

Minutes of the
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Fifth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
March 13 and 20, 2006
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of February 13, 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
 - University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 05-5) – B. Abbott
7. New business
 - Student Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 05-6) – P. Goodmann
8. Committee reports “for information only”
 - Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 05-13) – 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

Attachments:

- “[Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee Resolution Pertaining to IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program](#)”
([SD 05-5](#), as amended)
- “[Proposed Amendments to SD 89-28 \(IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct\)](#)” (SD 05-6, recommitted to Student Affairs Committee)
- “[Senate Resolution Pertaining to the Assessment of IPFW's move to Division I](#)” (SD 05-7, failed)

Session I
(March 13)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, A. Argast, S. Blythe, W. Branson, J. Brennan, J. Burg, C. Champion,
M. Codispoti, S. Davis, P. Dragnev, D. Erbach, B. Fife, L. Fox, R. Friedman, D. Goodman,
P. Goodmann, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, P. Iadicola, L. Kuznar, Z. Liang,
D. Lindquist, M. Lipman, L. Meyer, G. Mourad, D. Mueller, A. Mustafa, E. Neal,
D. Oberstar, D. Ross, H. Samavati, J. Tankel, S. Tannous, J. Toole, G. Voland, M. Walsh,
L. Wark, M. Wartell, R. Weiner, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

R. Bean, J. Grant, C. Hill, A. Karim, L. Lin, M. Montesino, G. Moss, R. Murray,
E. Ohlander, G. Schmelzle, S. Troy, J. Zhao

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, A. Friedel, M. Nusbaumer, K. O'Connell, F. Paladino,
S. Sarratore

Visitors Present: Various representatives from the *News-Sentinel*, *Journal Gazette*, Channel 15
and Channel 21, J. Dahl, G. Rathbun, A. Weissner

Acta

1. Call to order: G. Bullion called the meeting to order at 12:00.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 13, 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: Hello, Colleagues. The core mission of IPFW is to provide quality post-secondary education in Northeastern Indiana by focusing on student learning, fostering intellectual exploration and attainment, and serving the region.

We have dedicated faculty and excellent curricula to ensure the achievement of the university goals. The IPFW assessment plan is a good tool to evaluate whether the goals of the degree programs are achieved. The plan has led to improvement of academic

programs. The professional accreditations of many programs further add an external assessment that these programs, at the minimum, meet the recognized national standards.

For effective learning, the university must provide the support needed for students and faculty. Indeed, the Academic Support Services for students and the Center for Enhancement and Learning and Teaching for faculty are two good examples of support. However, the support for general instructional delivery is not very good. In many classrooms the furniture is old, and the rooms lack the necessary instructional equipment. The equipment in some laboratories is very old and, in some disciplines, there are no open computer labs that are desperately needed. The plan for improving the classrooms and upgrading the labs, in my opinion, is not sufficient, and the plan needs to be reassessed.

In conclusion, to achieve the learning objectives, we can build on our strengths and be creative in allocating the funds necessary to remain successful and up to date in academia.

Thank you.

b. Indiana University:

B. Fife: As I am close to vacating both the Speaker's position and my seat in the Fort Wayne Senate, let me just express my regard for this body. More faculty input in governance matters is essential in the academy as faculty tend to have a more longitudinal perspective on policy challenges than other constituencies. I would encourage departments and divisions to elect representatives who will make a substantial contribution to the deliberative process in the Fort Wayne Senate. A robust exchange of ideas and perspectives is a desirable commodity in any democratic institution, this one not excepted.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – G. Bullion:

I would like to take a few moments to express some concerns and also set the stage for what I hope to be constructive debate on key issues involving the future of IPFW.

I have three comments to offer and I am speaking from the heart, not from a prepared script. The comments are the following:

1) One of the concerns that I have had over the last few years, having been a long-term member of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, is that the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee has to report to the University Senate through the University Resources Policy Committee. Realizing that it would take an amendment to the university Senate Constitution to provide for it to report directly to the Senate, it is probably reasonable to leave the reporting relationship as is as long as it serves its purpose. There have been times that there has been tension between the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee and the University Resources Policy Committee, but we have always managed to get the job

done, and now we have that opportunity again with the resolution that is coming to the floor today pertaining to the finances of the Division I athletic program.

2) My second comment echoes the comment that Professor Fife just made. The whole process of participatory governance carries a major responsibility for the faculty and I think if we are not careful, faculty may become complacent in exercising their duties and responsibilities in this regard. When faculty committees do not assume an aggressive role in the debate and dialogue with the administration and almost, by default, defer to the administration, we have no basis to complain that the administration has usurped faculty rights. We basically can vacate our responsibility through inaction, and that would be one thing I would leave you with by echoing the comments that Professor Fife has just made. Be aggressive. When working with this administration, I have found a receptive audience for the mutual exchange of ideas, and I think that the forum for that is in place, and it is just a matter of faculty exercising its responsibility.

3) You are confronted with a document today that is coming from the University Resources Policy Committee. I had a major role in the production of that document, and I suspect that role will come out if there are any questions that come forth in the debate. I do not believe that this resolution should evoke a discussion as to whether IPFW continues its involvement in the Division I program. The resolution was not intended for that purpose. If you will look at the resolution and what it says, it is intended to spur debate, discussion, and investigation. That again is part of the constructive role that the faculty has in the governance process. There will be times that we have differences of opinion, but when I have had questions for Walt Branson and Mark Pope, the answers have always been forthcoming. They have willingly provided answers and accepted input, and I think that a constructive role for dialogue, discussion, and debate is in place. You have a lot of data attached to the resolution that has been presented here today. The five bullet items/comments/summaries were made only for the purpose of helping you to start to dig into that data and do your own analysis, and to raise your own questions. Quite frankly, maybe you will have no interest in having debate and dialogue on the report. The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee respects that option should it be this body's will, and I am sure the University Resources Policy Committee respects that as well. At least you have the information, and what you choose to do with it is up to you. When IPFW started the process of moving to Division I more than five years ago, I felt, personally, that we moved more rapidly than we should have. We moved with a distinct lack of supporting data on which the decision was to be made, but there were unique circumstances that triggered all that; i.e., a timeline where the clock was ticking at NCAA with respect to new members. I respect that. But the data has been collected for the first five years of operation of the Division I program and it is being presented as an attachment to the resolution. I hope that this body understands where the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee is coming from with this resolution and supporting material. Maybe I should not speak for the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, but I believe that I am reflecting its views with my comments. We will see what the outcome is; but again, it should not be a discussion, at this point, as to whether IPFW continues its membership in Division I. It should serve as the foundation for discussion and debate that may take

place in the university community three, four, or five years out as to whether IPFW's participation in Division I is to be continued.

Saturday's *Wall Street Journal* has an article on the Division I basketball programs, basically the top 100, and the article points out the challenges that confront all of those programs. The top 75 programs are probably not confronted with the same challenges as the bottom 25 in the list of 100 and the other 200 plus members beyond that group. The *Wall Street Journal* article pointed out that the rates of increase in expenses for the top 100 Division I basketball programs are racing ahead of the revenue growth. The growth in expenses is driven almost totally by the increases in coaches' salaries. Most of the programs are trying to stretch their revenues, but they are struggling to be sure that revenues grow faster than expenses. So anything that we have in the way of discussion on Division I economics here at IPFW is out in the public forum for discussion throughout the country. This includes Duke and Indiana University. I did not see the Purdue number, but it was alluded to. In all of those programs, if you look at them, the expense budget for their Division I basketball program is substantially larger than IPFW's total budget for its entire Division I athletic program. So, take that for what it is worth. If you happen to have an interest in looking at the data, it was in Saturday's (March 11, 2006) paper.

P. Hamburger: I want to make a short comment about your statement. The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Senate. A few years ago, when I was the Purdue Speaker, we tried to change the Constitution of the Senate to make it a committee. The argument against this was that we would lose a lot of people because, on the standing committees, only members of the Senate may serve. But on subcommittees, anybody can serve. So that was the argument against, and it came up several times.

G. Bullion: Your recollection is identical to mine, and the decision was made to not give up the opportunity to staff the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee with members of the university community who happened to not be members of the Fort Wayne Senate. In that respect, nobody bears any more blame than the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee does for it.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 05-5) – B.

Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve SD 05-5 (Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee Resolution Pertaining to IPFW's Division I Athletic Program). Seconded.

P. Hamburger moved to amend SD 05-5 with the following changes (changes in bold and strikeout):

Be it resolved that the IPFW University Senate **wants to engage discussion of** ~~express its concern with~~ the finances of the university's DI athletic program and call for campus-wide dialogue that addresses this critical matter during the **2006-07** ~~2005-06~~ academic year.

Seconded.

P. Iadicola called the question.

The amendment to SD 05-5 passed on a voice vote.

P. Iadicola moved a substitute resolution (see SD 05-7, attached to minutes) which was distributed at the door. Seconded.

The presiding officer called the question.

Motion to substitute failed on a voice vote.

G. Mourad moved to table SD 05-5 (as amended). Seconded.

Motion to table SD 05-5 failed on a voice vote.

P. Hamburger moved to amend SD 05-5 by deleting page 2 (list of 5 comments).
Seconded.

B. Fife called the question.

Motion to amend SD 05-5 by deleting page 2 (list of 5 comments) failed on a voice vote.

P. Iadicola moved to postpone SD 05-5 until the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting. Seconded.

Motion to postpone SD 05-5 failed by a show of hands. (Tie of 20-20 broken by Presiding Officer, aye: 20, nay: 21.)

M. Lipman moved to end debate. Seconded.

Motion to end debate passed by a show of hands (aye: 34, nay: 7).

Motion to approve SD 05-5 (as amended) passed by a show of hands (aye: 22, nay: 19).

The meeting recessed at 1:15 until noon, Monday, March 20.

Session II
(March 20)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, A. Argast, R. Bean, S. Blythe, W. Branson, J. Brennan, J. Burg, C. Champion,
S. Davis, B. Fife, P. Goodmann, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, C. Hill, P. Iadicola, L. Kuznar,

D. Lindquist, M. Lipman, G. Moss, G. Mourad, D. Mueller, A. Mustafa, D. Oberstar, E. Ohlander, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, S. Tannous, J. Toole, S. Troy, M. Walsh, L. Wark, N. Younis, J. Zhao

Senate Members Absent:

M. Codispoti, P. Dragnev, D. Erbach, L. Fox, R. Friedman, D. Goodman, J. Grant, S. Hannah, A. Karim, Z. Liang, L. Lin, L. Meyer, M. Montesino, R. Murray, E. Neal, G. Volland, M. Wartell, R. Weiner

Faculty Members Present: D. Bialik, J. Clausen, M. Nusbaumer

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, K. Stockman (*Journal Gazette*)

Acta

G. Bullion reconvened the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on March 20, 2006.

7. New business:

P. Goodmann moved to approve SD 05-6 (Proposed Amendments to SD 89-18 – IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct). Seconded.

P. Hamburger moved to make the wording concerning time constraints of this document identical with the wording of the grade appeal document. Seconded.

N. Younis moved to recommit SD 05-6 to the Educational Policy Committee. Seconded.

Motion to recommit SD 05-6 to the Educational Policy Committee passed on a voice vote.

8. Committee reports “for information only”:

Executive Committee – C. Champion:

C. Champion presented SR 05-13 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

J. Tankel: I just want to give you a heads up to please look at your agendas, when they arrive for our next meeting, because part of that agenda will include the proposal from the Educational Policy Committee which has been formerly known as the Goals and Objectives project. It will actually be coming forward entitled: “Pedagogical Framework for the IPFW Baccalaureate Degree.” The committee wants to assure the Senate that we are not intending to rush this process through in the last meeting. You will have ample time for discussion and, if we have to go into the following year, that is the way it is going to be. We wanted to get it on the table and get it to the point where we could have discussion in the Senate.

P. Iadicola: I would like to address the issue again regarding administrators' teaching responsibilities. I would like the Senate to think, in the future, of possibly encouraging administrators to follow Senate Document 96-4 which is entitled: "IPFW Policy Statement on Teaching Duties of Upper-Level Academic Administrators" and states: "Whereas, Teaching is an important function of all IPFW faculty members; and Whereas, It is important that upper-level administrators who hold faculty rank (deans and above) maintain scholarly currency and familiarity with IPFW students and with the issues and problems faced by faculty; Resolved, Upper-level administrators, present and future, who hold faculty rank should, as a condition of their appointment, be responsible for teaching one regularly scheduled class per year."

If I recall, the vice chancellor for academic affairs' report to the Senate two Senate meetings ago reported that several of the deans, as well as herself, have not taught in three years, and so I would like to encourage the vice chancellor for academic affairs to be in compliance with SD 96-4, for the good and welfare of the university.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty