

Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Nineteenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
February 14, 2000
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda*

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 10, 2000
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - J. Silver
 - b. Indiana University - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - R. Hess
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Agenda Committee (SD 99-10) - M. Downs
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 99-11) – L. Wright-Bower
7. Question time
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 99-13) - D. Oberstar
 - b. Agenda Committee (SR No. 99-14) - M. Downs
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

*As amended

Presiding Officer: R. Hess
Parliamentarian: J. Clausen
Sergeant-at-Arms: M. Sherr
Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, H. Abu-Mulaweh, K. Ahern, R. Berger, P. Bingi, F. Borelli, W. Branson, C. Champion, V. Coufoudakis, L. DeFonso, W. DeMott, M. Downs, C. Drummond, C. Erickson, B. Fife, L. Fox, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Harroff, B. Hume, A. Javaheri, M. Kimble, D. Marshall, N. McCroskey, K. McDonald, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Pugh, B. Salmon, H. Samavati, Z. Shipchandler J. Silver, K. Squadrito, J. Tankel, R. Tierney, M. Wartell, W. D. Weakley, L. Wright-Bower, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

J. Brennan, M. Codispoti, I. Hack, B. Harwood, C. Leiserson, R. Manalis, J. Nichols, D. Pfeffenberger, R. Sedlmeyer, C. Thompson, D. Vasquez

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, D. Mauritzen

Visitors Present: K. Browne, J. Dahl, M. Gruss, E. Kehoe

Attachments:

"[Proposed amendment to SD 82-2](#) (Academic Appeals)" (SD 99-11)

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

"[Terms and Conditions of Employment of Lecturers](#)" (SR No. 99-15)

"Approval of replacement member of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee" (SD 99-10 - approved but not attached)

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Hess called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 10, 2000: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

M. Downs moved to amend the agenda to include an item 7: question time and to renumber the remaining items. Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

The agenda was approved as amended.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University:

J. Silver: On February 4 I had the opportunity to address the Purdue University Board of Trustees--an occasion that arises about once a year. I reminded the

Trustees of our ongoing concern about our state per-student allocations as compared with those of other campuses. I told them about the planned lobbying trip to Indianapolis that took place last week and said that the purpose of that trip was to maintain legislators' awareness of this issue. I promised them that the IPFW community would engage in a vigorous lobbying effort next year when the biennial budget is under consideration. I once again asked them for their encouragement and support in this endeavor.

b. Indiana University:

M. Downs: At the most recent meeting of the University Faculty Council a set of proposals regarding academic appointments were approved in principle. I will be circulating information to members of the Senate. The administration will be informed through regular channels. I am not sure about the degree to which these new categories of academic rank will apply to this campus, but, in any event, it marks an important change in the way that Indiana University has dealt with academic appointments. It attempts to make them more regular and consistent across the entire university; it will not be approved, finally, until the next meeting of the University Faculty Council. If anybody has anything they wish to call to my attention about it, I will be happy to present those views at the next meeting.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer - R. Hess:

R. Hess reminded Schools that they are to conduct elections for new Senators by March 1. Also, Professor Weakley has distributed committee preference sheets. If you have not yet filled out yours, please do so.

6. Committee reports requiring action

a. Agenda Committee (SD 99-10) - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 99-10 (Approval of replacement member of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 99-11) - L. Wright-Bower:

L. Wright-Bower moved to approve SD 99-11 (Proposed amendment to SD 82-2 [Academic Appeals]). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

7. Question time:

Q: Will the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs give us detailed information about the new policy regarding continuing lecturers and tenure-track instructors?

A. S. Hannah: What I can do is report on a discussion. There is no policy yet. I will distribute to the Senate what now is a policy, which is a Purdue policy, on continuing lecturers. What is being discussed is how it is to be implemented here. I thought I would give you a little history. A new classification called "continuing lecturers" was approved by the Purdue University Board of Trustees in September of 1998. The following February President Beering issued an Executive Memorandum C-48 (attached [<http://www.adpc.purdue.edu/VPBS/c-49.htm>]), which describes the terms and conditions of this new classification for the West Lafayette campus. It goes on to say that regional campuses may use the category, upon approval by their Chancellor, or that any exceptions to the provisions of C-48 on regional campuses could be proposed for approval by the President or his designee.

What it says is that the purpose of it is to create a classification called continuing lecturers who are hired at .5 FTE or better on an ongoing basis. These folks would receive fringe benefits. There would be a presumption of annual reappointment with a one-semester's notice for termination. It is related to what Purdue calls limited-term lecturers--what we call associate faculty--in the following way: the notion under C-48 is that no one can be hired at .5 FTE for more than six continuous academic-year semesters. The assumption is that you either get rid of them or you convert them to this new position.

That happened in February 1999. That spring I appointed a subcommittee of the deans to figure out what this will mean to us. (Clearly, it is a policy that was passed by the Purdue Board of Trustees and C-48 recognizes there needs to be discussion at the regional campuses.) Last fall they gave a report to AOC and we spent some time developing some proposed implementation principles as to how the policy might work for us. The deans can talk about that with their department chairs. That's about where we are. I am getting a lot of feedback from the deans through departments: what is this going to mean to us? how would it work? I am also taking this to the Faculty Affairs Committee to have a broader policy discussion. Right now the discussion is underway. . . .

As we have gone into this discussion, there are a lot of issues. I'll just give you a list of them. (1) West Lafayette. This was designed to solve a problem in West Lafayette. It was not designed to address or even consider our particular issues. We have relatively many more part-timers than West Lafayette. We had 307 associate faculty in the fall of 1999. Twenty-seven of those had been hired at .5 or more for six continuous semesters. That is a much larger percentage in that category than West Lafayette has. They hire graduate assistants; we hire associate faculty.

(2) Cost. If we did make these conversions for those 27 people, the cost would go up at least 32% in fringe benefits, or whatever it is, plus any change that we would make in their salaries. So the minimum we would be spending, at least on those 27 people, would be 30% more, and most likely more than double. And those numbers could add up over time. That money will be hard to find.

(3) Program differences. Some departments are quite interested in this classification. Others are not so interested and have good pedagogical and staffing reasons for having differences of opinion about it. So those need to be thought out.

(4) Individual differences. Some faculty, who would be otherwise eligible faculty, are interested in such a conversion because of the fringe benefits privilege; others are not. Even at the individual level there are differences of opinion.

The point is there are a lot of things to work out. We've reached no conclusions about anything except that the policy as written for West Lafayette probably will not work for us here. We would probably need to be asking for some exceptions or revisions to the policy to make it work to fit our staffing needs. And, as Mike [Downs] pointed out, at the same time we are having these discussions, IU is having discussions about nontenure-track appointments. The biggest things in that discussion that appear to me as significant are that they are doing away with tenure-track instructor positions and, it sounds like, they may, for the first time, allow a fractional tenure-track appointment. But that is not final. All I can say is that the conversation is proceeding. I can provide more detail in writing if that would be useful.

P. Hamburger: You said that we don't have to rush because this won't be implemented until 2000 something. Does that mean that we cannot hire someone for this position immediately?

S. Hannah: I wouldn't be willing to hire someone for this position immediately because we haven't decided as a campus what we want to do with it. The classification has some possible benefits, but we need to think a long time about it.

P. Hamburger: What I meant was, could somebody have this position when they have already served six semesters? Can we do it in the future?

S. Hannah: We're not going to start counting until January 1999, so it doesn't matter if they've been here for 20 years.

P. Hamburger: My question was, when we hire somebody a person has to serve six semesters?

S. Hannah: I don't know. That could be one of the exceptions that we ask for. That we would just create such positions and hire people into it directly. Please don't say that we're going to do that. That's just an idea that has been suggested.

K. McDonald: I am a little confused because we are trying to hire a tenure-track instructor and are basically being told you don't think that is going to go through.

S. Hannah: Right. The tenure-track instructor is different from this. Those now exist. Indiana has them and Purdue has them. It is my understanding that IU wants to discontinue them, so that option is going to be gone. We have a lot of thinking yet to do.

K. McDonald: So it is not clear. We might put forth a tenure-track instructor and it might go through yet this year?

S. Hannah: It might, but I would think a long, long time before I would recommend it.

R. Tierney: The title of this is lecturer. This does not include people who are primarily clinical?

S. Hannah: No, that is a separate classification. So if I have confused you, good, because that is about where we are--a little confused.

M. Nusbaumer: I assume this will have no impact on people who are already on tenure-track instructor lines?

S. Hannah: No. Those folks are contracted and signed.

8. New business:

C. Drummond moved to approve David May as a replacement member on the Subcommittee on

Athletics for the remainder of the academic year. Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 99-13) - D. Oberstar:

SR No. 99-13 (ETCS proposal for a Certificate in Computer Networking) was presented for information only.

b. Agenda Committee (SR No. 99-14) - M. Downs:

SR No. 99-14 (Administrative Teaching Assignments) was presented for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

B. Fife: For the second year of this current budget, 2000-2001, we were informed to expect on average about a 4% increase in salary. Is that still the executive plan as of right now?

W. Branson: Currently the budget plan we have been looking at has a 3% salary increase in it. There are a couple of things that factor into that. When the legislature gave us funding, they had a 4% salary plan in it. They had given us 2% for S&E and 4% for fringe benefits. Since that budget plan was put together, we are looking at medical insurance increases of around 22% for next year. Utilities will go up something much

larger than 2%. So, when you factor those things in, it does cut down on the amount of money that it is available for salaries.

M. Downs: Was there no projection about an increase in medical costs? They thought it was going to be stable, steady, no change at all? No increase? What world do they live in?

W. Branson: I can't answer that. That is the way they put the budget plan together.

B. Fife: What had the medical cost increases been recently?

W. Branson: We have gone through a few years where medical increases have been relatively stable. A lot of that is because of cost containment measures that a number of the health organizations have put into place. What we are now hearing from the providers is that those days of small increases are over. At this point we are hearing 22% from Purdue; IU is saying 15%. So, it is generally being accepted that medical costs are going to be very high in the future.

B. Fife: What were these stable increases in the past?

W. Branson: I can't tell you off the top of my head, but certainly in the low single digits somewhere.

M. Downs: You understand our difficulty grasping this. It is one thing to say that medical costs are going up 22% over what they were last year; but, it is another thing if you're saying that they're going up 22% over an already estimated increase over last year. Not to have projected any increase over the year before would mean that somebody had omitted considering a relatively important budgetary item. In doing so they had not really built into the budget what is, these days, a natural increase. Although it may have been small in the past, I know from my service on the Health Care Commission of Indiana University that this increase has been predicted now for some time. They usually say we were lucky last year, that we may be lucky this year, but we certainly can't expect that we're going to continue to be lucky year after year. One adjustment I think you make is a projected increase when you put your budget together.

W. Branson: We would be happy to provide the prior increases of medical insurance. What Professor Downs is describing is accurate. We have known for some time that this was going to happen. But, unfortunately, the way the state puts the budget together, they've ceased to account for those kinds of factors that any institution is facing when they put a budget together. The same with utility increases. They don't account for that anymore.

M. Nusbaumer: I assume this proposed reduction over what the state legislature recommended is system-wide at Purdue. Also, is the IU system considering similar types of reductions in salary increases?

W. Branson: Remember, this is a plan at this point. We don't know where it is going to end up. Certainly our understanding at this point is that it will be system-wide at Purdue University--and I don't know where IU is going to come out; we've heard it will be in that range somewhere.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty