break. Nineteen will be in Kettler Hall, and two in Engineering and Technology. From there, the move forward is to do every room on campus that does not have technology. Eventually they will retrofit. This model is impressive. If some of you have not seen it, there will be an open house in KT 205B, on the 17th of January, from 3-5 p.m. You are going to love it.

The second thing is what is going on with the reorganization of the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, Learning Resource Center, and Information Technology Services. From the functioning end, what do you do? The Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee (ACITAS) is having an open house before next semester starts, question and answer time. Gail Rathbun will be there. The idea is so that you will know who to call because the reorganization is currently still under way. So we will have a better grasp at that time who to contact for certain things. That will be at 11:00 a.m. on January 5 in Kettler 046. That will answer some questions. You will get information on that.

W. Branson: The chancellor asked me to mention that he has submitted his annual report to Jacqui for inclusion in the minutes.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty