

Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Sixth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
February 9 and 16, 1987
Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 19, 1987
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - S. Hollander
 - b. Purdue University - D. McCants
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-11) - A. Finco
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-12) - M. Downs
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 86-10, "Recent Program Approval Activity") - M. Downs
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

J. Bell, J. Carnaghi, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, F. Codispoti, R. Detraz, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, L. Graham, S. Harroff, M. Hayden, J. Hersberger, R. Hess, S. Hockemeyer, S. Hollander, A. Karna, F. Kirchhoff, M. Kubik, M. Laudeman, C. Maile, D. Mauritzen, D. McCants, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, R. Otten, J. Outland, J. Owen, R. Ramsey, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, D. Schmidt, J. Silver, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Stevenson, J. Sunderman, M. Temte, S. Usman, K. Wakley, T. Wallace, D. Wartzok, J. Wilson, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

G. Bell, L. DeFonso, H. Garcia, R. Kovara, S. Manheimer, E. Nicholson, K. Perry, S. Sayegh, J. Ulmer, J. Violette, W. Worthley

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present:

S. Argast, L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, J. Lantz, R. Svoboda

Attachments:

"Amendments to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate Administrative/Professional Staff Membership on the University Resources Policy Committee" (SD 86-11)
"Assessment of Special Fees" (SD 86-12)

Visitors Present:

J. Clinton, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, E. Franklin, M. Hile, A. Montgomery, R. Steiner

Acta

1. Call to order: T. Wallace called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of January 19, 1987: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

M. Downs moved acceptance of the agenda. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. S. Hollander:

My report covers three matters. First, however, I would like to yield to Prof. Downs for a report on the search for a president for Indiana University.

M. Downs:

First a comment in the form of doggerel:

You cannot hope to bribe or twist,
The average Hoosier journalist;
But seeing what the man will do unbribed,
There is never an occasion to.

I am not in a position either to affirm or deny the substance of any rumor published in the press. It is not my place. I can tell you from the brief article that I read in the Journal-Gazette this morning that what Mr. Gonzo says is what I know to be true, and that what President Beering said is what I believe to be true. And I have no more to say.

S. Hollander:

1. The IU Board of Trustees met over the weekend before last, and the IU University Faculty Council meets tomorrow. The agendas of both of these meetings suggest--as usual--no major actions in regard to the Fort Wayne campus. I will report at the Senate's next meeting about anything of significance which did occur.
2. The new IPFW Bulletin is out--many would say finally out--and is being distributed under a new and troublesome policy. This policy comes at a time when thousands of dollars are being invested in advertising for new students; when additional, energetic efforts are being devoted to being reasonably nice to our long-suffering but shrinking student body; and when state funding penalties for declining enrollments are costing the campus far more than any possible printing costs for the Bulletin.

The new policy, not explicitly designed to alienate students or keep them in ignorance, provides that new or readmitted students will receive one copy of the Bulletin, and that others must purchase the book for two dollars or use reference copies available in the Helmke Library or offices on campus. This false-economy move was given serious discussion--and rejection--more than five years ago, for several good reasons:

First of all, as the Bulletin itself states, each new issue of the book contains various new policies which apply to all students. As the Bulletin text says, inside the front cover, "Since changes occur as the need arises, you should review the new statements on IPFW services, policies, programs, and courses in each new issue of the Bulletin published while you are a student. Changes in operating procedures and rules generally become effective upon their publication." Substantial moral and possibly legal problems attach to imposing new rules without providing reasonable notice to those affected. Neither the Communicator nor any other existing means provides for giving students official notice of such changes.

Second, as we are all too aware, our students change majors with great frequency. A change of major--from English to biology (preferably the other way around) or from pre-business to business is likely to mean a change of Bulletin. A student who was admitted as pre-business in 1975, for example, and who got her free copy of the current Bulletin then, would be bound by new degree requirements not in that Bulletin when later admitted as a regular business student. Charging this student and thousands like her two dollars for a new Bulletin under these circumstances strikes me as unwise; asking these hundreds of students repeatedly to visit the library or the Division of Business and Economics to consult a browsing copy of the Bulletin strikes me as silly.

Third, the current Bulletin is in many cases the sole source of information on new courses--what they cover, what their prerequisites are, and so forth. Rendering current bulletins inaccessible will mitigate against enrollment in new courses--an action precisely opposed, I think, to the interests of our faculty and our students.

Fourth and finally, the new policy on Bulletin distribution necessitates the establishment of an administrative bureaucracy for distributing the limited number of free copies available. Means must be established for determining which students are entitled to a freebie. Lists have to be generated. Offices have to staff counters at which student requests must be considered. Recipients have to be checked off. Perhaps an appeal mechanism must be established, providing due process to students claiming to be entitled to a free copy while university records suggest otherwise. All of this is going to cost money which might better be spent on printing additional copies of the Bulletin.

I am more aware than most of the expense involved in printing the Bulletin and of the number of copies referred to once and then trashed. But I would hope that the administration would reconsider its new policy on Bulletin nondistribution and that alternatives which are both cost-effective and nonpunitive would be examined.

3. The third and final matter I want to mention is long-range planning. Those of us who have been here forever remember a long series of abortive attempts at producing a long-range plan for this campus. Some of us have served on various committees, task forces, and councils, with various names, charged with developing such plans. In every case, I believe, the announcement of the establishment of such groups has been longer than the plan produced. Put simply, there has never been a long-range plan for this campus, though many planning groups have devoted interminable hours to the task.

Most recently, if I have my chronology correct, the Giusti years saw the establishment of yet another long-range-planning group, at the request of the Senate. When the administration changed, the new acting chancellor appointed a different planning group (still in existence, but moribund) despite his announced opposition to the very concept of long-range planning. Chancellor Wallace, as I suppose his report in a few minutes will indicate, last month appointed a Task Force on Strategic Planning and Management to perform essentially the same series of tasks as the precursor groups.

The Wallace task force--a sizable group of administrators, students, alumni, and faculty members including the two speakers of the faculties--met for more than eight hours two Saturdays ago. The agenda could

have come from the 1970, 1975, or 1980 meeting of earlier groups. The discussions were repeats of earlier discussions, though many of the administrative staff in attendance were too new to have heard them before; for me and many of the other faculty members there, d4'jI_vu was the order of the day.

But two things were new. Mark Franke announced that a poll by the campus' advertising agency had determined that nearly 20 percent of the high-school students in this area believe the word "urban," now frequently used as an adjective for this university, is synonymous with "homosexual." The second piece of news is that I got the sense that this task force was going to set a record. This year's chancellor seems determined that the current long-range planning group is going actually to do its job--actually create a long-range plan--and perhaps live to see some of its recommendations implemented. Those of us with a long-range commitment to this institution and intentions of remaining in her service over the long haul would certainly welcome the day in which our years of long-term (and sometimes long-winded) talking resulted in something and maybe made a difference for this campus.

T. Wallace:

Let me say a couple of things about the comments on the catalog. Of course we are not the first university in the history of higher education to look at whether bulletins are needed every year or not. Other institutions do things like put out a catalog every two years and then supplement it at very cheap prices every year. One of the things that I have been told by a number of people at other institutions is that there is no base of research that shows that the catalog is a main source of advertising. In fact, many institutions have gotten away from sending catalogs out ahead of time.

b. David McCants:

Don Schmidt and I are this campus' representatives to the Purdue University Inter-campus Faculty Council. The Council will meet this Wednesday. If you have concerns or resolutions which should be brought to that body, please make them known to us.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

a. We will have a faculty convocation on March 23. John Gardner, who is director of the National Conference on the Freshman Year Experience, will spend the day with us. He is also an associate vice president in the South Carolina system; he works with regional campuses. We have scheduled the convocation at noon. He will spend a couple of hours with the freshman orientation committee, and

he will also spend some time with the Task Force on the Nature and Quality of the Undergraduate Experience at IPFW.

- b. On Friday, I got a confirmation, but not a firm date, to have Jerry Gaff, Dean, College of Liberal Arts at Hamline University in St. Paul, come to talk to us. He will come some time in April. He has written extensively and consulted extensively on general education. He has a book, which was published in 1983, entitled General Education Today.
- c. As you heard, the Task Force on Strategic Planning had its first meeting. Those on the task force include: Edward Nicholson, John Carnaghi, Warren Worthley, George Bullion, Judith Clinton, Steven Hollander, David McCants, Leonard Iaquina, Rebecca Teagarden, Joann Tagtmeyer Schaab, Joseph Motherwell, Gina Kostoff, Wade Fredrick, Douglas Wartzok, Robert Otten, Evangelos Coufoudakis, John Ulmer, Michael Charles, C. Jack Quinn, John Bell, Lowell Beineke, Armond Ball, and Thomas Wallace. I would like to indicate that the report will be made up of sections that have been assigned to various writers. Some of the sections that will be in the report, which I hope will be done by the end of the summer, include: Academic Future: Priorities, Themes, Programs - Ed Nicholson; Continuing Education, Off-Campus Credit/Non-Credit - Wade Fredrick; Development Program - Len Iaquina; the Undergraduate Experience at IPFW - V. Coufoudakis and J. Ulmer; Resources and Facilities, including an update of the master plan - J. Carnaghi; Public Relations Program - J. Clinton; Athletics - D. Skelton and A. Ball; and Enrollment Management - M. Franke. I really hate to disappoint the IU Speaker with this report, but we already have some results that I want to tell you a little bit about.

Before I do that, though, let me say that we had not envisioned that everything would stop while we did this planning . . . but that we would be making decisions and getting things going this year as the whole task force reviewed the recommendations from the deans and directors. We know that during the fall semester the deans and directors were asked to begin the planning process, and that we were not going to hold off making the decisions while they did that. I did not know that we were going to have such an eloquent introduction to this topic, but I do want to say that Science and Humanities did an outstanding job.

I think those of you who want to know what a good strategic plan looks like ought to get a hold of the one by Ken Stevenson and his people. It is excellent. He has worked with the school to come up with something very specific in what they want to do. They have looked at a timetable and a budget and, more importantly, have not just put things down on a piece of paper; they have talked about implementation. I called Ken this morning and told him that I had read his plan over the weekend along with the others, and that we are willing to make a commitment to the four programs that that school laid out in its document. We are willing to agree to the budget for next year that Ken has laid out to accommodate those programs, and we are willing to commit to the development of the new efforts he laid out. . . . The four new programs or

projects include a minor in instrumentation and computers, the completion of the B.S. in speech pathology/audiology, the specialization in toxicology and biology, and the children's theatre company. . . . So during this budget year we will be making decisions. We are not going to wait until we get to next year and the planning is all done. We don't have the luxury of doing that.

The other thing that has been done that's a very difficult part of strategic planning . . . is budget reallocation. That's the tough part. There is a lot of misinformation that has been given out about that. I did a little quick calculation before I came down. If we combine what's happened in Arts and Letters and Science and Humanities--seven of nine positions were involved in reallocation, but five of the seven positions that were reallocated went back to the same group. In one case there was a chair's position authorized for hiring where the money to do that was the equivalent of two positions that were in the other pile. Why this becomes so complicated is because the money that was put in the pool for reallocation was not just from personnel. . . . I would say that only 10% of what I've heard in the rumor mill has been accurate. I would ask you to wait. John and I finished our proposal in the first complete draft to go down to President Beering on Friday. I would ask some of you to hold your judgments on the budget process. I told the Senate Budget Subcommittee that we would get back to them to talk about budget, and we will do that. I just wanted you to know that we are moving. I am very happy about that plan. Ken, my congratulations to the people in the school.

- d. I would like to announce that we will have HPER activity courses for credit in the fall. In the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985 we offered 323 students 19 sections of HPER courses. The cost of that upon review was fairly small. We are willing to go with that level of programming again, provided a couple of things happen: that we get, as with all credit courses, a proposal that will define the content and skill development in those courses and talk about evaluation. . . .
- e. I have asked EPC and AOC to look at a three-year, pre-tenure review program. I have sent them a draft of what I call a "Three-year, Pre-Tenure Faculty Review." In that document it says "The concept of a major review of faculty performance upon completion of three years of service at IPFW is intended to provide the faculty member with a clear indication of his or her progress towards tenure. . . ." What this is intended to do is to try to get faculty and the administration together so that they know specifically how faculty are doing prior to the tenure consideration. That document will be discussed and will come before this group.
- f. I am also interested in having a review of IPFW's progress in integrating the latest computing skills and techniques into our curriculum. I have looked at the charge to the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee, which is a subcommittee of the University Resources Policy Committee, and found that their duties are not inclusive of curriculum. I thought we might ask AOC, working through departments, to review our curriculum and to see how we are using computing,

not computers, and how the curriculum is being structured using computing, with a view to what is happening nationally. We need to ask ourselves questions like: How are we doing? What are the problems? What are the solutions? How are we using computer-aided instruction, computer management instruction, etc.? I am very impressed with the access to hardware that we have--particularly when we can tie into supercomputers and other computing devices off campus. For an institution our size with a primarily undergraduate mission, we probably have the richest computer resource of any institution like ours in the country. I would like to suggest that we ask AOC to do this review, but I would also be happy to ask the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee to do it, even though it's not in their charge. Maybe we want to add that to their charge or maybe add another committee to do that. I would appreciate your comments. The emphasis is not on computers, but computing.

- g. Finally, I am interested in establishing what I am calling a productivity grant process to begin in the near future. I will try to put together some guidelines and get them reviewed by different groups. The intent of this would be to make funds available to faculty, with approval of their department, for the use of instructional media for improving the quality and efficiency of instructional delivery. It could be computer-aided, computer-based education, programmed learning, whatever you want to do. What I would like to do is to have a call for proposals and to have a group that will review the proposals. . . .

S. Hockemeyer: Could you give us the current status of reorganization?

T. Wallace: I have had a number of discussions with President Beering. It is my expectation that on or before his arrival next month to meet with the trustees, we will have some information on that subject--which means we will either have an answer, or we will know of another process we have to go through. I think things are moving right along.

M. Downs: I want to thank you and Vice Chancellor Nicholson for your decision to restore the HPER courses. I think it's a good thing to do, and I am glad to see it happen.

R. Hess: Who will be responsible for the courses? As I understand it, there has been some kind of conflict with the Division of Education.

T. Wallace: The only conflict I knew about was that Marge [Souers] was asked to pay for the courses, and she didn't have the money. What we will do is to go to her with a memo, which is enroute, which will ask her to put together the syllabus for the courses and ask her how they will be evaluated. Assuming that those two things are present, they will be approved. We will provide the money.

R. Hess: One of the rumors that has been circulating is that the "take-back" of positions was motivated by a desire to have some source to supplement salaries. Is that inaccurate?

T. Wallace: No. We are not that far down the road.

R. Hess: Was that one of the goals?

T. Wallace: That depends on the version. If you recall, in the legislative budget committee they recommended a two percent increase. I would think that we wouldn't want to give two percent. The other version I believe was five percent. We just don't know. The worst-case scenario is two percent--the other end is five percent. Then, we also have the option, depending on what happens in the other parts of the system, to go above both of those.

R. Hess: So the rumor is inaccurate--that there is a pot being created to supplement salaries?

T. Wallace: That rumor is not accurate. However, I would say that if we only got two percent, we'd probably better do something, but I don't know what that something would be.

R. Hess: The other question I have concerns money as well. One of the bases for reallocation, as I understand it, of the positions to departments was the attraction of new students to the campus. How many new students have to be attracted to the campus as a result of that reallocation to judge it successful?

T. Wallace: I don't think you can put it that way. One of the reallocations is to create a research program. Another reallocation will be to enable us to do a more extensive job in continuing education. Other reallocations are going to generate, where we think we can, student credit hours. I don't think you make these kinds of decisions without the integration of the academic crediting in the decision-making process. There's no answer to that. . . . None of these decisions that I have seen can be separated that simply. . . . We are trying to get teaching, research, and service addressed in all of this.

R. Hess: So it's a rumor that we should discredit, that money is being placed into positions that would attract new programs and students?

T. Wallace: We're doing that, but not exclusively.

M. Downs: Do you have any new information about the complexion, the inclination of the legislature, concerning the fine arts building and the university budget? Could you provide us with a description of the efforts that are being made here locally with regard to those?

T. Wallace: As I understand it, if you go with the legislative committee's recommendation, there are funds for no capital projects in the state.

M. Downs: Is there an effort being made beyond that, to change the minds of legislators in reference to a recommendation that might come from that committee?

T. Wallace: Yes, but I think that all hinges on showing the governor where they can improve the tax-revenue base. Anyone who has any legislative pull should be pushing to get more resources put into higher education.

M. Downs: Urge them to raise taxes so there are additional resources?

T. Wallace: Of course, you know this country is greatly undertaxed in terms of the percent of the gross national product. It's just that we don't want to bite the bullet.

A. Finco: A local state representative recently introduced a proposal having to do with the transferability of credit from one institution to another. Do you know if there's anything being done on this campus to sidetrack that?

T. Wallace: No, I don't. Let's just say that we're talking to people about it, but that's about as far as it goes.

J. Sunderman: Can you tell us which of the three or so plans for reorganization were submitted to West Lafayette?

T. Wallace: All three were submitted. The president and I have spent a lot of time talking about all three.

R. Hess: My understanding is that there is, yearly, an evaluation by the department chair and the dean, and that there is a written statement about the evaluation for people in tenure-track positions who haven't received tenure. How does the existing approach differ from what you're calling a three-year, pre-tenure review program?

T. Wallace: I would put this in the category of a major review before you get to the tenure hurdle. I have used this in institutions before; I thought it was very good. It forces the faculty member to sit down with the chair and the dean and to focus on the fact that this is a major review. And, in this case, the vice chancellor would also have a chance to review each case. After going through my first series of promotion and tenure cases here, I think we really need something like this. I saw a lot of people that should have had some discussion early on. Maybe those discussions should have taken place, maybe they did, but they weren't documented. If we are a university where scholarship is important and you see people getting through with one publication, or they have one submitted, and then people say things like they really should have done more with scholarship before this. . . . Or discussion maybe about the quality of teaching, and it might not be apparent that that had been discussed prior to tenure time. I think we need to have a formal process where everyone recognizes this is a major

review at the vice chancellor's level and that there will be something in writing. . . . The other side of the coin is that people say what you're really doing is putting people up for tenure early. What do you do about somebody who gets a glowing review at the third year and doesn't do so well in years four and five? We can deal with that, also. Decisions should be made early on, where we have doubts about somebody being able to make tenure. There should be thorough discussions with tenure-track faculty at the end of the third year. When reappointment comes up in year four, it should be based on this third-year review. People should have a very clear understanding of how they're doing. It forces those who want to just drift through until the last moment, and it makes people make decisions early on. I would hope this could be done in a constructive atmosphere.

R. Hess: Since this is a new process, what would a faculty member have to do to prepare for that review in terms of mechanics? Is it a matter of preparing a case? And, if the case is strong enough, why not just go ahead and put it in for promotion on the Purdue University side?

T. Wallace: Good question.

R. Hess: Is it really a case?

T. Wallace: One of the things that I attached to that proposal is a format which has a person lay out what they have done for the first three years. It would include a person's vita and highlights from their first three years. . . . The first year that I used this as an academic vice president, I sent a lot of them back because I was getting the kind of weasle wording that you get in these kinds of things--two pages of glowing comments and a final statement saying, "However, the quality of teaching may be a problem." I would send them back and ask, "What do you mean by this? . . ."

R. Hess: Would you consider this as an entitlement at the third year for reasonable expectation of receiving tenure or promotion in the fifth year as the process now works under AAUP guidelines?

T. Wallace: The kind of wording that we began to see on these was something like "The candidate is making reasonable progress toward tenure. If this progress were to continue, he/she would qualify. . . ." That made people nervous, too, because they thought a decision was being made at the end of three years. . . . I'm sure the AOC and the Senate committee will have some discussion on this.

J. Wilson: Is there a document that exists that lists expectations or criteria for tenure in more detail than "More is better than less, and sooner is better than later"?

T. Wallace: I don't think you'll find those kinds of documents. It goes back to the comment I made earlier on teaching, research, and public service--almost every case you see is somewhat different in how you integrate your personal evaluation of teaching, research, and service. That all comes together into a view of whether someone

has reached that level of productivity to satisfy you as an individual or not. There have been attempts to quantify this, but I think it's like management by objectives: When you get quantifiable in that process, it sometimes collapses under its own weight.

M. Hayden: Will we be seeing some of this document within this academic semester coming before this body as far as details?

T. Wallace: It has already gone to the Senate committee and to the AOC for discussion. It depends on how long they take to look at it. If we get to it this spring, it could be implemented next fall.

F. Codispoti: Is it your position that under the current system, where in the fourth year there has to be a recommendation for reappointment, that it is not currently the obligation of the department chair, the dean and the vice chancellor to assure that when they make their recommendation that the individual is conceivably tenurable in the sixth year? I would assume currently that that's their obligation.

T. Wallace: Sure, I'm sure they're doing it. I think what this does is formalize the process in the fourth year.

D. Mauritzen: Is there any thought to doing an analagous service for those seeking promotion?

T. Wallace: You mean, after you are a tenured associate professor? I hadn't thought about that. People could discuss that along with this document.

6. Committee reports requiring action

a. University Resources Policy Committee (SD 86-11) - A. Finco:

A. Finco moved to approve SD 86-11 (Amendments to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Administrative/Professional Staff Membership on the University Resources Policy Committee). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 86-11 passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee senate Document SD 86-12) - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 86-12 (Assessment of Special Fees).

Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to delete from page 2 the words "recommended for application to students as well."

The chair ruled that the Rationale was not art of the motion, and did not accept the amendment because it dealt with the rationale or and not the substance of the motion.

Motion to approve SD 86-12 passed on a show of hands.

The meeting was recessed at 1:15 p.m.

Session II
(February 16)

Members Present:

G. Bell, J. Bell, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, F. Codispoti, L. DeFonso, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, A. Friedel, H. Garcia, L. Graham, S. Harroff, J. Hersberger, S. Hockemeyer, S. Hollander, A. Karna, F. Kirchhoff, C. Maile, D. Mauritzen, D. McCants, E. Nicholson, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, R. Otten, J. Owen, R. Ramsey, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, S. Sayegh, J. Silver, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Stevenson, J. Sunderman, M. Temte, J. Ulmer, S. Usman, T. Wallace, D. Wartzok, J. Wilson

Members Absent:

J. Carnaghi, R. Detraz, W. Frederick, M. Hayden, R. Hess, R. Kovara, M. Kubik, M. Laudeman, S. Manheimer, J. Outland, K. Perry, D. Schmidt, J. Violette, K. Wakley, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Faculty Present: V. Coufoudakis

Visitors Present: J. Clinton, J. Dahl

Acta

T. Wallace called the meeting to order at noon.

7. New business:

There was no new business.

8. Committee reports "for information only" - Educational Policy Committee (SR No. 86-10) - M. Downs:

M. Downs presented SR No. 86-10 (Recent Program Approval Activity) to the Senate for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Rosenfeld: I would like you to comment on the statement that was made in the News-Sentinel that if a student wants to elect a year of language they may not be able

to take French, but that they could take German or Spanish instead. I was surprised to read that statement. Suppose a student wanted to prepare herself or himself for a position in a multinational firm working in Montreal; Spanish and German would not help that student at all. Or suppose the student wanted to work in Geneva, Brussels, or Paris—

T. Wallace: Let me remind you first of all that when you read things in the newspaper, you generally are getting a piece of what was said, and you don't always get to appreciate the context. . . . I really appreciate your comment. When those things bother you, call me or stop to see me, or bring it up under General Good and Welfare of the University. I'll explain the statement. The reporters were quizzing us about the preparation of the budget. In particular, one asked the question that if we did not approve the French position, wouldn't that mean we couldn't have a French major, and what would the impact of that be? My comment was that, given the limited resources we have in the university, we may have to make very difficult decisions, very tough priority decisions in the budget process. I said that we may, by making that decision, be in a situation sometime where all students who wanted to take French as an elective-- I'm not saying major now--might not be able to take it because of our shortage of faculty. We do not have the resources to offer all courses that all students wish to take and be able to fit into their schedules. It has nothing to do whatsoever with the relative importance of the various languages or the importance of language at all. I think we could have chosen some other examples where we, in the budget process, have to make some very tough decisions on cutting down electives perhaps.

M. Rosenfeld: I understand what you are saying. I have just one or two more questions. An article in the Journal-Gazette that reported what had happened here in the Senate said that seven of the positions that are now vacant in Arts and Letters or Science and Humanities would be transferred to other departments. Most of the people who are teaching Women's Studies do not have appointments as Women's Studies people but come from the various departments--most of which are located in either Arts and Letters or Science and Humanities. If all those positions are transferred to other departments, which would not be, for the most part, in the humanities and sciences, what will happen to the Women's Studies program?

T. Wallace: First of all, you didn't state accurately what was in the paper. The comment that I made had to do with trying to point out to people that our making these difficult priority decisions on the budget was not, contrary to some speculation, removing positions in great number from the arts and sciences. Part of this is difficult to keep an accounting on because, as weeks go by, we continue to accrue more positions as things continue to unfold. At that particular point in time, I said that I counted that of the nine positions that we had brought into this pool to allocate based on priority, seven of the nine had come from the arts and sciences. I also pointed out that in the reallocation of seven positions from that money, five of the positions were in the arts and sciences. So it was not a situation where we had taken ten positions or nine positions away from the arts and sciences and put them back into something outside the arts and sciences. If a position goes from chemistry to biology, for example, that is not taking positions out of

the arts and sciences. Regardless of what the newspaper said, that's the reality. So we are reshuffling. . . .

M. Rosenfeld: I understand what you are saying. I realize articles may not always say what you say and may quote you out of context. That's why I am asking you these questions. I feel that the reshuffling results in major curricular change. I went through the bulletin of the Modern Language Association to look at all the four-year colleges and universities. There were maybe one or two that did not offer French, German, and Spanish. Only the theological seminaries and bible colleges do not offer those languages, because they offer Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic. French, German and Spanish are languages that are offered in practically all universities. I wonder if you can still call yourself a university and not offer a French major.

T. Wallace: I think maybe we are not communicating. We fully intend to continue to offer a French major, Spanish major, and German major. . . . All we're saying here is that we may not be able to offer any discipline as many electives as we would like to.

M. Rosenfeld: How many positions can be cut and still have a program that is viable? Two people in a section can only do so much. I wonder how much can be offered with such a reduced faculty. Maybe I'm still not communicating, but it is a concern that I have.

T. Wallace: We intend to maintain that major, and I think we will be able to do that. Reallocation is very difficult. And as we have said, in this budget we must continue to worry about our enrollments. I think if I were to say something like we have a loss of \$300,000 because of enrollment decline, how many people in the room would want to raise their hand and say their department should share in that reduction? But if we got \$300,000 worth of new money, and we asked how many departments want to share in the new money, we would have every hand up. We have to keep in mind that we are making a very difficult decision by reallocating money to stimulate majors--not saying that we're not worried about research or continuing education or public service--we have to keep enough majors, in my judgment, so that we do not lose any more money. That loss of money is real. That money has to come from some place. We're saying that we want to keep all of our majors. In fact, we are going to have new majors. That's why we are looking at programs that we think are going to attract new students, e.g., the M.B.A. and the M.A. in the humanities. There have been a number of things that have been proposed by the deans and directors to allow us to get new students by virtue of having new majors. The price we probably will have to pay for that, unless we get some great amount of assistance from the legislature, is going to come from not offering the number of electives that we make available to students. That's a tough choice. . . .

M. Rosenfeld: In connection with this business of enrollment, I realize that as a major concern and that it has to do with financial problems that naturally have to be faced. It goes without saying that there will always be more students enrolling in practical subjects, such as computer sciences--I am not making any value judgment on any of

these subjects, but some subjects will always draw more students than others. It seems to me in a university that we have to strike a balance, and that means that every area has to have support, and some areas may need support that has to do with issues other than just simply numbers, because they are so crucial and so central to what it means to have a quality undergraduate experience. And for that reason, I think that the numerical value of just numbers cannot be the sole consideration. I understand that financial issues are of prime importance, but I really feel very deeply about this issue because I think that the whole nature of the curriculum is going to be affected by these shiftings. The same thing with Women's Studies, and I don't mean for a moment to imply that it's the same as French, but it has some similarities. Once those programs are dismantled, you cannot rebuild them. We have spent years and years trying to build these programs--since 1972 or 1973 for the Women's Studies program--and it's very easy for this to be eliminated because mostly the people will be needed to teach in their own department, and then what happens to those subjects? They will affect the fate of half of the student population at this university.

T. Wallace: I agree with you 100%. That's why we maintain majors in French, German, and Spanish. We have a total of about 35 majors in all three, and that's why we are committed to keeping major programs in those three languages, given the low number of majors, because we believe exactly what you are saying.

M. Rosenfeld: One last thought. Are students invited to attend the faculty Senate meetings? I would like to see students present here. I think we can benefit sometimes from what students have to say or what their perceptions might be about some of these questions.

M. Downs: That's a question properly addressed to the Agenda Committee. Yes, students are invited. They are sent copies of the minutes and the agenda. I have from time to time personally invited students who have concerns to attend the meetings and ask for speaking time. They have not on a regular basis done so. Short of making it a requirement in some course, I don't know what else we can do.

T. Wallace: I would like to make one additional comment, because it really is a concern all over the country, regarding the size of faculty in arts and sciences. Over the last decade, students have marched to other areas, and I think my field of chemistry has been subjected to the same thing in many places. I would say to you that there are ways in which people in arts and sciences have to creatively put programs together to interlock/ intertwine the practical with the basic liberal arts and sciences, by combining majors and minors. When I met with your department early on, I described a German department that I knew that had a tremendous enrollment and German majors because faculty members, and one faculty member in particular, had counseled students, attracted students to major in German with a minor in business, and then found them jobs in international business. There were huge numbers of students in that German class. In chemistry departments, if they would look at how computing devices are used in laboratories and give chemistry majors instruction, say, for a minor . . . those jobs would be there. Whether we like it or not, the arts and sciences, for success in today's

environment, have to do those kinds of things--to go out and preach to high school students telling them they should avoid the practical to get a liberal arts and science major, is going to be very difficult to accomplish. I am not disagreeing with anything you're saying. It's just that when we manage the money and the dollars, it's like our budget at home: There is no bottomless pit. . . .

A. Finco: Last session I asked about the proposal of a state legislator having to do with transferability of credit. There was no information regarding any action to counteract this, I guess. The January minutes of the PU University Senate indicate they are taking steps to be more specific and to avoid misunderstanding by students who attend vocational/technical institutions. . . . In particular they have added statements that would make it clear, e.g. "Credit will not be transferred from any institution whose regional accreditation designation is A/V (Associate/Vocational-Technical). . . ."

T. Wallace: I think at the last meeting we had a report a little more recent than that which indicated that bill had been killed. Wasn't that what John Carnaghi told us?

A. Finco: I think action like this is needed anyway.

T. Wallace: I don't know that we're very different from that. We take transfer credit only from accredited institutions.

A. Finco: They have accreditation, but it is not the kind faculty find acceptable.

E. Nicholson: Tom, I don't recall that John Carnaghi did say that at our last meeting. The point Art is making is correct--that while they are accredited by North Central, they are accredited as a vocational/technical institution, not as an institution of higher education. Accreditation itself does not permit them to transfer those credits to any institution of higher education. . . . There have been some other things that have been done quietly to try and do something about that, including [correction of] some advertising that seems to be misleading.

M. Downs: I have reports on several matters. I'll be brief. The most recent meeting of the IU University Faculty Council approved a proposal to put on a firm footing at last a long-term disability policy. We have been under an interim policy that was established in 1978. The program is self-funded by the university and everybody has become increasingly uneasy about that and, as a result, the Fringe Benefits Committee entered into negotiation with the administration and with several carriers and providers of long-term disability insurance. A proposal was approved which would make the program an insured program with faculty members covered in one year rather than in five to seven years, and would ensure 60% of salary as a benefit. It brings the university into the modern age as far as long-term disability insurance is concerned. We are going to be considering a phased early retirement proposal. I am hoping that by the end of the year we will be able to recommend to the board of trustees a phased early retirement program which would allow faculty members to ease their way into retirement--this at no cost, as a matter of fact, at a savings to the university. In principle, everyone

supports this, but they are having trouble working something out--something that will be practicable on all campuses in all programs.

The fringe benefits committee which advises President Beering on behalf of Purdue University and our own Fringe Benefits Committee are about to undertake a joint effort, at last, after many years, to develop one proposal on behalf of both faculties concerning reciprocal fee courtesy. Both presidents have made it clear that they favor such a program in principle. We've had difficulty dealing with the next two lower echelons of administration to work something out that Purdue University would not be uncomfortable with.

I would like to return to what Professor Rosenfeld talked about. I think there is probably never a good time to reallocate positions. It seems to me to be even harder to undertake that kind of reshuffling or reorganization when a budget is tight, because we feel it much more directly and painfully. I recognize the perceived slide in enrollments and what it could mean for the university. I have my own personal reservations, which I don't think will surprise you at all. One, this is not a good year to be doing it, but I defer of course to the people who are responsible for making that kind of judgment to go forward with it. I also feel very uncomfortable because the priorities that I have heard talked about have been developed at a place and at a pace which does not, it seems to me, involve very much in the way of rank-and-file faculty in the considerations. I wish that these priorities had been set according to a method that was similar to that undertaken when we discussed reorganization, in which there was a great deal of faculty involvement and discussion and participation. We felt comfortable with what resulted. We may never feel comfortable with a reshuffling, but I think because of principles that I have held for a long time, that it is better the more you can involve rank-and-file faculty in these discussions.

The third point is that as long as the question is asked, "Do you want to contribute to a \$300,000 deficit; do you want to take advantage of a \$300,000 increase?" the question is not being framed so as to elicit from us the best and most responsible response. I think if the question were phrased, "Do you want to participate in the establishment of priorities, do you want to participate in the development of strategies and solutions, do you want to consider seriously the full involvement and responsibility of reallocation of positions?" we would all answer yes, and you would be getting the best that we can offer. If you ask us a simple question, we're much less likely to be professional and responsible. I think that there is a role the faculty should be playing this year in this process, and I have reservations that we're playing that role or we're being allowed or solicited to play that role to the best of our abilities.

T. Wallace: Mike, I would say the process that you described is exactly the one that took place. In the fall of the year at a meeting of the deans and directors, we talked about beginning the strategic-planning process and getting ready for this budget. The decisions that have been made have been based on the preparation of the budget next year in which the deans and directors were asked to come in with their priorities and recommendations. I don't know how much at the departmental level was seen of that . .

. you assume faculty have had input in terms of what kind of new thrusts we will get to take. If you're making the point that-they didn't get a chance to say or vote on money being transferred from one place to another, that would be true, that did not occur. In terms of preparation for plans for new initiatives, we did have what I thought was participation at the departmental level.

M. Downs: I don't want to debate with you. I know that process exists in the development of budgets and new "thrusts," but if you ask the department of political science what it thinks is important for it to do over the next few years, certainly this process allows that to take place. But at no point, does it seem to me, has anybody been asked what they think should happen in other areas. No place has the faculty, as a faculty, been asked to address campus- and university-wide concerns in regard to these matters. Not rank-and-file faculty members. You get a fragmented, narrowly conceived recommendation about a limited discipline. What I would suggest on behalf of the political science department, after consultation with members, would be one thing. If you ask me to weigh what we're asking for and what we think we ought to do against let's say a proposal from modern languages or chemistry or physics, there's no process or no place where I can offer my opinion as to how these things should be balanced and the priorities arranged. I think that's when you get the best from the faculty--when they're asked to consider not just their own department or their own concerns, but are asked to consider the university and the campus in its entirety. There is no device for this; there never has been here, and that is why, in large part, the policy that is made at your level is made without advice from people at lower ranks, at lower positions, who would also consider the good of the entire campus.

T. Wallace: Are you saying that the strategic-planning group that is not made up solely of faculty would do the kind of thing you're talking about in terms of a three-to-five-year plan, or are you talking about more detail than that? That is, if that group then reflects on these departmental/school/divisional plans that have been put forth--some of which we have tried to fund in the next budget--does that get at what you're talking about?

M. Downs: What I mean to say is that no institution is damaged when it asks the people who make up the institution to think in broad terms about the good of the institution; that no individual is hurt, and is in fact, improved, if they spend some time thinking about those things; that no administrators are going to be unduly injured or damaged to the extent that they listen to the results of these discussions and considerations.

T. Wallace: I understand that, but I am trying to understand what forum you're suggesting if we have this come up from the department planning through the deans and directors to the vice chancellor, and put the budget together to try to get the priorities. I am trying to get to the mechanism to understand the level of specificity that you're suggesting.

M. Downs: This probably isn't the best place for us to get to that, at a shank end of a meeting that's probably gone on longer than anybody wants it to. But, yes, I have some

definite ideas about that that I've floated in the past, that haven't gone anyplace. I continue to think it is a great weakness of this institution that such a mechanism doesn't exist, and I haven't yet seen the development of such a mechanism that will accomplish that. If you want to talk to me further, I'd be happy to do so.

D. McCants: I think it is unfortunate that information available to the faculty about reallocation comes in fragmentary form through official channels and through what seems like comprehensive, but, I think, inaccurate form through the press. I think it would behoove the administration, in dealing with such a sensitive subject, to make known to the faculty fully and accurately what decisions have been made. When I read in the press, for example, about how the communication and theatre department has been impacted by reallocation, I can say, authoritatively, that the press is incorrect. I presume that that means that anybody on this campus who depends upon Fort Wayne newspapers for their information about how communication and theatre has been impacted by reallocation is misinformed. I think that on such a sensitive issue it would behoove the administration to write a memo to all of the university community as to what decisions have been made regarding reallocation, and, if the administration is willing to share, something about the rationale for those decisions. I think that it is unfortunate that we depend upon fragmentary information through official channels and inaccurate, but what seems like comprehensive, information through the public press.

E. Nicholson: I share your concern, but I do want to tell you how that information got out. One or more of the newspaper folks call people on campus--deans, directors, faculty members, myself included--with fragmentary information and try to confirm it. By the time it got in press it was information that a variety of people passed along as their view of what was going on, and I can see a lot of that. I don't know how you stop that.

D. McCants: I've just suggested a mechanism.

T. Wallace: Ed, I think the only way your method works is if we keep everything quiet about the budget until everything has been done. I think, in particular, I am having some second thoughts about what we say in this forum because usually the press is right here. I tried when I came to give you progress reports on what is going on, but if I give you information, before you can get back to your faculty to talk about it, it's in the newspaper. So I think the kinds of things you're saying really sort of forces the administration into going back and keeping information very quiet until the last possible moment, until every decision has been made. That would be easy actually--to wait until all the decisions have been made and then to send out a memo saying these decisions have been made. I thought we were talking openly--and again maybe that's a mistake in this group--about the various phases of the budget process, and talking to you about how things are going. As I said last time, we just finished a budget that we sent down to West Lafayette just a week ago Friday. We'll certainly rethink that. I think that has caused a lot of people problems by getting that all in the newspapers.

H. Garcia: In reference to what Dr. Nicholson was referring to in reference to the press calling faculty members and people in the administration, I had that happen to me, and I frankly don't like to be questioned on the telephone. I simply told the young lady I didn't have anything to say. I would assume any intelligent faculty member . . . would have responded the same way. Why give information when you don't have it all in the first place? The only way to stop that is to not answer those questions.

T. Wallace: Obviously, if everybody doesn't do that, the press will keep calling until they find somebody who will talk. I appreciate your comments.

S. Hollander: If I may briefly return to a matter raised by Professor Downs, the question of whether the Task Force on Strategic Planning and Management is an appropriate place for reallocation decisions to be considered in a word my own answer would be no—

T. Wallace: Not reallocation, that was never intended by me.

S. Hollander: --for two reasons: I think anybody that is making such recommendations ought to have been selected by the faculty for that purpose. The task force consists of appointed members. Anybody with that charge ought to be reporting to the faculty through the Senate. Again, the Task Force on Strategic Planning and Management does not do that. Some other means ought to be found.

10. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt