

Minutes of the  
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Sixth Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne  
December 8 and 15, 1986  
Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 10, 1986
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Purdue University - D. McCants
  - b. Indiana University - S. Hollander
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-6) - M. Downs
  - b. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure (Senate Document SD 86-7) - W. Frederick (See also Senate Reference Nos. 86-4 and 86-5)
7. New business
8. The general good and welfare of the University
9. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

G. Bell, J. Carnaghi, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, F. Codispoti, L. DeFonso, R. Detraz, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, H. Garcia, L. Graham, S. Harroff, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, R. Hess, S. Hockemeyer, S. Hollander, A. Karna, F. Kirchhoff, R. Kovara, M. Laudeman, D. Mauritzen, D. McCants, E. Nicholson, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, R. Otten, J. Outland, R. Ramsey, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, D. Schmidt, J. Silver, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Stevenson, J. Sunderman, M. Temte, J. Ulmer, S. Usman, J. Violette, K. Wakley, T. Wallace, D. Wartzok, J. Wilson, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

M. Hayden, M. Kubik, C. Maile, S. Manheimer, J. Owen, K. Perry, S. Sayegh

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, G. Bullion, V. Coufoudakis, E. Cowen, T. Guthrie, D. McGee, R. Svoboda, H. van Nuis

---

Attachments:

["Amendments to SD 82-9, 'University Credit Courses in Area High Schools'"](#) (SD 86-6)

["Recommended IPFW Reorganization"](#) (SD 86-7)

["Recommendations and Rationale \[Recommended IPFW Reorganization\]"](#) (SD 86-8)

"A Minority Report to the Committee [On Academic Reorganization]" (SR No. 86-6)

Visitors Present:

J. Clinton, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, E. Franklin, M. McFarland, A. Montgomery, M. Shaffer, R. Steiner

Acta

1. Call to order: T. Wallace called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 10, 1986: The minutes were corrected as follows: page 5, line 5, the word "one-quarter" was replaced with the word "co-author." The minutes were approved as corrected.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:  
  
M. Downs moved acceptance of the agenda. Seconded.  
  
The agenda was accepted as distributed.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
  - a. D. McCants:
    - (1) I have one item to report. I offer it somewhat reluctantly because it is perhaps stale news. The Intercampus Faculty Council met November 12. Don Schmidt and I attended. The most important business was the opening statement of the Council's new presiding officer, Robert Ringel. Dr. Ringel is the newly appointed Vice President and Dean of the Graduate School. Dr. Ringel stressed that a function of his office and the Council is to ensure transferability and uniformity of standards among Purdue campuses. His remarks held interest for Don and me because he observed that some passages of the Fort Wayne academic regulations, on his dusk for review, potentially compromised principles of uniformity and transferability. I suggest that this report may be stale because I understand that Fort Wayne campus representatives have met with Dr. Ringel and that numerous concerns regarding the academic regulations have been resolved.
  - b. S. Hollander:

I would like to catch the body up on two items:

    - (1) The Educational Policy Committee chair informs me that he received this morning a proposal for a new associate degree program in Medical Record Technology. EPC will be looking at that proposal

and will make copies available to the faculty as provided for in the document (SD 85-11) passed by the Senate last year.

- (2) The Indiana University University Faculty Council has bottled up the proposal I mentioned last month from the Medical School which would have made it possible for the Medical School to appoint continuing, permanent, but non-tenure track members of the faculty. That proposal is not expected in anything like its current form to return to the University Faculty Council.

Over the weekend there was a meeting of the Indiana University Board of Trustees. A proposal from this campus to change the name of the two-year education program was presented. The current Bulletin lists the program as Education Technology. The proposal was to change the name to something more fitting: Early Childhood Education.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

I have two announcements to make that pertain to two announcements that you just heard from the speakers. The proposal before the IU Board of Trustees to change the name of our program in education to Early Childhood Education was approved. Second, regarding 85-18 (Academic Regulations and Procedures), Dr. Nicholson and I spent about three hours in West Lafayette with Dr. Ringel and the registrar. I thought it was a very productive meeting. Dr. Ringel understands the needs of the campus, and he is being very flexible in working with us. There were many points agreed to. Dr. Nicholson will be taking information to the Educational Policy Committee.

I have quite a few things on my mind which I would like to share with you. I would like to try to bring together three documents, two of which have been distributed, to try to focus attention on these matters.

First of all, I will be distributing this week to the Senate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee and to the Academic Officers Committee what I call a pre-budget planning discussion document. Prior to our beginning the budgeting process for the 1987-88 academic year, I think there are some issues that need to be discussed on campus so that we can work with our priorities and establish our priorities as a group. This will involve the AOC as well as the Senate subcommittee, but I think it needs to be discussed and viewed in wider audiences than that.

I have distributed two other documents, both of which are labeled drafts. One is a "Philosophy of Continuing Education and Public Service." I will be meeting with the Senate subcommittee shortly on that matter. The other document is a "Philosophy of Faculty Evaluation and Reward." The AOC and, the Senate subcommittee will also be seeing that document. My purpose is to get a number of very-much-related things discussed on campus not only by the administration and the Senate, but by others as well. I would like to take some time this afternoon to explain what is on my mind, and

what I hope we will work toward. I see us discussing these issues and dealing with what I think are questions of philosophy, policy, budget priorities, and planning. They are obviously tied into the strategic planning that we have already started.

I would like to start off by saying that I am greatly concerned about our enrollment picture. We are losing, in the next biennium, \$317,000 because of a decline in student credit hours. My experience has been that when this sort of thing happens, people just sort of think that that money evaporates, and sometimes they do not deal with the reasons behind the problem nor do they work to correct them. I think that while we can be happy that we have seen over the last five years a fairly stable headcount enrollment--it has fluctuated only plus or minus 1.5 percent in the last five years, due to the economy being good in Fort Wayne--the student credit hours have declined; in fact, they declined by 10 percent this year compared to 1983, which was a peak year. I think we can explain that. There were apparently a lot of people out of work who were going to school. The point is that student credit hours drive our budget, and this is a decline. I am very concerned about that.

One of the things that we are going to do immediately--we found some money, about \$50,000--is to try and do something about recruiting by increasing our advertising on radio and tv. One individual who talked to me, who is in this room, said he was home sick one day and was impressed, while watching the tv, with how much other institutions are advertising in our area. So I do not see spending this amount of money between January and next fall as the only thing we have to do, but it is a beginning.

We are working with a professional group to work with two themes: one is to project "The University," because we are a university. We are 10,500 students strong, and we have a wide variety of some 130 undergraduate and graduate programs. The other theme is choice. We provide a choice.

We are trying to get something under way as soon as possible to try to begin to prevent this erosion of enrollment, which I think has been an insidious thing. We are looking at older adults. We have to look at how we can bring together the Weekend College, summers, and evenings into a multi-year plan of offering courses. I think we have that under way, to look at that. It also involves new programming. I am hoping that by the time we get through this year with our strategic-planning process, we will not only be able to go into next fall with beginning to put together a recruiting/enrollment plan, but we will also be able to look at formats and delivery systems. So, in this budget-priority document that we will be discussing, I am suggesting that we look at the enrollment. (I am just giving you a flavor of what is in this document, which is only three pages long.) We have to look at the generation of student credit hours. How are we going to do that through advertising? We have to begin to implement, it seems to me, the outcomes of the study on the Nature and Quality of the Undergraduate Experience. We have to begin to implement some of the things coming out of the strategic-planning process this year. We are looking at new enrollments and quality. I think we have to be clear that we are also looking at teaching, research, and public service. We are not just focusing on the enrollment problem and excluding research.

Some of these things that have been proposed in the strategic-planning process already tie together very nicely--enrollment questions with research capabilities of the future.

This budget process, I want to warn you, is going to require some very, very difficult decisions on reallocation, and I speak to this in the budget document. We have some new monies, and we are losing some monies. We will try to outline that for the campus as we get that information clear. I would like to use an example of the kind of decision I think we have to, make. I am using this only as one idea--so please don't go out and say, "They have decided to put a lot of money into this." In the last couple of weeks, I have had some students talk to me, and the vice chancellors have talked to me, and others have talked to me about this. We have a communication major with a program in radio and tv. Enrollments look pretty good. A communication major then offers us an opportunity, because of the needs in this region, to increase our enrollment. We have Channel 23, which needs to have a position for an engineer. We are doing fairly well with equipment. We have gotten some support from the cable-tv fund for that. Channel 23 serves as a laboratory for our students. We have faculty vacancies there that have to be filled. What kind of faculty do we look for? It seems to me Channel 23 is also a potential delivery system for noncredit and instructional delivery in the community, as well as being a public service. That channel gets very good grades in the community with carrying Hispanic programming and some other things. I am suggesting that we have to look at courses that we are now having difficulty offering on campus because of some basic problems--difficulty in hiring instructors or, for example, we know that companies would like to have certain things on their site during the work hours because they don't want their employees traveling to campus on company time. So the question is, "Does all this make a package?" Can the tv be used to deliver more credit and noncredit programming? Is it then a good idea to invest some money here because of a major that has the appearance of having some strengths? Those are the kinds of questions we are dealing within the strategic-planning process in this priority setting.

The other two documents, the Philosophy of Faculty Evaluation and Reward and the Continuing Education and Public Service document, I think both reflect this theme we are looking at this year. What is our role in northeastern Indiana as an urban regional university? I would like to make some points pertaining to the faculty evaluation and reward document. This is labeled a draft. It is intended to get people asking questions, and they have already begun doing that because I have heard some of the questions. It is a part of this whole raising of questions, issues, and discussion. For example, I think anybody recognizes that there are various roles for faculty within and among the disciplines in a university--teaching, research, and public service. The disciplines vary; the interests of each of those three exist within a discipline. How do we reward people? Do we reward people for what we ask them to do? I think we should. What is significant public service in the evaluation and reward sector? What types of creative/scholarly works need to be recognized? I think, having just gone through some of the documentation on promotion and tenure, I would say that this idea of what is creative activities that we are recognizing could use some discussion. Do we expect more from faculty than coming to campus, meeting their classes, and leaving? I think

that these are questions that have to be addressed by this process of strategic planning. If we are saying we are going to focus on being an urban, regional university and get into things like the tv question I raised earlier, there are a lot of different faculty roles that are needed to make that go. I think one of the crucial issues that higher education has not done a very good job on is that there should be different weighting factors on the various criteria that we look at for faculty evaluation and reward as you look at the various personnel decisions that have to be made. If we want somebody working on continuing education, maybe that gets rewarded at increment time, but maybe promotion to full professorship does not weigh that [continuing education] heavily, and weighs scholarship much more.

So I am suggesting that this be discussed during the strategic-planning process. I think it is just imperative that we look at towns and cities in northeastern Indiana and ask, "What is our role as an institution to bring credit and noncredit programming to those communities?" One, because we have an enrollment problem, but that is also our mission. We have a lot of competition out there that is coming into Fort Wayne. So I think we have to look at this question as a social, economic, and cultural role we are playing in northeastern Indiana as we go through this planning process this year.

In summary, then, we are looking at mission, at image, and at research specialties. This is all part of a total picture of worrying about financial solvency as well as our future health in teaching, research, and public service. So I am looking to the vice chancellor, deans, directors, and chairs to continue these discussions. The Senate will discuss them. I am not looking for any of these documents to be adopted. I am looking for them to be discussion documents. I hope what comes out of that is a clear, department-by-department, discipline-by-discipline understanding of the mission, the image, and the message that we are trying to get out into the public. We need to bring all this together. So I see it as part of our priority-setting, goal-setting, establishing of budget, and our vision for the future in doing that.

S. Hollander: A recent editorial in one of the Fort Wayne newspapers alleged that it was your job to sell any reorganization to the faculty. I am not at all convinced of that, but since the major business of this meeting will probably be to look at academic reorganization and various proposals for it, and since you just outlined a number of the major directions in which you hope we will move this year, would you care to take advantage of this opportunity to give some of your views on the academic reorganization?

T. Wallace: I think my role is one of asking questions. I think if you look at those documents, you will see that I think I have done more raising questions than I have of giving precise, specific answers. I think, for example, as I said earlier, each academic discipline has to put together its mix of teaching, research, and public-service activities that address this urban, regional mission. I think my goal has been to raise those questions. I indicated when we started academic reorganization that I thought it was appropriate to sort of set up a target, to say, as I think I did in this group, say, "It seems to me this institution is not very different than other urban universities in the disciplines

it offers, that collect themselves about these kinds of schools." We have seen that what has come back has been something very close to what I laid out. I think that the fact that all three groups, independently, came up with something very similar is significant. Now people could say, "What do you mean independent? They had the benefit of each other's discussion." But I look at those groups and I think there are some very independent people. . . . I don't think it is my job to sell the faculty on anything in that sense of the word. I think it is my responsibility to ask questions, to hold people's feet to the fire, and handle this enrollment problem. . . . I am not going to try to tell anybody in great detail just how we're going to do it, because I think there are other people who can spend the time and have the expertise to do that. I am very comfortable with the three recommendations that have come out, because they are all

identical. I think if we had gotten 80 to 85 percent agreement in the three groups I would have been surprised and happy. The fact that we got 99 percent is phenomenal, and I am very pleased with what happened.

D. McCants: Has the campus received word of how the Commission for Higher Education ranked our budget request?

J. Carnaghi: I think Friday they are going to make their proposal known. We have seen some drafts. We had one of Purdue's lobbyists here Friday, and he said that our percentage growth, at least from what he had seen in early form, was best among the Purdue University campuses. We certainly have heard that our fine arts building is ranked second in the entire higher-education scheme of buildings, preceded only by the chemistry building in Bloomington. All in all, there was not a whole lot of money there. So while we're best in the Purdue system percentage wise, he said we're something like six percent growth the first year. That's compared to almost twelve percent in the last legislative session.

R. Hess: I appreciate the effort to celebrate the distinctiveness of the campus in this region through advertising. For our initial investment, what would you personally consider a success?

T. Wallace: I think, being a scientist, I guess I would do a linear extrapolation of our enrollment and say, "If we improve upon that for the fall and not decline, that's success." These are very difficult things to monitor, particularly short-term. Many years ago when I was in Rochester, we did something like this. It was much more extensive. It was very successful, and has remained successful, and enrollments have continued to grow even when others' are declining. I feel good about the process. We are doing it on a low budget and with a local group that hasn't done this kind of work before. We are not quite ready to go on the air, but I think what we are doing will have an impact. We are already seeing some registrations out of the Women's Center. We will continue to work on that. What are we talking about John, 400 or 500 people?

J. Carnaghi: We are down about 350 people compared to this time last year. It is a drop, but it is not as big a drop as we projected.

T. Wallace: In terms of full-time equivalent, I think we are talking about trying to find about another 300 or 400 students to come here who normally wouldn't to try and turn this trend around . . . I don't think it will happen until we get through the strategic-planning process and probably spend another year trying to put together a more sophisticated marketing/ imaging plan to get that message out there. People understanding that we have a wide variety of programs should help us, because I don't see that sense of understanding in the community. I think the fact that we draw such a large percentage of our students from such a small geographical area, and not the whole U.S., should help us be able to make some progress in a fairly short term relative to if we were drawing from the whole East coast and the Midwest also.

R. Hess: Is there any discussion concerning a target audience?

T. Wallace: Yes. We are talking about a two-prong attack: the traditional student and the older adult, part-time students. We identify about six client groups, and we are trying to hit two of them.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (SD 86-6) - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 86-6 (Amendments to SD 82-9, "University Credit Courses in Area High Schools"). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

b. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure (SD 86-7) - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick made an editorial correction to SD 86-7: to change the name of "Personnel and Supervisory Management" to "Supervisory Management and Personnel."

W. Frederick then moved to approve SD 86-7 (Proposed IPFW Reorganization Recommendations and Rationale). Seconded.

In response to a question, the chair ruled that approval of SD 86-7 would be approval of the pages labeled "Recommended IPFW Reorganization." This unchallenged ruling effectively split SD 86-7 into three parts: 1) SD 86-7 Recommended IPFW Reorganization, 2) SD 86-8 Recommendations and Rationale [for IPFW Reorganization], and 3) SR 86-6 A Minority Report to the Committee [on Academic Reorganization].

D. Onwood moved to transfer Transitional Studies from the School of Education to the School of Arts and Sciences. Seconded.

Motion failed on a show of hands.



S. Hollander moved to transfer Economics from the School of Business and Management Sciences to the School of Arts and Sciences. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander moved to delete Transitional Studies from the recommended IPFW reorganization. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 p.m.

Session II\*  
(December 15)

\*This session is not verbatim. The tape recorders did not work.

Senate Members Present:

G. Bell, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, F. Codispoti, L. DeFonso, R. Detraz, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, W. Frederick, L. Graham, J. Haw, M. Hayden, J. Hersberger, R. Hess, S. Hockemeyer, S. Hollander, F. Kirchhoff, S. Manheimer, D. McCants, E. Nicholson, D. Onwood, R. Otten, J. Outland, J. Owen, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, S. Sayegh, D. Schmidt, J. Silver, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, J. Sunderman, M. Temte, J. Ulmer, S. Usman, J. Violette, T. Wallace, D. Wartzok, J. Wilson, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

J. Carnaghi, A. Friedel, H. Garcia, S. Harroff, A. Karna, R. Kovara, M. Kubik, M. Laudeman, C. Maile, D. Mauritzen, D. Oberstar, K. Perry, R. Ramsey, K. Stevenson, K. Wakley, W. Worthley

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, G. Bullion, V. Coufoudakis, E. Cowen, A. Franz, J. Lantz, L. Meyer, L. Motz, M. Souers

Visitors Present:

J. Clinton, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, E. Franklin, M. Hile, A. Montgomery

Acta

T. Wallace called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

b. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure (SD 86-7) - W. Frederick:

A motion to approve SD 86-7 was on the floor from the previous session.

R. Detraz moved to amend SD 86-7 by changing the proposed name for the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences" to the "School of Engineering, Technology, and Applied Sciences." Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

M. Downs moved to amend SD 86-7 by moving Theatre from the School of Fine and Performing Arts to the School of Arts and Sciences. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

S. Manheimer moved to amend SD 86-7 by creating a School of Symbol Making and Communication, which would include Music, Fine Arts, Theatre, Communication, English, and Modern Foreign Languages. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander moved to amend SD 86-7 by removing Medical Education from the School of Health Professions. Seconded.

Motion failed on a show of hands.

S. Hollander moved to amend SD 86-7 by moving Gerontology from the School of Arts and Sciences to the School of Health Professions. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

A. Finco requested a written ballot. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

The motion to approve SD 86-7, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

M. Downs moved that the recommendations and rationale SD 86-8 be submitted to the Presiding Officer and chancellor for his direction and information. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

8. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs reminded the body of the Faculty Convocation scheduled for December 16 at 3:00 p.m. in Walb Memorial Union 224-226-228. Dr. Gordon Davies, Director of the State Council for Higher Education in Virginia, will speak on "The Urban University in a Diverse System of State Higher Education."

R. Hess asked for background on Dr. Davies. T. Wallace said that Dr. Navies received his Ph.D. in theology; that he served as director of the Virginia State Council, which is similar to our Higher Education Commission, for 8-10 years; and that he worked with the legislature and the governor's office in that capacity.

S. Hollander said he felt the overwhelming support of SD 86-7 was the result of two things: the quality of the work of people on the committee and the openness of the process by which they reached their recommendations. He commended them for doing an excellent job.

R. Hess mentioned the apparent tardiness of the Development Office in sending out the notices of pledges made to the university, T. Wallace said he would look into the problem, but felt it would take care of itself now that there is a director for the Development Office.

T. Wallace thanked everyone who worked on the three proposals regarding reorganization. He said he was proud of the work that was done and the professional manner with which participants had conducted themselves.

9. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt  
Secretary of the Faculty