

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Fifth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
December 12, 2005
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 14, 2005
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University – B. Fife
 - b. Purdue University – N. Younis
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion
6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 05-6) – D. Turnipseed
7. Committee reports requiring action
 - Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 05-7) – B. Fife
8. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 05-8)
9. New business
10. Committee reports “for information only”
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment*

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

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

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, A. Argast, R. Bean, W. Branson, J. Burg, C. Champion, M. Codispoti, S. Davis, P. Dragnev, C. Erickson, B. Fife, R. Friedman, J. Grant, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, C. Hill, P. Iadicola, A. Karim, L. Kuznar, L. Lin, D. Lindquist, M. Lipman, L. Meyer, M. Montesino, G. Moss, G. Mourad, D. Mueller, A. Mustafa, E. Neal, D. Oberstar, E. Ohlander, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, S. Tannous, J. Toole, G. Volland, M. Walsh, L. Wark, M. Wartell, N. Younis, J. Zhao

Senate Members Absent:

S. Blythe, J. Brennan, D. Erbach, L. Fox, D. Goodman, P. Goodmann, Z. Liang, R. Murray, S. Troy

Attachments:

[“Results of the Election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review”](#) (SR 05-9)
[“Athletics Report for 2005”](#) (Attachment A)

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, A. Rassuli

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, K. Stockman (*Journal Gazette*)

Acta

1. Call to order: G. Bullion called the meeting to order at 12:02.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 14, 2005: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Grant moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

B. Fife: I believe that early 2006 promises to be a fruitful time for the IPFW community. The work of the Call for Action groups, the ongoing strategic plan initiative, and the challenge of equitable funding are some issues, among others, that will likely be focal points in a growing dialogue which really centers on IPFW's future as a public institution of higher education in Indiana. This discussion is needed, and I welcome it. In advance, I wish all of you a peaceful and joyous holiday season.

- b. Purdue University:

N. Younis: Hello, colleagues. I went to the mall recently. I saw a line of faculty from other universities waiting to see “the Santa of all holidays for all people.” He granted each of us three wishes and granted me two additional wishes. The other faculty asked Santa why I was granted five wishes when they were only granted three. Santa said, “I can give you a long list of reasons, but for the sake of time, I will give you only two.”

1. He is from IPFW which is becoming the University of Diversity.
2. Look at that babe, the “Mastodon.”

One faculty member from a local university questioned Santa, “What about the Mastodon?” Santa told him, “The Mastodon program raised \$200,000 that was given to the United Way.”

Regarding the delivery, Santa said that IPFW is growing fast and there are more buildings than there were ten years ago. Therefore, Santa will deliver the wishes to the building that publicizes the accomplishment of the Mastodon program the most. I think we should publicize this endeavor to current and prospective students and their families as well as the community.

My five wishes to Santa were the following:

1. Every IPFW employee will make at least the national average salary in his or her area of work.
2. We will be able to modernize every classroom on campus and upgrade all the labs at IPFW.
3. We are off to a good start in the athletic arena by joining a conference in soccer; I wish we would join a conference for all sports. Rudely, I was interrupted by a colleague from another university when he asked Santa, “How about us? We have a football program.” I decided to stay out of that discussion. However, Santa told her, “It is not like you have the Nebraska football mystique.”
4. Student test results will be above the national average on professional exams and be successful in finding employment in their fields.
5. Lastly, but the most important and biggest wish I have, is to enhance the collegial faculty atmosphere. My colleagues need to reflect when dealing with differences. By the nature of our profession, we discuss and have dialogue about several issues. We can and should disagree on many things, but we should never lose the respect for each other. We might have differences, but never should we get to the point where we lose sight of the mission of IPFW. I am positive that the overwhelming majority of the faculty, if not all, is very concerned about the students. An unhealthy atmosphere between colleagues will precipitate to the students. Therefore, I would like to ask all faculty to take this time between semesters to reflect upon their relationships with their colleagues. Sometimes it is hard to reconcile the differences. I offer my services to all of you to call upon me to discuss any matter to enhance the collegiality. I will be glad to sit with any two parties or sides to hopefully solve any problem that might exist between faculty members. I am sure that my esteemed colleague, Speaker Fife, will do the same.

Thank you and Happy Holidays!

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion: There was no report.
6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 05-6) – D. Turnipseed:

D. Turnipseed read the memorial resolution for John Manzer. A moment of silence was observed.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SR No. 05-7) – B. Fife:

B. Fife distributed ballots for the election of the Faculty Board of Review. The ballots were delivered to the Secretary. The results are attached. (See SR No. 05-9).

8. Question Time:

There has been confusion to some faculty as to what issues the Indiana University Handbook controls in relation to Indiana University-mission faculty.

Listed below are 4 specific areas of concern. Please comment

- a. whether each is covered by the Indiana University Handbook,
- b. if not, why not, and
- c. the appropriate IPFW or Purdue document that supersedes the Indiana University Handbook (specific sites would be appreciated).

1. Salary and equity adjustments (e.g., merit criteria).
2. Promotion and tenure decision criteria.
3. Promotion and tenure decision due process.
4. Ethical violations and grievances.

Finance

Stan Davis
Department of Accounting and

S. Hannah:

The questions concern the relationship between the Indiana University Academic Handbook and various decision making processes at IPFW. I would like to address them in order of exclusive to shared governance. I believe that most of the documents I cite are already on the Senate web page or the OAA web page. Others could be added if that would be helpful.

1. **Salary.** Salary policy for IPFW faculty is set by Purdue University under the terms of the Management and Academic Mission Agreement for Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, Sec. 5. Faculty, which states that “initial salary levels, and subsequent adjustments will be established by Purdue University in consultation with Indiana University” for faculty in Indiana University Mission areas. In practice, IPFW faculty salaries are set here at IPFW and are approved (routinely) by Purdue. Indiana University has delegated its approval to the chancellor. Note that the overall salary policy at IPFW, although within Purdue policy, is consistent with the *Salary Policy* principles outlined in the Indiana University Academic Handbook. For example, the Indiana University principles state that merit and equity, with merit holding primacy, are the factors on which salary adjustments should be made.
2. **Ethical Violations and Grievances.** Here the question of which parent institution’s policy takes precedence depends upon the issue. If we are talking about charges of discrimination, all IPFW faculty – Indiana University and Purdue University mission – are covered by the *Purdue Procedures for Resolving Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment*. Purdue policies also govern questions concerning conflict of interest (C-39), integrity in research (C-22), intellectual property (B-10), and nepotism (C-37).

If we are talking about complaints on other subjects, the roads divide. Indiana University-mission faculty may follow the non-reappointment appeal process, the Indiana

University Code of Academic Ethics Violation process, or the Faculty Board of Review process described in the Indiana University Academic Handbook as appropriate. Purdue-mission faculty follow the Purdue procedure as spelled out in SD 98-14: *Grievance Procedures for Purdue Academic Personnel at IPFW*.

3. **P&T Criteria and Procedures.** At IPFW, P&T Criteria and Procedures are set down in SD 88-13 and SD 88-25, which were adopted by this Senate at the time that Indiana and Purdue mission departments were merged into larger academic units. Several faculty here today were part of that process and likely can tell you more about the context within which these important documents were developed. The important point here is that, as stated in the Commentary on SD 88-25, IPFW documents were intended to develop “one process where there had been two,” honoring “local ways of working within the Indiana University and Purdue University traditions.” Indeed, much of the language of these documents is lifted straight from the Indiana University Handbook or Purdue policy documents. The IPFW documents clearly capture Indiana/Purdue shared understandings of the differences between tenure and promotion and in academic ranks, the importance of peer review, the notion of having an area of excellence, and the importance of having criteria that reflect campus and unit missions, among others. I believe it is a tribute to the IPFW faculty who worked so hard on setting up these processes that they have remained virtually unchanged since their adoption some 17 years ago.

Perhaps those of you who worked on these documents and know this history better than I do might have comments.

S. Davis: If Purdue is handling salary and the Indiana University Board of Review is working under the Indiana University Handbook, where should a salary appeal go? Should it go to the Purdue side?

S. Hannah: In my opinion, the Indiana University Board of Review would be working within the terms of the Purdue policy. There has been a loose discussion among folks around here that maybe it is time for us to talk about one grievance policy because it can be confusing. In a number of other areas, with the Faculty Affairs Committee, we are trying to take the best of our two parents. For example, the Faculty Affairs Committee has been looking at a document, with regard to sabbaticals, where we have tried to mesh the two, taking the best part of each one. We have done that with job titles, and we have done that now with sabbaticals. There may be some other areas. It represents a maturation of the institution, developing our own unique mastodonian ways of doing things.

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

P. Iadicola: I would like to recommend that the vice chancellor execute Senate Document SD 04-14, the Senior Scholars Program, which was passed last spring in the Senate. This

past semester I have had the opportunity to have about six senior citizens of the community in my Advanced Sociology class. I must say that I first viewed this particular proposal with some degree of skepticism but, after having this group of students in my class, I found that it actually increased the amount of discussion in class. They were interested in the subject matter and learning and were very grateful. They thanked the other students and me for allowing them into the class. I really think that this could be a significant benefit to the community in terms of senior citizens being able to audit classes as long as they do have the permission of the faculty member. It also is important, as our student body gets younger and younger in terms of the age demographics, to have students who have experienced more than 20 years of life, and who can reflect on the changes that have occurred over more than half a century. I thought this was an extremely valuable experience for my students, and it was a very pleasant experience, so I would request that the vice chancellor would promote this program in the community. Many of the students were not aware of it. Promoting this among the senior citizen communities in our area as well as to the faculty will give the possible benefits of having senior citizens in your classes. I encourage the university to follow through on this policy and to monitor the results. If anyone's experience was like mine, you will be very happy with the results.

G. Bullion: I thought the policy was effective upon implementation the following year. So we should be in the implementation year. Is that correct?

M. Wartell: The current law states that senior citizens can attend for half the tuition. It is a trustee and legislature-level issue. I took it to Representative Randy Borrer and mentioned that it would be appropriate for the legislature to look at it and allow free tuition at state institutions for senior citizens. He is looking at it now. We cannot implement that policy on this campus on our own.

J. Tinkel: Last week some of you may have noticed an e-mail that was sent out about the exam policy that we had passed in the Senate last year, clarifying how that was supposed to work. In the process, I had seen the old one which was being sent around in my department. I would like to extend my thanks to Jacqui Petersen for quickly working on that and getting the University Relations website changed to be matched to our Senate website. Before going into our break I want to, in general, thank Jacqui for the work that she has done this year.

M. Wartell: I provided Jacqui with the annual report on athletics Senate had requested, and that will be appended to the minutes of this meeting. I would like to wish everyone a great holiday season. I hope you take a restful break and come back ready to do it again.

12. The meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty