

Minutes of the  
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Tenth Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne  
February 11, 1991  
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 28, 1991
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Switzer
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 (Senate Document SD 90-17) - F. Kirchhoff
  - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 90-18) - F. Kirchhoff
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: S. Harroff

Sergeant-at-Arms: R. Barrett

Senate Members Present:

M. Auburn, J. Blakemore, F. Borelli, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, A. Chatterjea, P. Conn, D. Cox, V. Craig, M. Downs, A. Finco, E. Foley, A. Friedel, J. Haw, R. Hawley, R. Jeske, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, J. Klotz, J. Lantz, D. Legg, J. Lutz, M. Mansfield, R. Miers, D. Oberstar, R. Ritchie, S. Sarratore, J. Scherz, D. Schmidt, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, J. Sunderman, J. Switzer, G. Szymanski, M. H. Thuente, W. Unsell, E. Waters

Senate Members Absent:

E. Blumenthal, S. Dhawale, J. Eichenauer, A. Karim, D. Kruse, J. Manzer, J. Meyers, R. Novak, J. Owen, A. Shupe, K. Wakley, W. Walker

Medical Education Representative: D. Bell

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, L. Griffin, S. Hockemeyer, M. Souers

Visitors Present: K. Beery, J. Dahl, D. Hyde

---

Attachments:

["Amendment of Academic Regulations: Academic Appeals Policy, SD 82-2"](#) (SD 90-17)

["Academic Appeals Policy"](#) (SD 82-2, as amended)

"Amendment of Senate Bylaws: Proposed Change in Name, Membership and Charge of the Transitional Studies Advisory Subcommittee" (SD 90-18)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 28, 1991: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Switzer moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

M. Downs: I have two items of interest to the Indiana University faculty--both having to do with fringe benefits. In the fall we had a hearing here on a proposal that had been developed by the administration and representatives of the faculty in regard to Indiana University's early-retirement plan. The idea was to come up with a replacement for the 18/20 plan for new hires--those people hired after the revision of the 18/20 plan was made a few years ago. A proposal was developed which included revision downward in the age at which faculty would be eligible for 18/20. It included two phased-early retirement plans for faculty and a new early-retirement plan for new hires. The Board of Trustees has signaled that not all of the elements in that proposal are acceptable to them at this time. The administration and faculty representatives have renegotiated; there have been some important changes in that proposal which will come back to the faculty members for consideration and discussion later on this semester. The downward revisions do make the proposal less attractive, I think, to the majority of the faculty, but more attractive, we hope, to the Board of Trustees, although that matter is still in doubt.

The other has to do with the question of pensions. Both Purdue University and Indiana University are currently involved in this process. We have sent a final proposal to the administration in regard to two important items: one is the leeway that faculty will have over alternate investment strategies with their TIAA/CREF pension payments. The proposal that is being sent forward will direct the university to select five other investment programs in addition to CREF and the faculty member will be allowed to decide for her or himself which investment strategy and which investor they wish to send that part of their pension money to. The other item has to do with the cashability of the CREF accumulation at the time of retirement. There were dramatic differences of opinion in regard to that. Personally I favor maximum flexibility and up to 100% cashability at the time of retirement for those

who wish to take their CREF money and do something smart or stupid with it. The compromise was 50% cashability. At the time of retirement you could take 50% of the CREF distribution allocation and use it as you wish. There is, as at Purdue University, a difference of opinion as to what philosophy ought to prevail--whether the money in these funds is deferred income, strongly argued by some faculty members, including this one, or just a pension. Our fringe benefits are very good but our salaries are low, and it is only natural for us to think of the money that goes into pensions as a kind of deferred income. The university's position is that it is retirement income. Ordinarily, if it is retirement income, it is strictly regulated and controlled by the university, an attitude that some of us think is parental. If it is deferred income, the faculty would be allowed maximum flexibility for both investing the money and cashing the money out. Right now we have compromised I think the compromise was possible because of the difference between what we consider retirement and what we consider deferred income is no longer very clear. If this is accepted, it will be a step in what I consider to be the right direction given the trends that are already in existence and very pronounced in the attitude of the university toward faculty.

b. Purdue University:

A. Finco: On Friday, February 9, Pat Collins and I met with the Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs for the purpose of discussing the options that the Purdue: University TIAA/CREF Retirement Task Force has before it. As a consequence of that meeting, I think Pat and I got several questions that we can use and propose to the task force and also: some inside thoughts that we can share with the task force. Mike has said they have sent their proposal forward. We will have a meeting on the 20th of February unless the schedule changes.

J. Lantz: Because we are two different parts of a house, is there any thought that the decision that is made by IU would, in fact, be regarded favorably on the Purdue University side?

A. Finco: That has never come up. You must remember that the task force has representatives from each of the regional campuses as well as from the main campus.

J. Lantz: We have enough artificial differences that are put out that I would encourage you to at least speak on behalf of the Fort Wayne campus--that doing things so that all of our employees are treated equally and justly might be of great importance.

A. Finco: I will do that. I don't know what kind of reception it will get. I think that the number of options that we are concentrating on are much fewer than what Mike says, Mike says there are five different kinds of investments outside the university that might be proposed. We are proposing. Two: one in insurance and one in stocks--a mutual kind of situation. Many members of the committee think

that the more complex it gets, the more difficult it will be for people to work with it. Too many options will be confusing. Of course, CREF already has started in that. One of them has to do with the money market fund and the other has to do with the social-choice fund,

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

W. Frederick: I would like to introduce a new member of the Senate: Senator Ritchie, who replaced John Carnaghi. Also, I would like to call your attention to the spring faculty convocation on February 15 from 2:00-3:00 p.m. in Walb 224-226-228. Congresswoman Jill Long will speak on higher-education issues and the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. I encourage all of my colleagues to attend.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 90-17) - F. Kirchhoff:

F. Kirchhoff moved to approve SD 90-17 (Amendment of Academic Appeals Policy, SD 82-22). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 90-18) - F. Kirchhoff:

F. Kirchhoff moved to approve SD 90-18 (Amendment of Senate Bylaws: Proposed Change in Name, Membership and Charge of the Transitional Studies Advisory Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. New business: There was no new business.

8. Committee reports "for information only":

A. Friedel announced that the Nominations and Elections Committee had received only one nomination--Bill Frederick--for Presiding Officer of the Senate for 1991-92. He was declared elected.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Lantz: I would like to announce to the Senate that last Wednesday the Purdue University Board of Trustees approved the contractor for the Engineering and Technology Building and the bids were quite good. This spring you will have to get used to driving past one more hole in the ground.

A week ago last Friday, Vice Chancellor Ritchie did sign the final drawings for the theatre building and it is out for bid right now to contractors. We will receive bids until March 12. We are hopeful that the bids will be as good as they were for the Engineering and Technology Building. If that is the case, contract will be let on March 22 for the theatre.

J. Lutz: Speaking of another hole in the ground, are we going to find some way to route all of the traffic into one bottleneck when we put up the building as we have done so marvelously with the parking garage?

J. Lantz: If everything goes right with the state, we will have a new entrance to campus next summer, fall or sometime in the near future, which we hope will alleviate some of the traffic congestion. I don't think we will have to block off one more road, because if we do we couldn't move anyplace. Someday we do expect traffic to flow nicely through campus. I can't promise that for some months to come.

M. Downs: This is in addition to what the Chancellor said. The parking garage is supposed to be finished and ready for use on March 1. At the same time the new building would begin. We would lose a number of parking spaces, but may gain many more. Good weather will make it possible for that timetable to be kept. If the weather is not good and the garage is not ready, progress will have a somewhat higher than ordinary price. We will lose something in excess of 250 parking spaces and we won't have the 735 new spaces in the garage. There may be two or three weeks of considerable inconvenience. I think everybody here should be prepared to explain to those who will be angry that there is a good and sufficient reason for it, that it is a sacrifice which will yield benefits for all of us in the end. Too often we shrug our shoulders and say "bad planning." Not this time. The weather is responsible for the difficulty in completing the parking garage on time. There are things that are beyond the control of administrators.

I should also say that at its last meeting the University Resources Policy Committee reiterated its strong opposition to the creation of a smoking lounge in Kettler Hall. Rumors continue that this is still an option being explored. We feel that with the shortage of space and funds, that this would be an inappropriate use of the space and funds.

D. Schmidt: When the Engineering and Technology Building construction begins, where will the A parking spaces be reallocated in the interim?

R. Ritchie: They won't be reallocated per se, but the parking garage has both A and B capability. We hope folks will use that for the time being.

D. Schmidt: Does that mean that both A and B can park in a particular spot.

R. Ritchie: Yes.

D. Schmidt: That's the only result of a loss of 200 and some spaces?

R. Ritchie: At this point, yes.

D. Schmidt: You're losing 200 As?

M. Downs: No, 40-some spaces are As.

D. Schmidt. Is there any thought in making 40 of those spaces in the garage?

R. Ritchie: I can't really address that specifically, but I'll be glad to get the information and get back to you.

A. Finco: To my recollection, that goes contrary to what the intent is as far as that garage is concerned. It will be opened to anyone. If there are additional A spaces they have to be taken out of the lots that are there.

D. Schmidt: My point was that it be in the garage. I think if you are going to lose 40 A spaces you ought to allocate 40 in some location in the approximate vicinity.

A. Finco: Once the switch is made we gain 500 spaces.

R. Jeske: On a nonparking matter, has there been any follow-up to the great deer round-up? Are we going to be doing anything else to help the deer situation?

R. Ritchie: Yes, Don Katter has met with the group from Michigan. They are looking at other alternatives. Nothing has been finalized at this point. We will continue to pursue it.

R. Jeske: Is there any consideration being given to simply going and hunting the deer out?

R. Ritchie: Not to my knowledge.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L Blauvelt  
Secretary of the Faculty