

Minutes of the  
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Sixth Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne  
March 12, 2007  
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of February 12, 2007
3. Acceptance of the agenda – A. Karim
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
  - b. Purdue University – N. Younis
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – D. Turnipseed
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 06-11) – N. Younis
  - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 06-12) – A. Karim
  - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 06-13) – J. Tankel
7. New business
8. Committee reports “for information only”
  - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 06-13) – A. Karim
  - b. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 06-14) – B. Fife
  - c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 06-15) – A. Karim
9. The general good and welfare of the University  
Payroll Information – J. Ferguson and K. Tolliver
10. Adjournment\*

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

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

---

Attachments:

- [“Disabilities Statement”](#) (SD 06-11)  
[“Academic Calendar, 2009-2010”](#) (SD 06-13)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, A. Argast, W. Branson, J. Burg, S. Ding, P. Dragnev, B. Dupen, C. Erickson,  
R. Farnsworth, J. Garrison, J. Grant, T. Grove, S. Hannah, C. Hill, P. Iadicola, A. Karim,  
L. Kuznar, D. Lindquist, M. Lipman, K. McDonald, L. Meyer, G. Moss, G. Mourad,

D. Mueller, A. Mustafa, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, E. Ohlander, J. Papiernik, K. Pollock,  
R. Saunders, R. Sutter, J. Tankel, J. Toole, A. Ushenko, M. Walsh, L. Wark, M. Wartell,  
N. Younis, J. Zhao

Senate Members Absent:

C. Champion, D. Erbach, R. Friedman, L. Graham, I. Hack, J. Hersberger, R. Murray,  
E. Neal, L. Roberts, H. Samavati, J. Summers, S. Troy, G. Voland

Faculty Present: B. Fife, B. Kanpol, K. O'Connell, S. Sarratore

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, J. Ferguson, E. Frew, K. Stockman (*Journal Gazette*), K. Tolliver

### Acta

1. Call to order: D. Turnipseed called the meeting to order at 12:03 noon.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 12, 2007: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

A. Karim moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: 1) Michael McRobbie has been made president of Indiana University. I am not sure that will have any impact on IPFW.

2) I wanted to point out something that has been raised in the Senate before. The campus Promotion & Tenure Subcommittee sent out recommendations for future effort, which I appreciate. One of the things that concerns me is that the campus Promotion & Tenure Subcommittee, at least in their letter in Part 1. H., refers to examples of teaching, research, and service excellence and refers to vice chancellor documents that establish these criteria. Those documents have no standing with the faculty as a basis of criteria. Criteria for promotion and tenure are set by faculty, not by any vice chancellor's document, so I am concerned about relying on that as a guideline. They may be great guidelines. If departments want to set them, that is fine; but unless the department accepts them as a faculty, they are not guidelines with official status in the university.

3) I am reminding folks of the Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs that we are meeting right after the Senate meeting to count ballots. Thank you.

b. Purdue University:

N. Younis: Good afternoon colleagues!

My report today is about my proposal regarding having one combined Indiana University/Purdue University grievance board, which I proposed at the January meeting; and also the Associate Faculty Teaching Award.

At the January meeting, I proposed that we form a committee that consists of faculty and administrators to establish a new IPFW grievance procedure to replace the existing separate grievance procedures and rules. With our collective wisdom, we can come up with one that is fair to everybody and better than the individual Indiana University and Purdue University grievance procedures. I have received a lot of feedback from Indiana University faculty in which they indicated they are against this proposal and they want to keep the current Indiana University grievance procedure. I would like to stress that we can still come up with an IPFW grievance procedure which could be better than either of the current two procedures; or if the Indiana University grievance procedure is so perfect, why not adopt it as the IPFW grievance procedure.

By now you should have received from the Faculty Affairs Committee the call for nominations for the Associate Faculty Teaching Award. I believe that we are blessed to have many outstanding associate faculty on this campus. Please take the time to nominate the deserving ones for the award.

Thank you.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – D. Turnipseed:

Last time we met I told you about the meeting with the Indiana Commission on Higher Education (ICHE). I went down there and it was incredibly interesting. We see so much that is prepared by this administration with their interpretation, Purdue University with their interpretation, and Indiana University with their interpretation. It was interesting to hear from the Indiana Commission data prepared from their point of view.

I brought and distributed this information, and there is also another handout on finances. I went in with the expectation that we would just be ignored and/or trounced. The big complaint that started off the meeting was poor facilities. From what I can gather, our campus and Ball State are in the best shape of the universities in the system in Indiana. So, we are clearly in good shape there. If you look at Page 9, we have heard about completion rates on this campus, and it shows here: 4-year graduation – 4 percent; 6-year graduation – 19 percent. That is sort of bad, but if you look at IUPUI, that is not all that much better. The point of this meeting was who cares where they graduate as long as they graduate. You can be assured that this was cause for a lot of discussion. They are going to start tracking these people. You will find all of this information very interesting. There are a lot of facts and figures on budgeting so, if any of you would like that, I would be more than happy to provide you with that.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 06-11) – N. Younis:

N. Younis moved to approve SD 06-11 (Disabilities Statement). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

b. Executive Committee (SD 06-12) – A. Karim:

A. Karim moved to approve SD 06-12 (Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate [Secret Ballot Voting]). Seconded.

Motion to approve failed by a show of hands.

c. Educational Policy Committee (SD 06-13) – J. Tankel:

J. Tankel moved to approve SD 06-13 (Academic Calendar, 2009-2010). Seconded.

P. Iadicola moved to change the term “spring recess” and “fall recess” to “spring semester recess” and “fall semester recess.”

D. Oberstar moved a friendly amendment to change the terms to “semester break.”  
Seconded.

Motion to approve the terminology change to “semester break” failed by a voice vote.

A. Argast called the question.

Motion to approve SD 06-13 passed on a voice vote.

7. New business: There was no new business.

8. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Executive Committee – A. Karim:

Senate Reference No. 06-13 was presented for information only.

b. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee – B. Fife:

Senate Reference No. 06-14 was presented for information only.

c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee – A. Karim:

Senate Reference No. 06-15 was presented for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University: Payroll Information.

K. Tolliver: Thank you for allowing us to come and speak. We are going to be implementing the Human Resources and Payroll functions of OnePurdue on July 1 of this year. We were here in the Senate January 2006 to talk about proposed changes in the academic pay schedule. You all should have received a memo sometime after that saying

that the academic year pay schedule is indeed changing. These changes will be substantial, especially for 10-month faculty and staff.

While Purdue academic year faculty and staff will still receive 10 pays per year, the August 31st and May 31st pay of each year will be a half-pay. The eight pays between — from September to April — will each be one-ninth of the annual salary.

Summer will change as well. 10-month faculty who teach Summer I this year will be paid in the same manner as last year, in three biweekly pays. The first week of Summer II will be paid in June, on June 22. The last five weeks of Summer II fall after the July 1 implementation of OnePurdue; pay for these five weeks will be split between, and paid at the end of, July and August.

We are doing our best to get this information out to avoid surprises in August. This is going to be a substantial change for those faculty and staff who are used to a full pay in August. We have met with the Academic Officers Committee at Dr. Hannah's invitation. We have met with faculty Senate leadership. We are meeting with this body. We are going to be sending letters out to the homes of all 10-month paid regular faculty, current graduate aides, graduate assistants, and limited-term lecturers. We will be having open sessions in April for anyone who cares to stop by, ask questions, and learn more about the implications. We have also added information to the Human Resources website. We have also placed a pay calculator on the website as a planning tool that will allow an individual to estimate pay in August and following months.

You may have heard about the 12-pay program. This is not a true 12-pay program; rather it is a summer savings plan that will allow academic year faculty and staff to set aside a portion of their salary after tax in preparation for the summer. The money will then be returned in four checks, May through August. Again, it is not a 12-pay plan, it is a savings account. Unfortunately, it is a non-interest bearing savings account. Although the program will be available for any individual on an academic year appointment, we recommend that the individual set aside funds independently and save the funds in an interest-bearing account.

A. Argast: Does it affect people with cream and crimson checks?

K. Tolliver: No. It is only a Purdue program. It only affects academic-year, monthly-paid people.

A. Argast: How about Indiana University-paid who are on a PRF-administered summer grant?

K. Tolliver: That needs to be determined yet. It appears that Indiana University people, because Indiana University-paid people will also have an appointment in the Purdue system at some point, will receive all of their pay from Indiana University accounts.

M. Wartell: I want to talk about the legislature because we are in the midst of a long session. That long session determines our budget for the next two years.

First, we had a budget proposal that came out of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and then, subsequently, the governor's office statement that gave us an operating budget that was parsimonious but acceptable if a reasonable fee increase is allowed. There would be salary increments for everyone as well as some extra money. When that got to the House, the House changed it considerably. What was approximately a three-percent increase in our operating budget was dropped to a two-percent increase. Ivy Tech's budget was raised to six percent. That really is a difficult budget for us, but this is the middle of the session, and a lot happens between now and the end of the session. We now have the Senate budget coming out, and then that goes to the conference committee where they may redo the budget entirely. It is our hope, and it usually happens, that the budget will come out in between the two extremes that I just described. In accordance with recommendations that partly came from the Fort Wayne Senate and partly from other constituencies, we focused on salary increments. We put the lion's share of extra money that we are allocated towards salary increments. We will continue to do that, depending how much is there. That is the approach we will take.

L. Kuznar: Do you know what Ivy Tech's original budget was?

M. Wartell: I believe it was four percent across the board for higher education.

W. Branson: I think they would have had six percent because it was the enrollment change that gave them the extra money: six percent in the commission recommendation and six percent in the House recommendation. There may have been a budget in between where they did not have the enrollment change.

L. Kuznar: Any rationale for these changes?

M. Wartell: The biggest increase in enrollment has occurred at Ivy Tech. So that is really the only rationale I can give you. There were some technical difficulties with the House budget. A specific example that I can give is that North Central was given enrollment change money where, for example, Calumet and Fort Wayne were not given enrollment change money. Technical examples like that will presumably be fixed in the Senate budget. In the original Indiana Commission recommendation, I believe the recommendation was either to give us enrollment change money or to give us an amount of money that was based on a formula which related to our graduation rate. Actually, the graduation-rate formula would have given us more, so we would have gotten that, but they forgot to put it in that budget. At least they did not do it in the House budget. It may have just been an oversight. Some were treated better than others.

M. Nusbaumer: In a general sense, what is the most primary issue for the legislature? A more specific question in terms of funding, are there also then controls on student fees?



M. Wartell: If you are asking me what the primary interest of the legislature is, I think at this point it is not higher education. There are a number of other issues that they are concerned about which explains, in some ways, the technical difficulties of the budget.

The tuition cap issue is an interesting issue. There is a proposal in the House budget to cap fees for all the institutions. That makes it very difficult, because the way we build a budget is to look at the legislative recommendation, look at what we believe we need for the next year, and then adjust fees accordingly. If there were a cap put on those fees, then that would make that process very difficult. The other argument against a salary cap is that that is the prerogative of the Board of Trustees. Of course the legislature can take the prerogative away, and essentially that is what they are talking about.

P. Iadicola: You mentioned that part of the House recommendation was a calculation based on the graduation rate. Do you see that as having any traction in the legislature as a way of funding higher education?

M. Wartell: I think that is a general shift that you are going to see throughout state government. In fact, the governor has talked about that since almost the first day he came into office.

The governor's office and the legislature have been very focused on developing a community college system. This is all part of that set of developments. We are still asking for the Student Services complex, and we have just gotten the money released for the architectural and engineering portion.

At the same time that is happening, the governor is proposing to contract out the lottery. He is expecting an upfront payment of one billion dollars. Of that money, \$400 million would be used for eminent scholars and \$600 million would be used for talent-based scholarships—a minimum of one per high school throughout Indiana. The money to support eminent scholars would mean attracting faculty to institutions. It is aimed also at the life sciences. That is a very broad umbrella. There is opposition to it from a) people who do not like gambling and b) people who do not like contracting out. It is characterized as “selling the lottery.” I think it is only leasing. But the greatest traction from the opposition has been gotten by saying it is encouraging gambling. The only way a private organization is going to increase the amount of money taken in from the lottery is to increase participation, and that would be from lower-income folks, and that is simply the way gambling has worked across the country. There have been changes to the ratios of money in the two programs since the original proposal, but the basic proposal has remained.

S. Davis: What is the Indiana legislature's stand on textbooks? Are they going to get involved in the costs of the textbooks?

M. Wartell: There has not been a great deal of movement on the part of our legislature in that regard. There have been individual legislators discussing it. I do not think there is a current bill containing textbook legislation. It has become a really serious issue. I think I

heard that one student said he paid \$5,700 for his textbooks over the course of his college career. That is a stunning amount of money.

Our legislators have done a good job for us. In the data that Brian Fife brought to you, we moved from 14<sup>th</sup> up to 12<sup>th</sup>. They will continue to try to help us. The problem is that there just is not any money. The state's income is not as large as they would like it to be, so prioritization is required.

P. Iadicola: Did it concern you at all, when you looked at the figures on instruction as a portion of our budget, finding a 20 percent decrease over that 20-year period?

M. Wartell: No, it does not concern me because there are so many ways of reporting that, and I am sure that we have changed our ways of reporting that over a 20-year period. The best example is the one that Vice Chancellor Hannah brought up, and that is Information Technology. There is a great portion of that, which is a large portion of our budget, that we may count in one area or end up changing out of one area into another. Every institution reports differently.

B. Fife: I would just reiterate, I think it is a very good measure of policy commitment over time. Purdue, as I understand it, reports those figures on our behalf. If there are any problems with that, some investigation should be forthcoming.

M. Wartell: We need to look at where we put the money. For example, with the technology fee, I do not know whether we are reporting that in institutional support or whether we are reporting that in academic support. That could have a major effect. We can take a look at that. The data is all public data.

M. Nusbaumer: In this Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data, probably the most troubling single statistic is that we have the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest percentage of our budget going to institutional support than any other institution in the state. I realize issues of measurement are a key, but I would like an explanation of why such a large percentage of our budget is going to institutional support.

M. Wartell: We can parse that out.

10. The meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen  
Secretary of the Faculty