

Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Fifth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
February 13, 2006
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 9, 2006
3. Acceptance of the agenda – C. Champion
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – N. Younis
 - b. Indiana University – B. Fife
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 05-4) – J. Tankel
7. New business
8. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (report on Indiana Speaker election and Presiding Officer election) – R. Friedman
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 05-12) – C. Champion
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: G. Bullion
Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen
Secretary: J. Petersen

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, A. Argast, R. Bean, S. Blythe, W. Branson, J. Brennan, J. Burg, C. Champion, S. Davis, D. Erbach, B. Fife, L. Fox, R. Friedman, P. Goodmann, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, C. Hill, P. Iadicola, Z. Liang, L. Meyer, M. Montesino, G. Moss, G. Mourad, D. Mueller, E. Neal, D. Oberstar, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, S. Tannous, J. Toole, S. Troy, G. Volland, M. Walsh, L. Wark, R. Weiner, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

M. Codispoti, P. Dragnev, D. Goodman, J. Grant, T. Grove, A. Karim, L. Kuznar, L. Lin, D. Lindquist, M. Lipman, R. Murray, A. Mustafa, E. Ohlander, M. Wartell, J. Zhao

Attachment:

[“Academic Calendar, 2008-2009”](#) (SD 05-4)

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, S. Sarratore

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

Acta

1. Call to order: G. Bullion called the meeting to order at 12:02.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 9, 2006: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

C. Champion 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: Good afternoon colleagues. I would like to bring to your attention two topics: 1) the associate faculty and 2) the consistency or lack of communications regarding the university policy of release time for faculty.

First, every IPFW member's contributions and constituent's input are vital to the success of this fine institution. The faculty is the thrust of the engine that drives the university to achieve its goals and objectives. IPFW is fortunate to have an outstanding faculty who enjoy great successes in the classroom. We also are blessed by having a solid group of associate faculty that complements our full-time faculty. These associate faculties are here because they love to teach and, in many cases, bring a wealth of industrial experience to the classroom. As faculty, we can reward them by nominating the deserving ones to the annual Associate Faculty Teaching Award. You recently received a call for nominations for the award from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Please show your appreciation to our associate faculty by nominating the deserving ones.

The second issue is regarding the consistency of faculty release time. Through my discussions with faculty, I came to know that most faculty do not know about the release time that their colleagues in other departments are enjoying. This includes, for example, the release time for developing a new course, writing a major grant proposal, establishing an assessment plan, extra time release for new faculty, etc. For consistency reasons and to be an organized university, I suggest that the VCAA office inform the faculty on a yearly basis of the opportunities for time release and the percentage of FTE release. It is

only fair that a professor from department A gets the same quarter-time release for doing the same work as another professor from department B.

Thank you.

b. Indiana University:

B. Fife: I have but a few more meetings in the Fort Wayne Senate as the Indiana University speaker. As such, I would simply like to reiterate two policy positions that I have delineated in the past.

First, I believe that this institution has matured a great deal over the last 40 years. IPFW has established its own niche in the Indiana higher education system. This is a comprehensive university destined to expand. We can serve the needs of our students and community in a more optimum manner as a separate, independent, publicly-supported institution. This is one great university, but it is high time that we confront the challenges of the future on our own terms and through our own objectives. In short, it is time to move forward and away from the colonial model of the past.

Second, as a faculty advocate, I cannot imagine a more compelling issue on this campus than the reality of compressed faculty salaries. The data are entirely clear and indisputable—our colleagues at IPFW are doing very poorly compared to most of our peers in the state, particularly at the higher ranks. In focusing on this matter again, my intent is not to be critical of any specific set of individuals, legislators, administrators, and faculty alike, for a retrospective evaluation will do little to facilitate a remedy for the problem at hand. What I would like to do, however, is to suggest that faculty members can certainly lend their expertise in order to help administrators reduce and minimize an issue that has been plaguing our community for years. I am not suggesting that the rank and file faculty members make recommendations for themselves. I do believe, that as part of the strategic planning process, faculty could, at the very least, collaborate with our executive leaders in order to devise innovative methods to deal with this most vexing problem. I am confident that more democratic deliberation, in general, can make our seemingly insurmountable challenges fall somewhere in the realm of the possible in a reasonable period of time.

Thank you.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion: There was no report.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 05-4) – J. Tankel:

J. Tankel moved to approve SD 05-4 (Academic Calendar, 2008-2009).

Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 05-4 passed on a voice vote.

7. New business: There was no new business.

8. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee – R. Friedman:

R. Friedman announced that there was one nominee each for Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty and for Presiding Officer. Michael Nusbaumer has been elected Speaker and David Turnipseed has been elected Presiding Officer.

b. Executive Committee (SR No. 05-12) – C. Champion:

C. Champion presented SR No. 05-12 (Administrative Personnel with Academic Rank) for information only.

Much discussion took place on both sides of the issue.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

P. Iadicola: For the good and welfare of the university, I recommend that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs adequately vet the proposals for changing the policy regarding faculty summer salaries by submitting the proposals for faculty comment to the following Senate committees: 1) Educational Policy Committee to determine curriculum impact, 2) Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee for budgetary rationale and impact, and 3) Faculty Affairs Committee for impact on faculty workload and compensation policies of IPFW, Indiana University, and Purdue University.

S. Troy: For the general good and welfare of the university and the Department of Theatre, I would like to remind you that we are having a production of the *Comedy of Errors* by William Shakespeare. It will be the last weekend in February and the first weekend in March. I happily invite all of you to attend and to encourage all your students to attend as well.

S. Hannah: I would like to discuss the summer compensation issue because this is something that may be misunderstood. I was looking to make more public and more visible a practice that has grown up over the last several years. When you did not have enough students to keep a class from being canceled, and a faculty member was willing to teach it on another basis with fewer students, we would work it out. In several instances over the last several years, we have done that to the agreement of both the students and the faculty. It has basically been a case-by-case practice, and has happened all across the university. I wanted to make it more public so that if anybody else wanted to know about this or take advantage of it, it is available. That is really the only change. Right now, there are minimums and we negotiate. If you know in advance that you have a class that is not likely to make it, and it is a class that you really need, we have been able to make those

accommodations on a regular basis. That will not change. I was trying to be helpful. Every year there are never more than three or four of these classes each session. There is only so much money to spend. The more students we teach, the more money becomes available, and the more the chancellor can put back in Supplies and Expenses, etc. It was just an effort to try to enhance both faculty and students. If it seems to be ill-conceived, then we do not need to do it.

P. Iadicola: Sometimes it seems that the execution of a policy, when it becomes formalized in a written statement of practice, becomes a part of the policy. And it can be more rigidly applied, just as you are implying: if you do not meet the minimum, you do not teach. If I understand the way the policy regarding summer salaries was executed, that it was really, as you said, also on a case-by-case basis, then that would impact curriculum. If there is a policy that is being developed or a practice that is being specified, then the appropriate faculty committees should have an opportunity to respond, recommend, or comment regarding those particular areas that are relevant to faculty.

S. Hannah: The Faculty Affairs Committee had a member on the taskforce that looked at all these different ideas. It is not finished. There is still discussion, and I will take it to the Faculty Affairs Committee on Friday. We want it to be fair. People will know what the rules are and what was optional. All or nothing never works. You cannot lay down the law that all classes will be “X” because there are always special situations that we are going to take into consideration. However, there is only so much money. I was trying to spread it as far as possible. If people do not like that idea, then let me know.

S. Troy: Just to be clear, Dr. Hannah, when you say “if people need these courses,” are you talking about students?

S. Hannah: I am talking about students needing them for graduation. That happens mostly in a highly structured curriculum, particularly in engineering and a couple of other places where the curriculum is sequential.

P. Iadicola: I do not want to take too much more of Senate time on this, but I am glad to hear that the Faculty Affairs Committee is going to be reviewing this. The issue may be an issue of communication, because there was a substantial number of faculty who were very much concerned that policy was being developed, and that faculty were not going to be adequately consulted in the process of development. So if it is an issue of miscommunication, I understand.

S. Hannah: Before the taskforce was set up, the Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to have members put on it, and one person volunteered.

P. Hamburger: You have probably already looked at it, but you mentioned that there are certain amounts of money that you can spend on this. Most of the courses are probably paid for by student tuition. I made a calculation when I was the Purdue speaker when this question came up several years ago. The calculation I made was that roughly six or seven students in the class should cover the cost of the class. I raised this question with the dean’s

office, and they said that that is not correct. There have to be at least 20-25 students, and it was explained to me that I did not include the heating and overhead, so it was not correct. I said that we have to heat the building, pay for the building, and pay the faculty salary anyway, so it should cover the whole cost. The final answer was that they did not seem to be able to say where this money goes. So how many students really cover the cost of the class?

S. Hannah: That is really the wrong question to be asking. If Deb Conklin was running a cost-per-class basis, your arguments would make good sense. She has her own pay situation in the summer. Summer is part of our general fund allocation, so all of the tuition goes from all enrollment periods into one pot. That in turn gets allocated into salary, heat, and light, etc. The summer budget, which is about \$2 million, is one item that comes out of that whole pot of money. If we were to change the way we funded summer to a cost-per-basis practice as you are suggesting, which some universities do, and spend more than the \$2 million allocated, then that would be less money for your regular salary increment and other things. That is because we are talking about a general fund allocation, not as a separate responsibility.

P. Hamburger: If you have more students, then more money comes in.

S. Hannah: The bottom line for this university is that you have to look at the whole year accounts, not just summer. We could do it that way, but we do not.

S. Troy: Is there a minimum limit for fall and spring courses; and if so, what is that limit?

S. Hannah: Yes, there is. Courses get canceled. Every semester the deans have to send me a report of every course with fewer than ten people in it and an explanation for why.

P. Iadicola: I understand the model that we follow. It is not a cost-basis model, and I am thankful for that primarily because there are other issues besides cost that should influence your decision. But I am somewhat mystified by the use of an arbitrary number of 10, 15, or 20 when you really have no cost basis to determine what that appropriate number should be. Have you done an analysis over a particular summer based on cost of faculty salaries and based on credit-hour generations?

S. Hannah: I think at one point all those costs were figured in and it came out at 15.

J. Dahl: Yes, we have done direct costs versus direct income studies which showed those numbers to be reasonable.

S. Hannah: So the 10, 12, etc. is all within what it costs.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:26 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty