

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Ninth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
December 14, 2009
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 9, 2009
3. Acceptance of the agenda – B. Abbott
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
 - b. Purdue University – R. Barrett
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – S. Davis
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 09-9) – M. Nusbaumer
7. a. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 09-10)
b. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 09-11)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-12) – A. Livschiz
 - b. Executive Committee (memo sent to EPC for action) – B. Abbott
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: S. Davis
Parliamentarian: A. Downs
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen
Secretary: J. Petersen

Attachment:

“Results of the Election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review” (SR No. 09-13)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, N. Adilov, A. Argast, R. Barrett, S. Batagiannis, S. Beckman, W. Branson, J. Burg, C. Crisler, J. Dalby, Y. Deng, P. Dragnev, C. Drummond, E. Foley, J. Garrison, J. Grant, R. Hile, P. Iadicola, J. Jackson, R. Jensen, D. Liu, A. Livschiz, W. McKinney, D. Miller, D. Moore, G. Mourad, D. Mueller, P. Ng, M. Nusbaumer, K. Pollock, D. Redett, J. Tankel, C. Thompson, A. Ushenko, W. Utesch, G. Wang (ENGR), L. Wark, M. Wartell, R. Weiner, M. Wolf

Senate Members Absent:

S. Ashur, S. Dhawale, R. Elaver, R. Gregory, K. Leonard, H. Luo, J. Mohammed,
C. Nicholson, M. Ridgeway, Z. Todorovic, J. Toole, G. Voland, G. Wang (PHYS)

Faculty Members Present: J. DiClementi, M. Drouin, L. Finke, D. Townsend, L. Vartanian

Visitors Present: S. Alderman, J. Dahl, Fox 55 News, M. Franke, P. McLaughlin, K. Soderland
(*Journal Gazette*)

Acta

1. Call to order: S. Davis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 9, 2009: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

B. Abbott moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to thank Purdue President Córdoba for getting back to me on an inquiry. Also I would like to thank her for placing an Indiana University representative on the review committee for Chancellor Wartell for the first time in Purdue's history.

I wish all of you peace on earth and good will to all!

- b. Purdue University:

R. Barrett: Thank you to Vice Chancellor McKinney who has moved the academic side of the safety on our campus forward. He took the approach that this is not an option for IPFW. Probably by the end of the year, all of our labs (the academic side) will be safety certified. That is really an important measure.

The salary decisions are out via the annual report from West Lafayette. Vice Chancellor Branson let me know that they were out in December. They are now in the Helmke Library if anyone would like to go and review his salary.

The chancellor review is going on – it is the five-year review by President Córdoba. There was a notice out to everyone who would like to have input: faculty/staff/administrator. You have an opportunity to send any feedback you would like. It is going to go to Victor Lechtenberg, who is an associate vice provost at West Lafayette.

There are three things I picked up in the last week or so that I thought are really interesting from the Board of Trustees meeting. The core curriculum issue at West Lafayette now has a faculty committee of 34 people. There are no course specifics at this point, just areas and a number of credit hours that will be required. They are saying they will have it to their Educational Policy Committee in March and to their Senate before the year is over.

Purdue-Calumet contacted me while I was down there, and said they heard IPFW has the best Promotion and Tenure process around. They would like to have a copy of it. I said we would be glad to share.

For the first time I heard a few data points about retention that is from Core 40. This came from Purdue-Northwest. They have fewer than 1,000 students. Their faculty is looking into the whole issue, but they noted that Core 40 with the honors format courses, that their retention rate is 72 percent; and 3 math courses, their retention rate is 55 percent. Somebody who they accept without being Core 40 would only have 2 or fewer math courses, and their retention rate was 30 percent. There may be some data points to start looking at.

Everybody have a wonderful holiday season!

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – S. Davis:

S. Davis: I wish everyone a happy holiday season.

Today is the election for the Indiana University Board of Review, which is the first of a few elections we are going to be having. One of the elections will be for Presiding Officer for next year. I am going to step down and run for the Indiana University Speaker position because Mike has served out his two terms.

I want to encourage you to think about getting involved, and I hope I can run against a full slate, because I would like to see more people involved in faculty governance. The Presiding Officer position is a great position to be in except you cannot get into debate. In the interest of transparency, over the years it has evolved from a bonus. There is a stipend that goes with this position and the two Speaker positions. I just wanted to let you know about that. It is a \$3,000 stipend that goes with the position for Presiding Officer, Indiana University Speaker, and Purdue Speaker. You pick up some duties. You go to several meetings. We have an hour or hour-and-a-half leadership meeting after every Senate meeting with the chancellor and the vice chancellor. You go to board of directors meetings, and down to the Indiana Commission on Higher Education. That is usually a two-day trip, for which the chancellor picks up the overnight stay. You get a couple of calls each semester from the chancellor. So actually, the hourly pay is not that great, but I encourage you to think about taking on this responsibility.

A motion was made to amend the agenda by discussing No. 7.a. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 09-11) at this point.

Motion passed unanimously.

7. a. Question Time: (Senate Reference No. 09-11):

Q: (Please refer to the attached questions).

M. Wartell: 1. We feel that, as a responsible employer and a student-centered organization, we remain committed to offering access to affordable and high-quality child care. It would be ideal if we could have it on campus, but that is not possible right now. While this arrangement is not on campus, it is our belief that the arrangement with The Learning Center (TLC) will allow the university to meet its commitment to addressing almost all of our goals, and those of the child care taskforce, with regard to child care. With respect to permanence, any arrangement is subject to change if it is found to be inadequate or if a better alternative presents itself. Obviously, if we want to have child care, we are going to look at those alternatives.

2. We believe that it is in the university's best interest for the arrangement with TLC to be successful. Should that prove not to be the case, we will work immediately to identify alternatives to pursue the commitment that I mentioned in the last answer.

3. The decision to cooperate with TLC in offering child care service was based on consultation which represented the child care taskforce. These include subsequent conversations with various members of the campus community and conversations during Senate meetings. There have been four to five years of discussion about child care. We believe that the consultation issue has been met.

4. TLC has already demonstrated a cooperative spirit in employing the members of our current staff as well as a substantial portion of our current student staff. They will be adopting our current curriculum which will transfer directly. This will assure availability of part-time service and the adoption of a rate structure that we had in place for this year, plus the minimal change in rate structure that we had planned to implement for the coming year.

5. We already have a major part of the faculty over there that are adopting the current curriculum. Unlike most privately owned day care centers, TLC will operate in association with IPFW. The university will continue to monitor operations at TLC to ensure that it is providing quality care consistent with our commitment. In moving forward, there is going to be a parents' council that will provide feedback and advice on how things are going with TLC. If we are not satisfied, we will make sure that changes are made.

6. I do not know how they could be more a part of the arrangement because we moved to a full-time child care facility because of the needs of the faculty. Child care needs of the faculty are a part of the arrangement. TLC will be providing full-time care, and it will be honoring the current rate for service to faculty and staff through the end of the academic year. Those rates will then be raised, as I mentioned, by the same amount as was planned for our child care center.

7. There were no funds set aside for the on-campus center. Some portion of the proceeds from the lease at the property at Hobson and Crescent would have been used for relocation costs. It is likely that some portion of those proceeds will be used to move

forward to help ensure affordable rates at TLC for members of the IPFW community. In other words, we are subsidizing both student and faculty child care at TLC in order to make the rates affordable.

M. Wolf: I was at the meeting where these questions were discussed. Question No. 7, just as clarification, also meant in-kind expenses that the university performed for the day care center.

M. Wartell: You mean what it is spending right now?

M. Wolf: Yes.

M. Wartell: We are probably going to have to use a significant portion of that to continue to subsidize it, but we were subsidizing child care on the campus to the tune of about \$1,000/student; and there were 107 students there. We were putting slightly over \$100,000 into our current child care center. Part of that was student-initiated, and I do not know exactly what is going to happen. We may be paying part of the salary of some of the people who were taken over to that new center. We will be subsidizing.

M. Wolf: There are two sources of funding: there are student fees that pay for salary now, and then the in-kind.

M. Wartell: In-kind does not exactly have a value. If we knock down that building, that is part of in-kind that can never be recovered.

M. Wolf: True, but it is an expense now. That was part of the concern for the people who may be looking to long-term care.

W. Branson: I am having trouble with the terminology: in-kind. If you are talking about utilities that we would save, that is not going to be that much money. It will just get absorbed into the rest of the utility budget. I am not sure what else there would be besides that.

M. Wartell: It is just that they are very hard to calculate in that they are just a part of everything else that we do. If there were specific projects that we could point to; i.e., putting on a new roof, it would be easy to evaluate that. On-going maintenance is a little harder to evaluate.

A. Ushenko: I have no questions that are about procedure. Thank you for the clarification, but I was aware of this going on for some time and did not pay too much attention initially. I just want to put this on record: I have students who were just fanatically happy with the child care that they had and ecstatic about the personnel. They have been upset, and this is understandable, but I just wanted to put on record that apparently the services were outstanding. If there is any possible way that some of these employees could become part of the center at TLC, it would make people very, very happy.

M. Wartell: Obviously some have been. Had we pursued the option of renting the church property, we could not have expanded to full-time child care to infants and toddlers. This affords us the ability to do exactly that.

A. Ushenko: Thank you.

M. Wolf: To reaffirm some answers, one of the questions concerned about the pros of this move, and I, in full disclosure, suggested this building so people at IPFW had somewhere to move to. So, just in full disclosure, the expansion of services is excellent; but, I guess one of the concerns people have are that, while TLC is hiring people, they are losing benefits. These people are losing something, and they were good employees. In fact, (I am not sure if the director was hired), she certainly ran a tremendous day care. I think, in this economy, there is the notion that people are being left out of a job and without benefits. That is the way of the world; however, is there something the university can do in recognition of this?

M. Wartell: In terms of benefits, we have looked into that and are extending some benefits. In terms of the hiring, I am not going to discuss the personnel issues involved.

R. Hile: I was at the Chancellor's Chat, and we were talking about the need for a donor to build an on-campus center. I had the impression that, at the university I was at before, there was the concept in place that the child care center did have an instructional purpose. I wondered how we see that as a model for representing it in this way to get state funding to help.

M. Wartell: We probably could get some state funding, but it is a percentage of usage. The fundamental use is as a child care center. Actually, the education program, in my understanding, could not use the current child care arrangement because it was not full time and not accredited in the same way. Now the education program will be able to use the TLC child care center, so that is an advantage of the TLC child care center. As a percentage of use, I do not see how we could justify much more than ten percent to go after state money. When you talk about ten percent of the funding, we would still need that major donor.

George McClellan can speak to what is happening, for example, throughout the Indiana University system child care, which is very interesting. A lot of our sister campuses are cutting way back. Child care is subsidized as far as I know in every campus.

G. McClellan: In our sister institutions across the Indiana University system, one of them has actually dropped its child care. The others are all heavily subsidizing it; and, at some of those campuses, it is starting to cause a ripple about, in light of the current economic situation, what they are going to do.

Some universities in the system have chosen to move from an educational model to more of a babysitting kind of a model. As the chancellor said, we remain committed to this vision of quality child care: child care as an educational enterprise, not just "keeping kids safe for a certain number of hours" kind of model. I think we are still at the forefront of the pack in terms of thinking about expanding our services. Nobody else was talking

about expanding services. A number of them have already diminished services or are in the process of rethinking where they are.

Purdue Northwest (I think) has a head start program, and they are essentially operating a community dayschool. Very few of the young people who are served through that center are actually the children of students, faculty, or staff. They are really operating a community child care. So it is kind of a different creature. It just sort of stands apart as a model from some of the others. Our vision that was articulated that we pursue is one of getting through TLC at this point where it is full-time accredited.

M. Wartell: I think two of them have moved to non licensure.

G. McClellan: Two of them have moved from an educational model to more of a day-care model. One of them is considering moving its child care center away from its School of Education to a different arrangement. Again, most of those are responses to stable enrollments and rising costs, and also concerns that they have not been able to fully, in the constraints of their economic situation, realize the model of an educational attachment. I did not talk to the two flagships: Indiana University Bloomington and Purdue West Lafayette.

M. Wartell: They also have a large number of graduate students with families, so they have more of a critical mass of students that we just do not have.

M. Wartell: I want to take this opportunity to address the general good and welfare. One of the things we need to do is rename the Classroom Medical building. It is becoming confusing to have two buildings with the word medical in them. I am going to be sending out a letter to all of the occupants of Classroom Medical, and I will accept any feedback that you want to give. I would like to change the name to Liberal Arts. Since nursing is going to occupy that building, I have already had a talk with them. They are not going to object very much because nursing would like to be seen as a liberal art. I just wanted to give you a heads up that that is happening.

You will be seeing a lot of information on the governor's six-percent cut. You received my memo, and the president's memo. West Lafayette right now is looking at more draconian measures than we are. I hope that we will be able to weather that storm without using any of those. Enrollments are holding for spring. I do not know if you have seen the numbers, but we are still over ten percent ahead in credit hours. That is very good for us because in terms of the governor's takeback, we can afford to give back a good deal as the result of the enrollment change.

The strategic plan report which I usually give in November is not being required by the Purdue Board of Trustees until the spring, so I will give that report to you in the spring when I give it to the Board of Trustees.

The athletic report will be published in the not-too-distant future. I apologize for having to leave the meeting.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SR No. 09-9) – M. Nusbaumer:

J. Burg and J. Summers distributed ballots for the election of the Faculty Board of Review. The results are attached. (See SR No. 09-13).

7. b. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 09-10):

What is the reason behind making class dismissal an option, that is decided by faculty, when there is a bomb threat in the building in which they are teaching?

Peter Iadicola, Chair
Department of Sociology

W. Branson: I did communicate with Peter Iadicola a couple of times to clarify the question. Based on that I think the issue is “how can anyone make a decision to evacuate when they do not know anything about the threat?”

The “optional” evacuation procedure was implemented and used a few years ago. It worked more smoothly then, but it was during a time when we were having multiple threats. When you get back to the question, I honestly cannot answer that question, but I can fix the problem.

The way to solve the problem is to eliminate the “optional” evacuation procedure. Given that, our plans right now for the future are not to have optional evacuations.

J. Grant: How will people be notified, because I thought about this last time. I usually turn my phone off during class.

W. Branson: If you are in a building where the bomb is supposedly located, the alarm system goes off in the building.

R. Barrett: Did it go off in Kettler?

W. Branson: No. In the “optional” method, it did not go off. In an evacuation bomb threat, it does go off.

J. Summers: Something came up in the Chancellor’s Chat last week that I would mention. I turn off my phone during class, but it beeps if I have a text message. Is there any way to switch the call to a text, because I received a text from someone that said, “By the way, there is a bomb threat. Are you in that building?” So I knew about it; otherwise, I would not have known.

W. Branson: Our emergency notification system will not handle texts because text is actually very slow, and we have found that has not been effective even in systems that have that. Right now, we do not have a way to do text. We are going to keep looking at that, though, as a possibility for the future.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-12) – A. Livschiz:

Senate Reference No. 09-12 (Audiology and Speech Sciences name change to Communication Sciences and Disorders) was presented for information only.

b. Executive Committee:

(Proposed Amendment to IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Changing of Auditing Option (for information only – [submitted to Educational Policy Committee for action])

S. Davis: This is sort of new. Professor Downs had pointed out that when the Executive Committee sends a task to a committee, the Senate should be notified. We usually just send it to the proper committee. The idea is, if we notify you via this, then you can have input to that committee; otherwise, you would not even know that committee received it.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to formally thank the employees of the IPFW day care for their service to this campus.

Also, I would like to thank Walt Branson for making the correct decision on the bomb threat issue.

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

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-12) – A. Livschiz:

Senate Reference No. 09-12 (Audiology and Speech Sciences name change to Communication Sciences and Disorders) was presented for information only.

b. Executive Committee:

(Proposed Amendment to IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Changing of Auditing Option (for information only – [submitted to Educational Policy Committee for action])

S. Davis: This is sort of new. Professor Downs had pointed out that when the Executive Committee sends a task to a committee, the Senate should be notified. We usually just send it to the proper committee. The idea is, if we notify you via this, then you can have input to that committee; otherwise, you would not even know that committee received it.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to formally thank the employees of the IPFW day care for their service to this campus.

Also, I would like to thank Walt Branson for making the correct decision on the bomb threat issue.

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



Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty

MEMORANDUM

TO: Indiana University Faculty

FROM: Michael Nusbaumer, Chair
Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs

DATE: 14 December 2009

SUBJ: Results of the Faculty Board of Review Election

The following faculty members were elected to serve on the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review by Indiana University Senators. Their terms are from 1 February 2010 to 31 January 2011.

Stevens Amidon
Margit Codispoti
Ahmad Karim
Michael Nusbaumer (chair)
Audrey Ushenko

Alternates:

Augusto De Venanzi (1st alternate)
Joey Nichols (2nd alternate)
Linda Wright-Bower (3rd alternate)

Question Time

1. The university administration expressed a long-term commitment to a high-quality, full-time, *on-campus* center. The proposed arrangement does not meet this goal. Is the TLC arrangement seen as temporary? Is the university still committed to the long-term goal of a high-quality, on-campus center which is an integral part of the university community?
2. If the arrangement is not seen as temporary, how will the university proceed if the arrangement is not found to be financially viable for TLC, and it must again close?
3. Why was this decision made with no consultation with affected constituencies?
4. This arrangement has been described as a “cooperation to pursue mutual goals.” How is that “cooperation” to be demonstrated as we move forward? At the very least, we would like to see a university staff member, such as Lynda Place, in the role of liaison between the campus and TLC, as well as a board of directors with members from among the faculty, staff, and students.
5. How can we be assured that the quality of the care provided at TLC will equal that of the current IPFW Child Care Center? It is rare that privately-owned day-care centers operated for profit can offer care that approaches the quality of nonprofit centers, especially those operated by universities.
6. Why were the child care needs of faculty not part of the arrangement? As noted above, the fee structure puts those seeking part-time care, and care that is matched to the university’s schedule, at a significant disadvantage relative to the current center.
7. What will happen to funds that were set aside for the on-campus center, and to the cost savings from “outsourcing” the child care?