

Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Seventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
February 11, 2008
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 14, 2008
3. Acceptance of the agenda – B. Abbott
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – N. Younis
 - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – S. Davis
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 07-11) – M. Walsh
 - b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 07-5) – C. Hill
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 07-6) – J. Jackson
 - d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 07-7) – J. Jackson
7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 07-12)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment*

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

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

Attachments:

- “[IPFW Statement on Civility](#)” (SD 07-5)
- “[Academic Calendar, 2010-2011](#)” (SD 07-6)
- “[Proposed Revision of SD 85-18 \(Academic Regulations\)](#)” (SD 07-7)
- “[Academic Regulations](#)” (SD 85-18, page 4)
- “[Report from Question Time: J. Dahl and S. Hannah](#)” (Senate Reference No. 07-13)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, N. Adilov, A. Argast, W. Branson, C. Champion, S. Choi, S. Ding,
P. Dragnev, B. Dupen, C. Erickson, R. Friedman, J. Garrison, J. Grant, T. Grove, I. Hack,
S. Hannah, J. Hersberger, C. Hill, J. Jackson, D. Lindquist, M. Lipman, D. Liu,

K. McDonald, L. Meyer, G. Mourad, K. Moustafa, D. Mueller, R. Nelipovich,
M. Nusbaumer, E. Ohlander, K. Pollock, M. Ridgeway, R. Sutter, C. Thompson, J. Toole,
A. Ushenko, G. Volland, M. Walsh, M. Wartell, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

S. Blythe (sabbatical), J. Burg, P. Iadicola, G. McClellan, A. Mustafa, H. Odden, T. Parker,
L. Roberts, H. Samavati, R. Saunders, J. Summers, J. Tankel, J. Zhao

Faculty Members Present: S. Batagiannis, L. Finke, B. Kanpol, J. Leatherman, D. Moore,
K. O'Connell, S. Sarratore

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, E. Frew, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin, K. Soderland (*Journal
Gazette*)

Acta

1. Call to order: S. Davis called the meeting to order at 12:03.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 14, 2008: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

B. Abbott moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Purdue University:

N. Younis: No report.

b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to take this opportunity to note the passing of Professor Linda Graham. I have known Linda for a long time. In my years here, I have absolutely known no other faculty member who has provided more service to the underprivileged in this community than Professor Graham. It has been an honor to serve as her colleague.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

S. Davis asked that the Senate observe a moment of silence in memory of Linda Graham.

L. Meyer: In regards to Linda Graham's passing, certainly the Department of Nursing misses her tremendously, but the community will also miss her tremendously. She was

extremely active in the whole community, and very much the advocate for those who are less fortunate.

S. Davis: I believe the Nursing Department will have a memorial resolution coming forth next month.

Please double check the voting faculty list which you received to make sure everyone is included. If there are any problems with the list, please contact Jacqui Petersen, and she will take care of it.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee (SR No. 07-11) – M. Walsh:

M. Walsh distributed ballots for the Presiding Officer election and also reminded senators to turn in their committee preference forms by Friday, February 15.

b. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 07-5) – C. Hill:

C. Hill moved to approve Senate Document SD 07-5 (IPFW Statement on Civility).

B. Abbott moved to amend SD 07-5 by removing the “regardless of” list and leaving it as “to all individuals” as follows: “Respect and civility should therefore be afforded to all individuals. ~~regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, religion, family status, socioeconomic level, educational background, veteran status, or position at the university.~~” Seconded.

Motion to amend SD 07-5 failed on a voice vote.

J. Grant moved to amend SD 07-5 by adding “gender orientation” to the “regardless of” list. Seconded.

Motion to amend SD 07-5 failed on a voice vote. Seconded.

K. Moustafa called the question.

M. Lipman moved the previous question (close debate). Seconded.

Motion to close debate passed by a show of hands (2/3 votes).

Motion to approve SD 07-5 passed on a voice vote.

c. Educational Policy Committee (SD 07-6) – J. Jackson:

J. Jackson moved to approve SD 07-6 (Academic Calendar, 2010-2011).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

d. Educational Policy Committee (SD 07-7) – J. Jackson:

J. Jackson moved to approve SD 07-7 (Proposed revision of SD 85-18 [Academic Regulations]).

B. Dupen moved to refer SD 07-7 to the Educational Policy Committee. Seconded.

Motion to refer failed on a voice vote.

C. Thompson moved to amend SD 07-7 as follows: “Students who do not meet one of these requirements ... as specified by the Department of English and Linguistics and **approved by** the College of Arts and Sciences ...” Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

J. Hersberger moved to amend SD 07-7 as follows: “Students who do not meet **at least one** of these requirements ...”

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 07-7, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 07-12):

S. Davis yielded the chair to Speaker Younis.

N. Younis announced that Jack Dahl was given speaking privileges.

Question: It seems that the administration relies heavily on CUPA data in determining equitable salary levels for faculty. The purpose of this series of questions is to, first, help some of us better understand how CUPA data (and also what CUPA data) is developed for comparison and decision-making purposes related to faculty compensation. Second, there are a couple of questions as to the process of transparency of the use of this data.

1. Exactly who are the peer schools that comprise the CUPA data used by IPFW?
2. The following is an example for year 2001 of an economics professor from a CUPA report (not IPFW).

For example purposes only:

Rank	Min	Q1	Q2	Q3	Max
Assoc. Prof.	\$57,800	\$63,900	\$71,718	\$83,938	\$110,000

Specifically, in this “example”, what would be the CUPA baseline for an IPFW economics professor?

3. In our December 10, 2007 Senate meeting the VCAA stated that equity has focused on “full professors who have 5 years or more in rank and who are at least 15 percent or more below the national average for their discipline.”

Why is 15% the benchmark number? What was faculty's role, either consultative or formal, in setting this particular benchmark? Is there continuing review of this benchmark? If so, are faculty involved?

4. Since CUPA data is such an integral part of the faculty compensation process, is the current CUPA data used available to faculty for review? If so, where is it located? If not, could the data be placed at the Helmke Library for public access? I believe that Deans and Chairs receive copies of faculty's CUPA benchmark for their areas of responsibility, but, do individual faculty formally receive their benchmark number each year?
5. Is the information derived from CUPA compared for reasonableness to other external salary databases? The AAUP, I believe has a listing for Indiana. Also, wouldn't it make sense, when faculty are held to external standards required by external accrediting bodies that salary comparisons would be made using those accrediting disciplines as their peers? I am familiar with AACSB, and I am certain that other disciplines have accrediting bodies or associations which more closely represent their current market.

Thank you,

Stanley W. Davis
Professor of Accounting

S. Hannah: Jack Dahl will answer Questions 1, 2, 4, and 5. I will answer Question 3.

J. Dahl: This report will be posted with the Senate minutes and will be available on the Senate website. I would like to give you a brief overview of the material at this time.

1) The first question is about how the university uses CUPA data. CUPA has become a widely used acronym for the College and University Personnel Association. They do us a great service by collecting salary data, and we cooperate in them doing this every year, and then publishing discipline-level salary averages for institutions across the country. They do the same thing for administrators at two different levels. There are administrators and mid-level administrators. The Registrar is an administrator, and the assistant registrar is mid-level administrator. That is the concept.

On the faculty side, we start out with the peer institutions, which is whoever answers the survey. That is actually a very stable group. There are public and private universities, and there are institutions by level. The doctoral level is only slightly represented here because they usually participate in conference surveys, like the Big 10, and in professional organization surveys like AAU (Association of American Universities). Relatively few doctoral schools participate here and relatively few bachelors do. In the end, CUPA ends up being a little bit higher than what AAUP (American Association of University Professors) reports for public master's universities. AAUP does not publish data about individual disciplines.

The public ended up reporting data on 137,000 faculty members in 2006-2007. We are right now telling them about 2007-2008. The budget was set July 1, we talked about it after that, and it takes all year long to get this collected and then reported back to the institutions. About 67,000 faculty members were reported from the private universities, for a total of 205,000. CUPA also reports the overall salary increase for the year. Last year, the average increase was +3.9. That was higher than our 3.5. We lost a little ground.

That is the context for peer schools and how CUPA does business and, again, we are one of the participating schools and have been for many years.

2) This question showed an Economics professor with a minimum-maximum salary in quartiles along the way. That style of presenting data is used for administrative positions, but it has not been used for faculty positions for many years. What is reported for faculty is simply average data by institution type. I used the discipline of accounting just to pick one example (see information in report): the category “public institutions” and the discipline of accounting. Up until this last year, we talked about non-collective bargaining versus collective bargaining institutions. Frankly, the union made a difference. They do not do that anymore – I am glad they do not. It was a small difference, and what it did was fracture the sample size. Even with 137,000 faculty, by the time you split by rank, public, and discipline, you end up with some small numbers. There are about three disciplines this year where we moved from the public average to the all-university average because the pool size was just too small. It became non-representative.

The discipline of accounting does have representative numbers. A lot of institutions teach accounting. For public universities, then, we have professors who made an average of \$108,000 last year. Associates were at \$88,000, and Assistants were at \$76,000. Notice that new assistants were at \$81,000. This is one of the disciplines where new hires are above current averages. Instructors were at \$50,000. This was the 2006-2007 result. After July 1, I know our 2007-2008 salaries. The last step in getting data assembled, discipline by discipline, is to adjust the CUPA numbers to reflect current year estimates. We chose +3 percent.

That leads to the sample on the bottom. We do not have any current accounting professor who makes \$100,000. That is a hypothetical example. Comparison of the salaries leads to a conclusion that this professor is making 8% below the national average.

Next year we will start over. The group of disciplines that is reported each year also changes. Every year, there is a report for group level, and Group 52 is business. The 52.03 is accounting. We also have to make a decision of whether we are going to use a group or subgroup. When we report enrollments, we go all the way down to subgroups.

The first sheet is the end of the story in developing the data. That is entirely separate from how the data will be used in determining salaries for the coming budget year.

4) The CUPA book itself is given to each dean, and is also on reserve at the library. It is 200 pages long and shows the list of institutions that responded.

5) We do compare the CUPA numbers to AAUP. CUPA is our only source at the discipline level. AAUP does public by institution level by rank. My interest is in the national number for public masters universities. Since CUPA also publishes their version of that number, I can compare the two. CUPA comes in more or less higher than AAUP, and that is fine. Everyone else participating in the survey uses it the same way as we do to 1) evaluate new-hire salaries, and 2) look at equity. We have made a real commitment to new hires being at the market level, and I am confident that they are. We also look at the data from the AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business),

when deans put them on the table. They tend to be even less representative of us. The AACSB is maybe 50 percent Ph.D.

S. Hannah: 3) This question asks about how we came up with the algorithm that we used that focuses on full professors, 15%, and 5 years in rank. I would love to say that this was the result of a careful, rational process. I need \$2.5 million to move the entire faculty to the CUPA numbers, and I have, on a yearly basis, about \$200,000. The notion was to come up with something that goes after where the problem is the most severe in a rational manner, can be justified, can be explained to everybody, and can be applied objectively.

The professor part was objective. Jack Dahl also does another nice form which is distributed widely which talks about AAUP and CUPA differences by total. You can look at that, and, as the chancellor has reported in his strategic plan on a regular basis, we set some targets about moving and focusing on those full professor salaries because that was where we were had the greatest difference from the AAUP average. At the professor level we knew that, by whatever measure we looked at it, that was where we were the most out of line. We needed to focus there, so we made a decision to focus there.

We chose five years in rank because it would be unreasonable to think that someone just promoted would be at the average. Five years sounded like a good number.

The 15 percent was chosen equally on a common sense basis. I looked at all the full professors, and where the lines fell that seemed to make the most sense. Then we wanted to get it down to something that could actually make a difference. We got the whole problem down from \$2.5 million to \$127,000. I still cannot fix that when all I have is \$200,000. But I can start.

The last part of the algorithm is the recommendation of the dean about the satisfactory performance of the person involved. We looked at why the individual was so far out after so many years in rank. As we have found out for most of those for whom we have tried to make a difference, they started with such low salaries that there was no way, even with super merit every year, they were ever going to catch up. It really turned out to be a function of where they started, which reinforces our decision to bring in new hires at competitive rates. Over time, this problem should take care of itself. If we bring people in at the proper salary to start with, then we will not end up with these huge 30 percent differences from national averages after ten years in rank. We have made a difference. I have not presented those numbers, but we can get it to you to show you, at the full professor rank, the number of folks whose salaries we have improved.

To come up with an algorithm that makes sense, I would like all the input I can possibly get. I have taken the question to the Faculty Affairs Committee every year. They have agreed that the problem is so huge that this particular process seems to make as much sense as any. If anyone has more suggestions, I am always open to them. The Senate had passed a resolution asking the Faculty Affairs Committee to take a formal role in this. It had been somewhat informal, and they asked that it be formalized. All of that input is welcome.

Two years ago, the Faculty Affairs Committee looked at the compression at the associate rank as well. In terms of equity, we wanted to look particularly at associate-rank faculty who were below what brand-new assistants were going to make. I cannot fix the School of Business. The market is a wicked mistress, and that has really taken over what beginning salaries are for the School. Every year there is a conversation and there is faculty involvement. We look at the benchmarks, at the 15 percent, and we will look at the five-year algorithm, too. Deans have the ability every year to propose somebody who does not fit any of that criteria, who they believe has a justifiable case, and I have tried to be responsive. I am very pleased to see every year that we have made a little difference. We are not there yet.

R. Sutter: Does this leave any room for discretion for those individuals who might be under five years?

S. Hannah: Yes, we have had deans who have said if you wait five years for this person, it is going to be unmanageable. If we do something now, we can prevent what we see coming as a train wreck, because even if this person gets significant increases, he is never going to catch up.

M. Nusbaumer: I just wanted to reiterate for everyone what you said. The Faculty Affairs Committee, for the March meeting, will be coming forward with recommendations for the Senate to look at on salary increments. I believe we are meeting a week from today to finalize those, so you can still send comments to me.

S. Hannah: I said that there is a \$2.5 million problem, and I have \$200,000. That \$200,000 is the one percent at the campus level, which is not all spent for equity. In the past it was 50-50, and for the past several years, by Faculty Affairs recommendation, 70 percent merit, and only 30 percent equity. So now my \$2.5 million problem is \$60,000 – that is all I have. It is going to be a long walk to fix it. You have to make choices, and I appreciate the Faculty Affairs Committee being willing to wrestle with these very difficult questions.

A. Ushenko: When you talked about those people who have been low forever and will never catch up, did you mean that you kind of ignore them because they are hopeless anyway or will not ever make it up to right level?

S. Hannah: If they are recommended by the dean, we look at that.

K. Moustafa: You said that part of your determination of raises in salary is based upon satisfactory performance.

S. Hannah: There is some discretion in what that means. That does not mean you have to have gotten super merit every year. It may mean that every once in a while, you might get merit. If you are always below the average in your department, or pretty close, then probably there is a reason that you are 30 percent behind. We are not looking for the

super meritorious, but we also are not looking at people who have always been below the average in their own departments by their own standards.

R. Nelipvoich: Does this data look at continuing lecturers? Where do they fit?

S. Hannah: Yes. In the AAUP, we consider them part of the instructor category. I would only need \$76,000 to bring everybody up to the national average there.

N. Younis yielded the chair back to S. Davis.

8. New business: There was no new business.
9. Committee reports “for information only”: There were no reports.
10. The general good and welfare of the University:

A. Ushenko: I recently took over the handling of money from AAUP. I have been president of our chapter for three years, and I would like to urge anybody who belongs to the institution to consider being a chapter member. We could send the money back to AAUP, but that would be sad, but there is very little money. I have been told by people that they are unsure about paying money to join an ineffective organization. AAUP is not an ineffective organization. Because it has no power, it is not just another institution trying to force people to do things. These were originally academically respectable institutions. If any of you can find it in your hearts to consider being a chapter member, please leave me a message on my voice mail. It would be an important step in developing your profession.

M. Wartell: 1) The Commission on Higher Education approved three masters tracks last Friday. Dr. Susan Hannah, Dr. Linda Finke, and Dr. Carol Sternberger were involved with this. Two of them are clinical tracks. That is very important to the university, so I think we owe them congratulations. They have done a great job to develop that. Also, Katherine Willock, who is our graduate director of nursing, helped a lot. Those two clinical tracks will contribute greatly to our ability to train nurses in the future. There is a requirement on the part of the accrediting agencies of the state that those who teach clinical experiences in the hospitals have masters degrees. It is a very important step for the nursing program.

2) The legislature is in mid session. It is not a budget session, but remember that all kinds of things can happen even in non budget sessions. There were bills to put faculty members on boards of trustees. That would be one interesting sort of development. Another bill would allow the carrying of firearms on public institutions. Many of those things will die in the legislature. On the other hand, we have to be fairly vigilant about things that will affect the university and what we do.

3) I suggest that you carefully read the sci-tech contribution for today in the newspaper written by our dean of ETCS. The technology base of pornography will become immediately obvious to you.

G. Voland: It is not due to technology. Technology just opens the gateway.

M. Wartell: Thank you all for everything you do.

K. Moustafa: I would like to add that the Doermer School of Business and Management Sciences has been reaffirmed in our AACSB accreditation which is an international system of accreditation. We are very pleased.

Also, I would like to inform you that we have taken students to the International Business Competition which was held in San Francisco. Our students came in in the top 18 of 88 international universities. We were there with Stanford and many other Ivy-league schools. They had no idea who IPFW was. As Bill Todorovic said, they now know who IPFW is. We are hoping that we may receive funding again from another business to support the next trip.

M. Wartell: I apologize. The reaccreditation of business is certainly a very important step, at least equal to getting three new nursing programs. That is a wonderful step, and our colleagues in the Doermer School of Business and Management Sciences deserve congratulations as well.

S. Davis: Over the next two weeks, we will have the candidates in for the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs position. Please try to go. There are two meetings set up for each candidate. Please try to show your support and interest in who will be chosen to be our next academic leader.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty