

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Eleventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
December 9 and 16, 1991
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 11, 1991
3. Acceptance of the agenda -W. Unsell
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (SD 91-5) - S. Sarratore
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 91-6) - S. Sarratore
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 91-7) - D. Oberstar
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (SR No. 91-13) - S. Sarratore
 - b. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee - D. Pfeffenberger
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick
Parliamentarian: S. Harroff
Sergeant-at-arms: R. Barrett

Session I (December 9)

Senate Members Present:

F. Borelli, E. Blumenthal, J. Brennan, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, P. Conn, S. Dhawale, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, J. Dunlap, J. Eichenauer, A. Finco, J. Haw, R. Hawley, S. Hollander, R. Jeske, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, D. Kruse, J. Lantz, D. Legg, P. Lin, M. Mansfield, D. McCants, J. Meyers, R. Miers, D. Oberstar, J. Owen, R. Pacer, R. Ramsey, A. Rassuli, R. Ritchie, S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, A. Shupe, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, J. Sunderman, W. Unsell, W. Walker, E. Waters

Senate Members Absent:

A. Chatterjea, D. Coy, E. Foley, R. Hill, J. Klotz, D. Linn, L. Meyer, A. Pugh, J. Switzer

Representative from Medical Education: D. Bell

Faculty Members Present: L Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, M. Kaufmann, D. Pfeffenberger
Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, R. Steiner

Attachments

["Ethical Guidelines for Student Computer Users at IPFW"](#) (SD 91-5)

"IPFW Mission Statement" (SD 91-6)

["Purdue University TIAA-CREF Retirement Plan Task Force Recommendations"](#) (SD 91-7)

"Recommendation for 1991-1992 Unallocated Funds and Budget Recommendations for 1992-1993 Fiscal Period" (SR No. 91-14)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12-02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 11, 1991: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

W. Unsell moved to accept the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University: M. Downs had no report.

- b. Purdue University:

A. Finco: The Intercampus Faculty Council has passed a *Procedures for Accepting Credit from Vocational Technical or Non-Accredited College Transfer Programs* document for distribution to the faculty governing bodies at the various campuses. I have asked the Educational Policy Committee to consider the document and make a recommendation to this Senate. I hope it will come before the Senate at its January meeting.

The WL Senate has recommended that the Bond and Social Choice Funds be made available as CREF options as soon as possible. They have also approved University Senate Document 91-2, Recommended Guidelines and Procedures for Approving Deviations from the Tenure Policy for Justifiable Conditions. At this same meeting of the University Senate, Daryle L. White of the Purdue Students' Government noted that "legislation also passed to recommend that the University amend university policies to include sexual orientation when addressing practices of discriminatory treatment" and he said "this is of grave concern to the student body; Purdue University is the only school in the Big Ten not to include this clause in its policy."

5. Report of the Presiding Officer

W. Frederick: I have attached to the agenda a report on the current status of documents passed by this body. I also remind you that tomorrow afternoon at 3:30 p.m., in Walb 224-226-228 we will have a Faculty Convocation. It will include an open forum with Dr. Steven Beering, President of Purdue University. I urge you all to attend.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 91-5) - S. Sarratore:

S. Sarratore, moved to approve SD 915 (Ethical Guidelines for Student Computer Users at IPFW). Seconded.

F. Borelli moved to amend SD 91-5, under the section titled "Access Rights and Responsibilities," paragraph 3, line 2, by deleting the word "is" and replacing it with the words "may be." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

J. Sunderman moved to amend SD 91-5, under the section titled "Access Rights and Responsibilities," paragraph 2, line 2, to read "Their application for inappropriate purposes may constitute. . ." Seconded.

R. Ramsey moved to amend the amendment by replacing the word "inappropriate" with the word "other." Seconded.

Motion to amend the amendment passed on a voice vote.

J. Clausen moved to amend the amendment by deleting the words "Their application for other purposes" and inserting the words "other uses" Seconded.

Motion to amend the amendment passed on a voice vote.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 91-5, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 91-6) - S. Sarratore:

S. Sarratore moved to approve SD 91-6 (IPFW Mission Statement). Seconded.

A. Dirkes moved to amend SD 91-6 by moving the following two sentences from page 2 to page 1, paragraph 5, preceding the sentence which begins "Teaching quality will continue" and by adding a sentence as indicated below:

Recent enrollment increases reflect a growing number of students from the lower 50% of their high-school class, admitted under special conditions. The campus will continue its programs of academic support for these students. [added sentence: There are opportunities also for students with outstanding ability and substantial preparation.]

Seconded.

Motion to amend failed on a show of hands.

J. Smulkstys moved to amend SD 91-6, page 2, paragraph 3, line 1, by deleting the word "constructive." Seconded.

Motion to amend failed on a voice vote.

A. Dirkes moved to amend SD 91-6, page 2, paragraph 3, line 2, by putting a period after the word "research" and by starting the next sentence with the words "Some research is supported. . . " Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

A. Dirkes moved to amend SD 91-6, page 2, paragraph 2, by inserting a sentence after the third sentence which would read: Enrollment also includes students with outstanding ability. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

J. Brennan moved to amend SD 91-6, page 2, paragraph 2, by inserting the word "also" after the words "Recent enrollment increases. ... " Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

J. Haw moved to amend SD 91-6, page 1, Paragraph 4, by inserting after the words "undergraduate teaching" the words "expansion of library collections." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

F. Borelli moved to amend SD 91-6, page 1, Paragraph 2, last sentence, by replacing the word "added" with the word "enhanced." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander moved to recommit SD 91-6 to the Educational Policy Committee. Seconded.

Motion to recommit passed on a voice vote.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 p.m. until Monday, December 16, at noon.

Session II
(December 16)

Senate Members Present:

F. Borelli, E. Blumenthal, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, P. Conn, D. Cox, S. Dhawale, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, J. Dunlap, J. Eichenauer, A. Finco, E. Foley, J. Haw, R. Hawley, S. Hollander, R. Jeske, N. Kelley, J. Lantz, D. Legg, P. Lin, M. Mansfield, D. McCants, L. Meyer, J. Meyers, D. Oberstar, R. Pacer, A. Pugh, R. Ramsey, A. Rassuli, R. Ritchie, J. Scherz, A. Shupe, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, W. Unsell, W. Walker

Senate Members Absent:

J. Brennan, A. Chatterjea, R. Hill, F. Kirchhoff, J. Klotz, D. Kruse, D. Linn, R. Miers, J. Owen, S. Sarratore, J. Smulkstys, J. Sunderman, J. Switzer, E. Waters

Representative from Medical Education: D. Bell

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, D. Pfeffenberger, C. Sorge

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell

W. Frederick reconvened the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 91-2) - D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD91-7 (Purdue University TIAA –CREF Retirement Plan Task Force Recommendations). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. New business:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 91-6 (IPFW Mission Statement) as amended by the Senate and the Educational Policy Committee. Seconded.

Two editorial changes were made: 1) page 2, paragraph 3, the word "foundations" was replaced with the word "donors" and 2) Chemistry was added to the list of master's degrees offered at IPFW.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

8. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 91-13) – S. Hollander:

S. Hollander presented SR No. 91-13 (Proposals for Computer Art Concentration and Degree Title changes for Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering) for information only.

b. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee - D. Pfeffenberger:

S. Hollander asked that the report of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS) be recorded verbatim in the minutes.

D. Pfeffenberger: The BAS has asked to be put on your agenda for two reasons: the first concerns several references to the BAS in Senate discussions earlier this semester. The subcommittee felt a need to briefly restate the role we play in the budgetary process. Second, due to our placement on the agenda we hope to stimulate questions about the budgetary process that may be addressed to me, other members of the BAS, or administrative personnel during the general good and welfare of the university portion of this meeting.

Duties of the BAS described in SD 81-10 include advising the administration and Senate on budgetary policy matters pertaining to the needs of the campus by making recommendations on the annual operating budgets and occasionally providing input on other financial matters which affect the needs of the campus.

We address this task by meeting early in the fall semester with the Chancellor, and the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs to discuss in very general terms their insight into the financial needs of the campus and what funding constraints we may be facing.

In a series of subsequent meetings the subcommittee discusses the various areas of concern brought to their attention by the administration, by various members of the subcommittee, and by other individuals who may address the subcommittee.

In late November we concluded our deliberations with a recommendation on the areas we feel require special funding allocations in the next fiscal year. Last Monday, you received two documents which contain the subcommittee's recommendations for unallocated funds in this fiscal year and our recommendations for next fiscal year (See Senate Reference No. 91-14). Both of these documents have been sent to the University Resources Policy Committee and the Chancellor's Office.

How successful have we been? To give you some perspective, in the past four years the BAS has recommended a total of three times each the following: additional funding for faculty salaries, additional S&E and travel allowances, and additional

funding to replace part-time instructors with full-time faculty. Recommended at least once during the last four-year period were increased funding for faculty micro-computer support, athletic center alterations, increased number of introductory courses, and adjustments for salary equity issues. Of these thirteen recommendations, all of which were made at the highest level of priority, eleven have been funded. It is difficult to determine if the level of funding would have been the same without the BAS'S recommends-ion; still, the issues were raised, discussed, and funded to some extent.

In closing, I would characterize the working relationship between our subcommittee and the administration as a harmonious one. The administration has been cooperative in responding to our requests for information and attentive to our recommendations. Again, the purpose of this report was only to make sure our committee's role in the budget process was well understood in this body and to provide an opportunity for any questions. Thank you.

S. Hollander: Earlier this year this body received some indication that the BAS was consulted about changes made necessary by West Lafayette's decision to have an across-the-board and unusual salary increment this year. Was the BAS consulted about that?

D. Pfeffenberger: The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee has not met since late last fall semester until early this fall semester, so, we, as a committee, did not discuss that particular issue.

J. Haw: In regard to your recommendation for increased funding for library book purchases, as a matter of information, will the \$50,000 allocation this year roughly restore the level of book purchase funds that was available last year, increase it over last year, or fall short of last year?

D. Pfeffenberger: It would at least restore it to the level and, perhaps, depending on some other considerations, may go over a little.

M. Downs: In reference to the proposal concerning the library, I think that it is a very positive step and I am very happy to see that the BAS has made this recommendation to the administration. I gather that, since the relationship is harmonious, the administration plans to honor it if it is at all possible.

J. Lantz: We are at this point putting together all the requests, and we will have a final meeting on Friday. I should also tell you--I don't think that I am speaking out of turn--that I asked the Vice Chancellors to make recommendations. The first recommendation from the Academic Vice Chancellor was also library funding. No specific amount was recommended. We will give it every consideration on Friday.

D. McCants: I would just like to add that the AOC recommended that the campus priority should be library acquisitions. The AOC did not attach a dollar figure, but

unanimously agreed that that ought to be a campus priority for using a significant portion of that non-recurring money.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Lantz. I presume you are aware that we recently instituted a two-tier policy in notification of bomb threats: one is to ask all to evacuate and the other is to make an announcement that we have been notified that there is some kind of explosive device in giving you the option of evacuating or not evacuating the building. As faculty members you have a right to make the decision, I believe, for yourself; you do not, however, I believe, have the right to make the decision for your students. I do not believe you can, nor should you, punish students if they decide to do it differently than you do. In the last two announcements of that, we did have a student who came to our offices reporting that they had been encouraged not to leave and, in fact, were given some idea that there might be some change in their grade. I implore you to think about what you are saying to students and to encourage your colleagues to think about what they are saying to students. We have the right to decide "we will stay." We make that choice for ourselves. Not for anyone else and no one should be punished for their decision.

M. Downs: This is a longer statement than is usually made during this section, but I feel compelled to make it--but that's no excuse.

Presidents Beering and Ehrlich have visited the campus during this semester and each has, in a different way, addressed the concerns we have about the present and future here. I attended both sessions and listened very carefully and my own view, which may not be unique, is what I now express. It is this: the current arrangement between this campus and both systems is inconsistent in important ways with the educational needs and aspirations of the students, faculty, staff, and people of Northeastern Indiana. Please consider:

President Ehrlich, confronted with the problems regarding what I call the zero-token increment this year, the unbalance in the library budget, the proposal regarding non-tenure-track appointments, salary compression, sexual preference in the student code, and so on expressed sympathy, but took refuge in the management agreement which places operating authority in the hands of President Beering and Purdue University. Some time ago in a private conversation, President Ehrlich asked me why, when he came to this campus, the number of Purdue University faculty attending his speeches outnumbered IU faculty here. I explained to him that his visits to this campus were very much like visits of the King of Norway to Minnesota: there are a lot of Norwegians in Minnesota, and they have a nostalgic affection for the King of Norway, but the Governor of Minnesota is the one who makes the important operating decisions and his meetings, of course, are colored with more importance.

President Beering, the responsible partner, answered particular questions. Professor Smulkstys asked him about the lack of faculty input regarding the zero-token increment. President Beering said he was surprised that there wasn't any input here. He had required it; he promised it would not happen again. I was left, and perhaps others were left, to

think that perhaps it was some omission on the part of the Chancellor that eliminated faculty input here. I don't think that is the case. Professor Smulkstys asked why we should not make such budget decisions here. President Beering gave no answer to that question. What about the letter from the physical plant staff about the union and collective bargaining? President Beering hadn't gotten the letter. Perhaps the postal service or his staff had fouled up. What about sexual preference in the Student Code? President Beering was for it, but the lawyers had stopped it. This raised a question in my mind, "Where do you find lawyers who tell you what you don't want to hear?" The presidents and boards of trustees of nine of the universities in the Big Ten found lawyers who told them what they wanted to hear and sexual preference is protected in their student codes. He was asked about reduced tuition and other incentives for out-of-state students in adjoining counties in Ohio. The Higher Education Commission was at fault in regard to this. President Beering is a man who can rouse the Japanese out of a sound sleep to listen to him on satellite television (by his account), but he is apparently powerless to help us with the questions and concerns that we have.

In discussing the sexual preference section in the IPFW Student Code, President Beering said that actions are more important than words. If you want a system of laws and not just a system of men and women with their wonderful inconsistencies, he is in a large sense, dead wrong. But I agree with him that actions and words are measures of individuals and their character and their priorities.

Both presidents are well meaning; I take that on faith. It is their priorities that are increasingly irrelevant to us and our purpose here. When President Ehrlich talks about the New Majority student and the emphasis we must place on it, it is hard for me to take that seriously because the New Majority student is the Old Majority student here, and we have been addressing their needs and their concerns since the place was established. When he talks about eight front doors to Indiana University, eight front doors makes little difference to a student in Fort Wayne who comes to this front door and finds nothing behind it for him or her.

I admire both universities and I think we can still benefit from an association with them, but not the way things stand now. We will benefit less and less if the continued association continues to mean decisions with the content and substance that we have experienced this year. At the next meeting of the Senate, under New Business, I will propose that this campus develop its own proposals for changes in the management agreement and that these proposals be put before the Boards of Trustees when the current arrangement is reconsidered in two years. This faculty has shown over and over again that it can persuade itself to agree and to develop a consensus on difficult matters. We can do it once more. The tougher task is to persuade not just the Boards of Trustees, but the administrations of both universities, important and influential members of this community, and the state legislature that a university with over 12,000 students, with over 300 faculty, with a proven track record in educational endeavor deserves to make more of the decisions affecting its destiny here. At a bare minimum, we should be our own fiscal manager. If Indiana University can manage Indianapolis, to the benefit of both universities, and Purdue has been able to manage this place for the benefit of both universities, then an

IPFW fiscal manager could manage it in the interest of both of the universities and do a better job of managing it in the interests of the faculty, staff, students, and people of Northeastern Indiana.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty