

**Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Sixteenth
Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort
Wayne**

February 10, 1997

3:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda*

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 13, 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 - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-8) - B. Bulmahn
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-9) - B. Bulmahn
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-10) - B. Bulmahn
 - d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-11) - B. Bulmahn
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-12) - B. Bulmahn
7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 96-20) - M. Downs
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 96-21) - R. Barrett
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: M. Sherr

Sergeant-at-Arms: N. Younis

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

C. Aikman, S. Argast, R. Barrett, R. Berger, W. Branson, B. Bulmahn,
C. Champion, J. Clausen, V. Coufoudakis, L. DeFonso, M. Downs,
D. Edwards, R. Emery, F. English, O. Freiburger, S. Frey-Ridgway, J.
Grant, T. Hamilton, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, L. Hess, S. Hollander,
P. Iadicola, M. Masters, L. Motz, G. Mourad, D. Oberstar, K. O'Connell,
D. Ross, H. Samavati, D. Schmidt, J. Silver, P. Terry, C. Thompson,
M. H. Thuyente, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

V. Badii, F. Borelli, C. Chauhan, N. Cothorn, P. Hamburger, R. Hess,

C. Humphrey, R. Jeske, B. Kingsbury, J. Knight, M. Lane,
T. Laverghetta, D. Legg, M. Scudder, P. Stubblebine, J. Wilson,
L. Wright-Bower

Attachments:

["Change in membership of Assessment Council"](#) (SD 96-8)

["Mission statement of the School of Business and Management Sciences"](#) (amends Senate Documents SD 93-27 and 94-13)" (SD 96-9)
"Assessment Plan" (SD 94-13, as amended)

["1999-2000 Academic Calendar"](#) (SD 96-10)

["Amendment to the academic regulations"](#) (Senate Document SD 85-18) -
Redefinition of W grade" (SD 96-11)

["Amendment to the academic regulations"](#) (Senate Document SD 85-18) - Bulletin
for certification of minors" (SD 96-12)

"Letter with attachments regarding SD 96-7 (Funding for the 1997-1999
biennium)" (SR No. 96-22)

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, W. Ludwin, D. McCants, S. Skekloff, B. Steffy, D. Thuente

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, G. Smith

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of January 13, 1997: The minutes were corrected to show that Mark Masters was present. They were then approved as corrected.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

S. Hollander 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. Downs: The University Faculty Council meets tomorrow in Indianapolis. At the next meeting of this body I will have a report from that meeting.

The Management Agreement Committee held its first meeting last week and discussed various ways and means. A fuller report will be forthcoming at an early meeting of this body as to the substance of

its discussions.

The Presiding Officer and I met with Vice President Ringel and President Beering, Academic Vice Chancellor English and Chancellor Wartell on Friday. I am sure the Presiding Officer will present you with a much fuller account of what took place. I would characterize the discussions as consisting of a series of frank exchanges about a variety of matters. One in which I am particular interested is the Management Agreement. At the meeting I told President Beering that we had begun to work on recommendations to be submitted to the faculty and then to those who develop the Management Agreement. The Senate Management Agreement Committee expects to discuss its work with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor and other administrators on this campus and to invite them to be full participants in that work. Neither the Vice Chancellor nor the Chancellor nor President Beering protested and I sensed, although I may have seen more in it than was there, that they generally agreed that cooperation would be something that would be good as we move forward and prepare these recommendations.

b. Purdue University:

J. Hersberger: There was a disagreement on my part and some others as to who was to attend that meeting on Friday, so I chose not to attend. I spoke with Presiding Officer Frederick before hand and my concerns were discussed fully at the meeting. President Beering was gracious enough to let me speak with him this morning at length on the phone. I would call it a frank and productive session.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick: I will amplify what Speaker Downs had to say about the meeting. It went very well. I spoke with President Beering directly and handed him a copy of the letter that is going out to the legislators concerning our underfunding, i.e., the document that we passed here: SD 96-7. He has backed us to the hilt in any initiative we want to take with the legislature. It was a frank, open and collegial discussion. I don't see any concern on the part of West Lafayette or any other group about us talking to legislators or dealing with this matter of our underfunding. In fact, President Beering is willing to do whatever he can. I will attach to the minutes a copy of the letter that did go out and the attachments that went with that. In addition to SD 96-7, I have data from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education that supports the same data that came from our Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee and letters from Chancellor Wartell and President Beering supporting our effort in this matter. (See Senate Reference No. 96-22)

We also, as Speaker Downs mentioned, discussed the Management Agreement. As I recall, President Beering said something to the effect that he is looking for increased IPFW--not IU and not Purdue--identity on this campus. I think I even asked at that time, "Do you mean an IPFW Alumni Association?" He was somewhat surprised. He said he thought we already had that. In case you are not aware, we have the Indiana University Alumni Association and the Purdue Alumni Association. They meet together as a group, but preserve their own

identities.

Also, a copy of the letter I sent out on SD 96-7, legislators' addresses and a personal plea that I wrote is on the Bulletin Board under "Issues du Jour." I urge you as individual faculty and members of the Fort Wayne community concerned about IPFW to write to your legislators. The addresses are there. Don't use university stationery. And the burning issue probably shouldn't be your salary, but how we can maintain the integrity of this academic institution.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-8) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-8 (Change in membership of Assessment Council). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-9) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-9 (Mission statement of the School of Business and Management Sciences (amends Senate Documents SD 93-27 and SD 94-13)). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-10) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-10 (1999-2000 Academic Calendar). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-11) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-11 (Amendment to the academic regulations [Senate Document SD 85-18] - Redefinition of W grade). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-12) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-12 (Amendment to the academic regulations [Senate Document SD 85-18] - Bulletin for certification of minors). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 96-20) - M. Downs:

Q: Are the official enrollment figures for this spring semester calculated before or after the last washout?

A: The official enrollments for the spring semester were counted Tuesday night before the final cancellation on Wednesday night.

Normally,

we would have counted the enrollments after the final cancellation on Friday night of the first week of classes. Because of the weather disruption, we extended the registration period through Tuesday of the second week of classes. (Monday was a holiday.) We traditionally give students one grace day to pay their fees after the final registration period is over. We felt that the students still expected this and, therefore, made Wednesday the grace payment day. Enrollment was counted on

Tuesday to establish a count equivalent to the end of the first week of classes which is guided by policy and to be consistent with financial aid

enrollment counts.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 96-21) - R. Barrett:

R. Barrett presented SR No. 96-21 (Recommendation on Chair Emoluments) for information only.

S. Hollander: The Agenda Committee awarded speaking privileges with regard to this item to the chair of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, David Thuente, and I would like to yield to him.

D. Thuente: The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS) acted fairly quickly on this matter and did not have time to get it to the University Resources Policy Committee for action for this meeting. We found out about it [the chair emoluments proposal] on January 22. We talked with someone in the Vice Chancellor's office that afternoon, our regularly scheduled meeting was the subsequent Friday, and we had to get the document to the Agenda Committee the following Monday at noon. The BAS felt very strongly about this matter. The resolution speaks for itself.

The original costing of the resolution from the [Chair Emoluments Subcommittee] did not include such items as TIAA/CREF for additional salary. It costed out all of the additional courses at \$1500 per course by associate faculty. When the BAS costed out the program at nearly \$300,000, we costed it at opportunity cost or true cost. We took a ten-month faculty member who would teach full-time at eight courses, divided that salary by eight courses

and, for each additional course that was needed for that faculty member, we took one-eighth of that salary plus the fringe benefits. With a twelve-month faculty member we divided it by ten because that would represent the number of courses that a full-time teaching faculty member would teach through the academic year plus two summer courses. So we took each one of those salaries and divided each one of the faculty salaries at a twelve-month appointment and divided by ten and added that to the total. That is how we came up with the \$306,000 as the true cost, and it is a fairly precipitous cost--a fairly precipitous increase in administrative cost for this campus. It would represent an additional five, perhaps six, maybe even seven faculty positions that would be lost if we were to keep all these courses taught by full-time faculty.

The BAS felt very strongly about it. We moved very quickly and thought it was important for this information to come to the Senate. We realize that it is not a formal recommendation, but we thought it was important to have input before it became a formal recommendation. What we reacted to was a memo from David McCants dated January 22 in which he stated, "Dr. English asked me to distribute the report and to request you to send comments upon it to me. Your comments are needed promptly in order for the Vice Chancellor to make a decision about implementation beginning with the new fiscal year." We thought prompt action was important.

F. English: I would like to say that the series of recommendations were made by a subcommittee to the Vice Chancellor. The recommendations concerning the chair emoluments have yet to be formulated in a recommendation to the Chancellor. I think the action was a bit precipitous. There is not a set of recommendations yet and the assumptions based on the salary are not necessarily those that will be recommended.

W. Frederick: For clarification, are you referring to the--

those
Chancellor
on this matter.

F. English: I am referring to the assumptions regarding cost of put forward by the BAS. They are not necessarily going to be the assumptions which are recommended by the Vice Chancellor to the

University
Resources Policy Committee (URPC)?

R. Barrett: Do you think, Fen, by next Monday that you are going to have recommendations, or would you like to come and speak to the

F. English: I wouldn't mind meeting with the group. I don't know whether I will have the recommendations done. No one from the BAS contacted me about this matter.

the
that.

D. Thuente: The BAS has gotten a memo from the Vice Chancellor and Subcommittee has been working and drafting a memo in response to

Some members of the Subcommittee say they like the draft memo,
others say
we need to discuss it--

R. Barrett: I don't think you ought to be discussing it.

D. Thuente: I can tell you how many committee members have voted yes
on it--

R. Barrett: It has not been discussed. I don't think it's germane
at
this point.

W. Frederick: The document is for information only. Please allow
Professor Thuente to continue.

D. Thuente: The point we thought is relevant here is that a very
senior group of administrators met and formulated recommendations.
The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee felt we had to take that very
seriously. The chairs have had two opportunities, I believe, for
input into these recommendations. You received the recommendations
from the Chair Emoluments Subcommittee on January 13, but did not
contact the BAS about this at all. On January 22 you put a memo
out asking for additional input from the chairs so that the BAS, or
I, at least, do not understand why you would ask for subsequent
input from the chairs if it wasn't fairly serious, or the status of
this wasn't fairly current. Why would you go out and ask for
additional input from the chairs if the status of this wasn't a
fairly serious recommendation, and the status wasn't current? I
think the BAS felt as though we would like to have had you come to
us and say, "These are recommendations that have been made to me,
what do you think?" You had nine days to get back to us before
this went out. We, in fact, had two hours to contact your office,
which we did. It was on the basis of that information that we went
forward. David McCants was out of town from that Wednesday
afternoon until the following Tuesday. Consequently, we did what
we thought was best. . . . We would like to have had more
information. We would like to have had more time. In fact, I
would like to make a plea not only to you but to every
administrator on this campus. When you have programs that have
significant budgetary impact, bring it to the BAS as soon as
possible to get input. We are willing to work with you. We had a
two-hour time frame. That was the only time frame we had to get
the information and I think we did very well with it.

F. English: I think it was a two-hour, self-imposed time frame
because the recommendations were coming back to the Vice Chancellor
for recommendations, then to other groups. The chairs have been
solicited several times, and this was a matter of courtesy for the
chairs to respond to the latest of any number of proposals from the
subcommittee of deans which put the proposal together. It would
have been precipitous on my part to take that recommendation, in
which I have not had an opportunity to put my own recommendations
on yet, to your committee or any other committee for that matter
because I haven't had an opportunity to formulate them. I wanted
to hear what the rest of the chairs had to say about the final
recommendation coming from the subcommittee.

M. Downs: I don't know whether this gets to the bottom of this or not, but there have been two opinions expressed: one is that the recommendation of the BAS was made in a timely fashion under what it perceived to be a deadline and a second expressed by the Vice Chancellor that the recommendation was precipitous. I take some satisfaction that the Vice Chancellor did not say that he wasn't going to consider it or the information contained therein as he prepares his recommendation to the Chancellor. This is the more important matter. I certainly expect that when the final recommendation is sent to the Chancellor, the BAS will have an opportunity to examine it and make yet another recommendation, this time, perhaps, through the University Resources Policy Committee to the Chancellor.

D. Thuyente: We viewed this as information that needed to get out. The BAS doesn't have any power, so it was simply felt that this information was needed for the formative stages of your final recommendations.

I do have one other thing I have been asked to do by the BAS. That is, I have been asked by the BAS, at its January 31 meeting, to express dismay and disappointment on the implementation of SD 96-7, the biennium funding resolution. The BAS carefully considered strategy when passing its biennium funding resolution and expended considerable effort to have its resolution at the December 9 Senate meeting. This was done so that it would be available for state budgetary hearings and to get maximum impact on the budgetary process. In the opinion of the BAS, we have missed our best opportunity for a significant increase in funding for IPFW because of the two-month delay in the materials calling attention to IPFW's severe underfunding being sent out to the designated recipients.

W. Frederick: I believe you're out of order, Professor Thuyente. You were given speaking privileges with regard to SR No. 96-21. Perhaps some other Senator would like to introduce this under general good and welfare.

J. Silver: I would like a point of clarification. As I understood what I heard, the Vice Chancellor received this report from the Chair Emoluments Subcommittee and, among other people, he sent it to the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee to ask for their comments. Is that correct?

F. English: I just received a report from the BAS that they had acted on the last set of recommendations prepared by the deans which were, in effect, posted to the chairs and not sent to the BAS because we were still gathering data on how the chairs felt about the recommendations.

b. Nominations and Elections Committee - M. Masters:

the M. Masters announced the election of Jim Hersberger as Speaker of Purdue University Faculty.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

T. Hamilton: We all received in the mail today rosters from the Registrar's Office asking that we take attendance, list when students have quit attending classes, and verify by signature that the attendance as recorded is correct. A couple of colleagues and I have concerns about this: 1) I don't know, and none of the other faculty members have been able to tell me, whether this Senate body has ever discussed this issue. I don't recall any discussions in this body, at least not in this academic year. 2) I don't recall an executive memorandum that has come out on this issue. My colleagues and I are concerned that the university is dictating that we take mandatory attendance in our courses in order to fill this out correctly. If we do not fill this out correctly and we sign it, are the faculty going to be held legally responsible? If you have a class of 120 students, and the class meets for 50 minutes, are you going to take 20 minutes of that time to call roll? The only time some of us take attendance is when we give an examination, which may occur only every fourth week or so. Otherwise, we will not know whether these people are attending or not.

B. Bulmahn: As a member of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), I recall in EPC such a necessity being expressed to us and it is my vague memory that an "information only" item had come to the Senate in regard to that. It was not this year, but in a previous year. I am not having any success in finding it right now. It was discussed in EPC--of course the membership has changed since that time--but my recollection is that those people were in sympathy with the need for this information, but recognize the difficulty in implementing it.

F. English: The changes in procedure are mandated by federal law which relates to student aid, and a large number of our students receive such aid. The federal government has begun auditing, and has audited one campus, in the state of Indiana. We must be able to show when students stopped attending in order to check our own liability as an institution; otherwise, we may have to return the money from our own coffers because they are not likely to get it from the students. So what we have tried to do is not have faculty take attendance every time, but at selected times. We have taken the most lenient position possible. It has been hotly debated for a very long period of time. We did not want to mandate taking attendance every time. The strictures of liability have forced us into a procedure where we have to ask faculty, at selected times, who is still in class so we can have some reasonable assurance as to when our liability ceases. As a faculty member you may be asked, if we are audited by the state or federal government, to produce records as to when students stopped attending. We have tried to anticipate that. One of the problems is with associate faculty. We have had to make them aware of their responsibility. If there is a better or easier way to do this, we would certainly like to hear it. It has been discussed at some length.

S. Hollander: In a large lecture class the traditional taking of attendance doesn't make a lot of sense, but there are alternatives. One of them is just passing around a clipboard or something asking students to initial next to their name. If they check off not only for the current day but previous days on which they missed, we have records and that is what counts. Our only interest is when they last attended.

Taking this kind of attendance need not be a time-consuming task.

M. Downs: I think it is being suggested that the records don't even have to be accurate. I recognize the need for the University to respond in regard to its obligations to the federal government, but there are a lot of wrinkles that have to be worked out of this system so far as faculty obligations are concerned. In a large lecture class students will put initials next to their friends' names. I report this based on personal experience as a student. I remember the various strategies that we used to avoid being marked absent in class. But some of us teach independent readings courses, some of us teach distance education courses, some of us administer internships and practicums. If the records have to be accurate, there are some problems to be worked out. If it is necessary to change faculty responsibilities, a real proposal ought to be offered for consideration by the faculty. Right now the procedure isn't particularly effective and some of it is a little unsettling for faculty. More work should be spent developing a technique that works.

W. Frederick: I don't like to speak from the chair, but I was part of the committee that implemented this report that you got. What we are looking for is the best possible information to limit the university's liability without going into mandatory attendance. We didn't want that. We were concerned with academic freedom. Any kind of instrument you might have can be used, e.g., a test that they took, an email they sent to you, whatever you can get to prove that the student was, in good faith, participating in your class.

T. Hamilton: Don't students lose their federal funding if they don't maintain a certain GPA?

F. English: It takes time, however, to catch up with that in that there are several semesters in which you can do poorly before the curtain drops.

W. Frederick: It is called reasonable academic progress. We are trying to monitor that now and that includes attendance. It is not just a matter of GPAs.

T. Hamilton: So, in an effort to reduce the University's liability, is that liability being shifted to the professors of this campus by making us sign these cards saying that they have not been attending these courses? If the faculty member cannot come up with the record, then who is going to be liable at that point?

F. English: The University would still be liable for the amount of money that the federal government would say that we owed them. In reference to what Senator Downs was saying, we may come to that. I was hoping we wouldn't. I was hoping we could keep it more informal. Part of it is that if they have recommendations, we would obviously have to follow their recommendations; but if we made a good faith effort, and that is what this is, then our liability is lessened. . . . This was not taken lightly. This has been a state-wide discussion as well. IU's and Purdue's obligations are much larger than ours. Their students also take the kinds of funds our students do.

P. Iadicola: Not to second guess the committee's deliberations and

discussions, but I assume this attendance procedure only takes place during the period of time in which the student gets a refund. If it is an issue of financial need, I assume that after that period there really would not be a need to take attendance because they wouldn't be receiving a refund anyway.

F. English: There are two times: the fourth and the ninth weeks. One we pick up if they never showed and the other if they showed but then stopped coming. That was the least amount we thought we could do without taking attendance each time. As the Speaker indicated, we can use other marks: the last time a test was turned back, or a lab quiz, without having to take attendance. We need to zero in on the date our institutional liability ceased.

P. Iadicola: I understand the issue is money in terms of the federal government a) paying out this money and b) being concerned about whether these people actually attend classes. If they stop attending after the refund period, there is no money back anyway. Am I misunderstanding something about this?

L. Motz: I may want to take a little bit of the responsibility for the business about asking that these documents be signed. As I recall, this came up in EPC last year and I expressed some concern that previously . . . we, as instructors, were supposed to check "yes" on the attendance sheets that everything was fine, sign them, date them and send them back. In recent years we have gotten away from that and the policy was check this and return it only if you have someone who is not attending. When faculty did not have to sign these and send them back in, I noticed a terrible irresponsibility of faculty throwing them in the wastebasket. It was my suggestion at that time that we return to a policy where a faculty member was to look at this and sign it. It did give a certain amount of responsibility back to the faculty member--not that they were going to be held accountable necessarily, but with some reassurance that they were going to take this seriously because it was a serious matter.

J. Silver: The financial aid that we're talking about here is not only tuition aid, but it also includes grants for living expenses and that continues throughout the semester. They will continue getting financial aid for living expenses unless a faculty member identifies them as not being in class any more.

T. Hamilton: I have had a student in the past who has come up to me at the end of a semester with extenuating circumstances wanting to drop a course and singing the old song about why they weren't in class. If you look back at the student's record, they have a history of withdrawals. A simple call to the Financial Aid Office reveals that the student is receiving financial aid. I experienced this two or three years ago, so I understand the issue here. . . . I guess I take those forms seriously and I sign them and send them back. So I didn't see another need for this document. This document has certain implications, or overtones; in fact, it is mandatory attendance whether it is stated or not. What happens when associate faculty members don't fill these out and send them back and someone stops attending? There are just some certain questions here that need to be looked at a little deeper.

M. H. Thuente: I wanted to report on the progress of the review of Option 1/Option 2 that the Faculty Affairs Committee has been conducting. You will recall that the Senate charged us to review the satisfaction and impact resulting from Option 1/Option 2. We have had two open faculty meetings. They were attended by between 25-30 people. We are just about finished conducting interviews with all Option 2 faculty and have randomly selected a group of Option 1 faculty. By the end of this week or early next week all faculty will receive a survey regarding Option 1/Option 2. Because of some problems we have encountered . . . setting up the survey, we may not meet the February 28 deadline of the Agenda Committee to have this on the March agenda. Given the importance of the review, we think it is more important that we take some time with all of this information. If you don't have it in March, you will have it in April.

M. Downs: I would like to call everybody's attention to the on-campus fund drive for the library which will begin soon and conclude by the end of March. The Presiding Officer and the two speakers are handling the faculty side of the on-campus library fund drive. We are interested in recruiting other individuals who share this activity and be willing to make contacts and handle bookkeeping for that drive. . . . I would like to make this drive, and I know Bill and Jim agree, an example of the faculty's commitment to higher education on this campus. You should be aware, first of all, that there is a considerable tax advantage to making a contribution to the library fund drive. There is an absolute reduction in your state income tax liability and, of course, an indirect reduction in your federal income tax. We have arranged as well that your pledge can be fulfilled over a period of one, two, three, or maybe even four or five years. . . . The third thing we've done is to work out an arrangement so that you can earmark your pledge so that it could be spent on your own department's library budget. In other words, you can see a direct impact of your pledge on the amount you and your colleagues can spend on books in the year that the money has been received. This will provide as much incentive as possible for giving to the library fund drive and to confer as much advantage as possible on the faculty who contribute. It is, as you know from discussions in this body, important for us to develop library resources because they have been the poor stepchild in the budget process over the last few years. I want to call attention to the Chancellor's commitment to allocate money to the library over and above its normal allocation for a period of time in order to augment the funds that are available. Before we go to the community we want to show that the library is important enough to the campus that we are willing to spend some of our own money.

M. Wartell: May I add to what you just mentioned. You spoke about augmentation of the library budget. That augmentation will be recurring augmentation. It will occur over a period of three years, but it will stay in the library budget. We are adding \$50,000 a year for three years and, at the end of the three years, the \$150,000 will be staying in the library budget.

W. Frederick: We will be calling on some of the leadership to help us with this campaign. I suggest you volunteer or we'll send Mike Downs to see you, and he puts on the bite pretty good. He put it on President Beering and Vice President Ringel very well Friday afternoon. . . . I won't say whether they gave or how much they gave, but he's

good.

M. Downs: President Beering did say it was something he would think about.

M. Wartell: The Purdue University academic review occurred on campus on Friday. The response from our colleagues at Purdue was praise of the campus and praise at the kind of energy they saw on this campus. Three faculty presented their research. The presentations were as exciting as I have seen anywhere. The faculty members who presented were Professors Paladino, Farlow and a combination of Sternberger and Meyer in Nursing. They did a magnificent job. It couldn't have been a better presentation. The response was a real tribute to the way things are going on this campus.

11. The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty