

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Seventeenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
December 8, 1997
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 10, 1997
3. Acceptance of the agenda - S. Hollander
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - J. Hersberger
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 97-5) - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 97-6) - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board (Senate Document SD 97-7) - J. Wilson
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 97-8) - M. Downs
7. New business
 - Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 97-9) - J. Silver
8. Committee reports "for information only"
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: J. Clausen

Sergeant-at-Arms: N. Younis

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

C. Aikman, S. Argast, V. Badii, R. Barrett, F. Borelli, W. Branson, J. Brennan, C. Champion, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, V. Craig, M. Downs, R. Emery, F. English, L. Fox, S. Frey-Ridgway, J. Grant, P. Hamburger, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, L. Hess, S. Hollander, M. Kimble, D. Legg, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, D. Pfeffenberger, A. Pugh, D. Ross, H. Samavati, J. Silver, M. H. Thuente, R. Tierney, A. Ushenko, D. Vasquez, J. Vollmer, M. Wartell, D. Weakley, J. Wilson, L. Wright-Bower

Attachments:

["Results of the Election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review"](#) (SR No. 97-7)

["Response to Revision of Purdue University Executive Memorandum C-19 Regarding Grievance Procedures"](#)(SD 97-7)

["Faculty Workloads and Evaluation"](#) (SD 97-8)

["Amendment of the 1997-98 academic calendar"](#) (amends Senate Document SD 94-21)" (SD 97-9)

Senate Members Absent:

R. Berger, L. DeFonso, C. Humphrey, A. Karim, B. Kingsbury, M. Lane, C. Leiserson, R. Manalis, K. McDonald, K. O'Connell, D. Schmidt, J. Tankel

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, G. Hickey, P. Lane, W. Ludwin, D. McCants

Visitors Present: A. Alesia, J. Dahl, N. Newell, A. B. Sidibe

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of November 10, 1997: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

S. Hollander moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Indiana University:

M. Downs: I have several items to report on today:

1. At the last meeting of the University Faculty Council, President Brand announced a number of initiatives that are to be taken in connection with the Indiana University faculty and their compensation package. He has called for, and the Board of Trustees has approved, an equity review throughout the Indiana University system which would compare salaries of women and other groups that have been traditionally discriminated against with the purpose of remedying discrimination.

He also gained approval from the Board of Trustees for a comparison of salaries of Indiana University faculty throughout the system with peer institutions with the announced purpose of raising the total compensation for I.U. faculty throughout the system to a point where it would rank in the top 40% of the Big Ten or peer institutions. In particular, he made it clear that neither of these reviews would be conducted on behalf of Indiana University faculty on this campus. He said they would not be conducted here because, as the fiscal manager, Purdue University has the responsibility for setting salaries on this campus. This is a procedure which we will not be going through.

The third item, however, is something which is important to I.U. faculty on this campus who came here before 1989. Indiana University has discovered what has been known widely for a long time: that is that the expense of the 18/20

retirement program will, in the next few years, begin to impose a heavy burden on the university budget. In discussing this matter, President Brand has gone to great lengths to say that no change in that retirement program is being considered, nor would it be made if it were considered. In other words, the program will remain as is; however, it does present certain challenges to Indiana University to come up with creative ways to finance this future liability. President Brand is going to appoint a committee composed of administrators and faculty to look into various proposals for finding the funding that is necessary in order to keep the program afloat. He emphasized that there is no crisis here. There is no hurry, but the time to deal with this problem is now rather than later. He will be announcing the membership of that university-wide committee very soon. It will work with national accounting firms and actuaries and other financial planners to find ways to take care of this problem soon.

2. I.U. faculty may have noticed that Parkview Hospital, which had been dropped from the Anthem System, has been taking initiatives in order to retain as patrons people who have Anthem insurance. Letters have been sent to faculty who receive hospital services from Parkview inviting them to investigate alternative arrangements with Parkview Hospital. There have been ads in the newspaper. There was a rather lengthy story in yesterday's *Journal Gazette* about the dispute between Anthem and Parkview Hospital. I have been told by people who call the number that Parkview Hospital is willing to make concessions to policyholders with Anthem in regard to reducing the difference between the in-and-out-of-system payments. . . . I suggest that faculty who have Anthem/Blue Cross-Blue Shield Insurance call and find out what kind of accommodation can be made so that they can continue to receive their medical care from Parkview Hospital, if that is their preference.
 3. The last item is very short. It addresses a matter that has gotten a lot of attention on campus. The speakers of the two faculties and the presiding officer agreed with the Chancellor's decision to ask for outside evaluations of the IPFW athletic program, which he announced earlier this semester. There was, however, no perfect meeting of minds among us on the scope of those studies. We wish, in particular, to disassociate ourselves from one study which focused on particular personalities and isolated incidents to what we think was no good purpose.
- b. Purdue University:
- J. Hersberger had no report.
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 97-5) - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick presented SR No. 97-5 (Report of the Presiding Officer) for information only.
 6. Committee reports requiring action.
 - a. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SR No. 97-6) - M. Downs:

M. Downs conducted the election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review. Results are attached (see SR No. 97-7).

b. Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board (SD 97-7) - J. Wilson:

J. Wilson moved to approve SD 97-7 (Response to Revision of Purdue University Executive Memorandum C-19 Regarding Grievance Procedures). Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to amend SD 97-7 by adding at the end of the document the words "and that address the special circumstances of the dual campus in Fort Wayne." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 97-7, as amended, passed unanimously.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 97-8) - M. Downs:

M. Downs made the following two changes to SD 97-8 and then moved approval: in paragraph 1, sentence two, add the words "unless otherwise provided in writing" after the words "at the time of their initial appointment" and, in the same paragraph, to delete the semicolon and the word "they" and to replace them with the word "and." Seconded.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

7. New business:

a. J. Silver moved to approve SD 97-9 (Amendment of the 1997-98 academic calendar (amends Senate Document SD 94-21). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

b. D. Oberstar moved to approve Karen Wakley as a replacement member on the Subcommittee on Athletics. Seconded.

Motion was approved unanimously.

8. Committee reports "for information only": There was nothing mentioned under this item.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

W. Branson: I originally sent part of this information out on email, but Bill asked me to make my comments here at this meeting. I thought I would take a moment to add a couple of thoughts to Senator Hersberger's report to the Senate on November 10. In particular, I would like to comment on Jim's remarks regarding the policy of paying monthly employees on the first business day of January for the December pay period.

Jim appropriately reported that this year there is a 40-day span from the November 26, 1997 payday to the January 5, 1998 payday. This is the longest it should ever be and has happened for two reasons. First, Thanksgiving falls on November 27, which makes the last business day in November the 26th. Therefore, you are receiving your November paycheck four days before the end of the month. In the past four years, the pay date has been November 30 three times and November 27th once. Second, the scheduling of the New Year's holidays has made January 5th the first business day of the new year. In the past four years this pay date has been January 2 twice and January 3 twice. I think it is important to realize that although the 40-day span is long, in reality, the January payday is only two or three days later than normal.

The good news is that because of a change since the Senate meeting, the 40-day time span applies only to individuals receiving actual paychecks. If you are using direct deposit, your pay will be available in your bank account on January 2, thus eliminating three days of the payroll time span.

However, none of this helps solve the January pay date issue. According to an article in the October 28, 1997 issue of *Inside Purdue*, this is not a new issue. This situation has existed since 1946. I have been involved in numerous discussions of the January pay date over the years and the issues always boil down to one factor, "What are the tax implications to employees?" The problem is if we changed the January 5, 1998 payday to December 31, 1997 every monthly employee would be taxed on an additional paycheck in 1997. In 1998, employees would once again be taxed on 12 paychecks for fiscal and 10 paychecks for academic. It has always been felt that the tax on the extra paycheck would create difficult tax situations for a number of employees, even though it would be a one-time occurrence.

There are certainly positive reasons for changing the pay date. Jim also brought up the problem of automated deductions for bank accounts. As automatic withdrawals grow in popularity, their use will become a strong consideration for changing the pay date.

The January pay date is not a problem that has been taken lightly by anyone. While the solution appears very simple (and could probably be made very simply) it has never been implemented because of the potential impact to employees.

Jim also commented on the issue of medical benefits for new Purdue employees with pre-existing medical conditions. He indicated that the rules governing pre-existing conditions may have been changed retroactively for faculty to their detriment.

To give you a little background, new employees and their dependents receive reduced medical benefits for pre-existing conditions for the first 12 months of their employment at IPFW. This policy has been in existence for several years and is common in medical plans.

This will change in the future because of federal mandates effective January 1, 1998. Beginning in January, employers must give credit to new employees with pre-existing

conditions for time covered by medical insurance of previous employers. This credit would then shorten the length of time of reduced benefits. Certain restrictions apply but, because of the change, future new employees with pre-existing conditions could have less or even no months of reduced benefits. Furthermore, in January 1998 employees hired in 1997 would be able to apply past coverage and thus reduce their time under limited coverage.

The good news in this is that employees' coverage is not being reduced. In fact, for employees subject to pre-existing conditions, there may be a substantive increase in benefits.

J. Hersberger: I want to thank Vice Chancellor Branson. There was one other item that I mentioned and I will mention it again and that is the issue of the end of August versus September 15. It seems to be a much more important and universally accepted problem for my colleagues. There is simply no defensible reason in 1997 that David Legg, for example, should get paid on September 15 and I.U. colleagues should get paid at the end of August. Purdue University, I am happy to note, has been wrestling with a thorny issues for 50 years without asking the faculty if they are really concerned about this alleged additional tax bite in January; but I still fail to see any rational reason for that discrepancy in which they get paid at the beginning of the year.

M. Downs: Two things. The first is that I was intrigued to hear that if this change were made, Purdue faculty would receive an extra check this year, and the same number of checks thereafter. I gather that the year that you quit or retire, you would get one less if you'd gotten that thirteenth check this year. I couldn't conceive of the University giving everybody an extra check and then saying, "just a little Christmas bonus." Although that's not a bad idea.

Second, I wanted to give the administration an opportunity to respond to something that several members of the staff have said to me about the possible change in the bomb threat policy. This is the optional response which I think we all received a memo about. Two staff members have asked me whether or not it would be optional for staff to go or to stay if a building was under a bomb threat. I have said that of course it is optional. It means that anybody, whatever they do here, would be allowed to leave if their comfort level was so low as a result of a bomb threat that they felt that their life was in danger. I think it would be good if Vice Chancellor Branson said that no action will be taken against any staff member or faculty member who exercises their option to leave the building when it is under a bomb threat.

W. Branson: What you're stating is correct. If we need to say that again, we will be happy to do that.

M. Thuente: At our October meeting in the middle of our discussion about the grievance procedures the Chancellor announced that Colin Powell might be coming in April to benefit what he called the athletic program. I read in the *Journal Gazette* the other day that Colin Powell's April 9 visit stated that that event will benefit the IPFW scholarship

fund and "provides both athletic and academic scholarships to IPFW students." It was the account clerk in athletics that was quoted as the source of information about the event. My question is, "What role does the athletic department have in administering the funds and what portion of them will actually go to academic scholarships as opposed to athletic scholarships?"

M. Wartell: First, it was not in the middle of discussion. It was under good and welfare that I announced that. That is simply wrong information in the newspaper. It is a totally athletic supporting event and it is for athletic fundraising.

M. Thunte: No academics?

M. Wartell: No academics.

M. Thunte: Maybe there should be a clarification.

10. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt

Secretary of the Faculty