

Minutes of the
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Thirteenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
March 14 and 21, 1994
Noon, Kettler G46

Agenda*

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of February 14, 1994
3. Acceptance of the agenda - A. Dirkes
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - R. Barrett
 - b. Indiana University - S. Hollander
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - F. Kirchhoff
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 93-16) - S. Hollander
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 93-17) - S. Hollander
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Budgetary Affairs Committee (SR No. 93-16) - R. Barrett
 - b. Agenda Committee (SR No. 93-17) - A. Dirkes
 - c. Educational Policy Committee - S. Hollander
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

*As amended

Presiding Officer: F. Kirchhoff
Parliamentarian: M. Sherr
Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Wilson

March 14, 1994
(Session I)

Senate Members Present:

S. Argast, R. Barrett, J. Bell, E. Blumenthal, F. Borelli, W. Branson, J. Brennan, B. Bulmahn, C. Butler, C. Champion, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, V. Coufoudakis, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, R. Gillespie, R. Hess, C. Hill, S. Hollander, R. Kendall, J. Lantz, C. Lawton, M. Laudeman, D. Legg, P. Lin, D. Linn, J. Meyers, R. Miers, R. Pacer, R. Ramsey, L. Schlager, D. Schmidt, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, W. Tsai, W. Utesch, M. Wartell, L. Wootton, N. Younis, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

N. Bradley, N. Cothorn, D. Cox, L. DeFonso, J. Grant, R. Hawley, L. Kuznar, M. Mansfield, L. Meyer, A. Rassuli, S. Sarratore, R. Sriram, C. Sternberger, E. Waters, C. White

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, R. Novak

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, J. Silva

Attachments:

"Resolution on the English-as-a-Second-Language program, including amendments of the Academic Regulations" (SD 93-16)
["Amendment of the Academic Regulations--Grade-point averages"](#) (SD 93-17)

Acta

1. Call to order: F. Kirchhoff called the meeting to order at 12:02 p. m.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 14, 1994: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

A. Dirkes moved to accent the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to amend the agenda by deleting item 6.a. (Revision of the IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct). Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

The agenda was approved as amended.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University:

R. Barrett: The AAS (Associate of Applied Science) switch over should be completed in the next few weeks. We are waiting on Calumet's final documents. In April a document will come from the Intercampus Faculty Council regarding the first two years of the Engineering degree for all campuses. The EEs have really done a fine job in the third and fourth year and they are going to continue to meet on an annual basis. So, I think over the next few years we'll have even more movement in the engineering degrees.

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee did a quick study of CREF cashability, the options that are available, and some cautions that people need to be aware of before jumping into that pool. They sent it to their Faculty Affairs Committee and it is now on the University Senate agenda. I have two copies of it. I will give them to Walt Branson and, perhaps, they could be given to Personnel so that anybody interested in that report could find it.

b. Indiana University:

S. Hollander: The IU University Faculty Council had a rip-roaring meeting on Tuesday, March 8. All three of your representatives--Professors Downs and Kirchhoff and I were present for an unending, often horribly funny discussion of "the balanced case." "The balanced case" is this notion that for promotion--instead of having one area of excellence and two of satisfactory performance--one can have three areas of somewhat more than satisfactory, but not quite excellent performance. If you ever get a chance to buy the tape, get it. In any case, the University Faculty Council at that meeting reaffirmed, with some minor changes, its endorsement of the notion of "the balanced case." That document still has to go before the Board of Trustees of Indiana University. It is my understanding that it not yet in effect. So it doesn't affect anything here, yet. And as Professor Kirchhoff, in addition to serving on the University Faculty Council, is also a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, he might want to warn the Faculty Affairs Committee of the possibility that this body may someday have to get engaged in similarly frivolous discussions.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer: F. Kirchhoff had no report.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (SD 93-16) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 93-16 (Resolution on the English-as-a-Second Language program, including amendments of the Academic Regulations). Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to suspend the rules so that the body could vote on SD 93-16. Seconded.

Motion to suspend passed unanimously.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 93-17) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander moved to approve SD 93-17 (Amendment of the Academic Regulations--Grade-point averages). Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to suspend the rules so that the body could vote on SD 93-17. Seconded.

Motion to suspend passed unanimously.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

7. New business: There was no new business.

8. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (SR No. 93-16) - R. Barrett:

R. Barrett presented SR No. 93-16 (Recommendations for the 1994-95 Budget) for information only.

B. Bulmahn: I have a question relating to a "3 % raise planned last year for faculty and staff be done." Does faculty and staff include associate faculty members?

R. Barrett: No, it doesn't.

M. Downs: In the paragraph that reads "further, if a rebate becomes available from the Indiana University Service Charges this amount go totally to S&E for academic departments (again based on a study of S&E use) that run out during the second semester every year, and for the Library for additional books." Is the study of S&E use going to consider the possibility, very remote, I am sure, that departments that run out of S&E during the second semester every year do so because of irresponsible expenditures, or is it just taken for granted that a department that runs out in the second semester is chronically underfunded? I ask the question because this seems to create exactly the wrong incentive for dealing with the problem.

R. Barrett: We have asked for three years for a study in S&E because it is possible we have mismanagement. We also have some inequities set up in the way S&E starts out at the beginning of every year between departments. There is no study planned at this time; however, next month you will see a resolution from Budgetary Affairs that went through University Resources Policy Committee where it was changed slightly. It will be in the Senate and we hope the weight of the Senate behind our request will get at a real study. We do know we have easily identifiable departments that run out of S&E and need constantly to have other sources stepping

in--they're using gift funds, etc. There has been no study to find out why some of them are running out: We'd like to get at that.

J. Lantz: I don't know how to get at that. In fact, in the last three or four years, we put extra money into deans' budgets to address those S&E concerns. My understanding is that in some schools that did not get filtered on down to departments. I believe this is an item that ought to be looked at school-by-school. If there is a problem in the school I think the dean should come to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor to discuss it.

R. Barrett: And that may be, but that is not our responsibility. We're faculty looking at it differently. We have heard enough that we know there is a problem out there somewhere. I know the administration's standard line is "we don't know how to get at this study." I have heard that for a number of years and yet I've asked some budget administrators and budget administrators tell me, "Yes, I can tell you exactly what departments are running out, when they're running out, and how they're getting it covered."

J. Lantz: I believe they report to a dean and I would suggest they ought to discuss that information with their dean.

R. Barrett: They also report to the Vice Chancellor of Finance.

J. Lantz: He, however, does not set S&E budgets, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs does.

B. Bulmahn: Following up on my previous question, am I correct that there has been no report from the Faculty Affairs Committee on ever having discussed the issue of associate faculty pay?

R. Pacer: There isn't anything this year. I can't speak for previous years.

b. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 93-17) - A. Dirkes:

A. Dirkes presented SR No. 93-17 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

c. Educational Policy Committee - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander: When this body approved the new general-education requirements it did so with an amendment that provided that the Educational Policy Committee revisit the question of whether students in programs classified as Artistic Expression would find that they had reduced general-education requirements in the other areas so that their general education total requirement would continue to be 36 credits like everybody else's on campus, or whether they would have the same requirement as the other areas, in which case their credit total would be 42

while that of all other students on campus would be 36. The Educational Policy Committee has now done that. We met at length with Gerald Ratliff, Dean of the School of Fine and Performing Arts--where most of the programs affected are housed--and talked about the options. He was very supportive of the action that the Senate had taken initially. The Educational Policy Committee decided. not to recommend any change in the new policy as it was submitted to and adopted by the Senate.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

R. Hess: There is IPFW interface with the international diploma plan for South Side High School and other schools in the area. My questions are: What is the International Diploma? and What is the nature of the interface discussion at this point?

S. Hollander: South Side High School and some other high schools nationwide, although I am not sure there are any others in Indiana, are going with a new kind of high-school diploma which focuses on preparing people for a globalized world--whatever that means. Students in that program will meet routine, state-mandated graduation requirements, but they will focus their courses on international-studies kinds of things. They may be arriving on this campus with course work that qualifies them for advanced credit. The Educational Policy Committee has not yet received any written documentation on what is proposed. We have not discussed it, but we've been alerted to the fact that at some point probably in this semester this is an item we will have under consideration.

R. Hess: So this is your view that this is an honors diploma with an international emphasis?

S. Hollander: No, no, no. It's a high-school diploma.

R. Hess: No, I mean is there honors involvement at the high school level? Is the content the same as the honors program with an international emphasis?

S. Hollander: I don't know.

M. Downs: We all appreciated the visit that the Senate received from the Community Advisory Council. I was particularly interested in what Mr. Helmke had to say about the search-and-screen process and I wonder if anybody in the administration or from the search-and-screen committee could tell us what the specific plans are for bringing candidates to this campus for interviews? It is now the middle of March and the semester becomes increasingly hectic as we approach its end. Do you have any information concerning the process?

J. Lantz: On Friday my office received a call from Joe Bennett. He gave us times and meetings for various and sundry people. , That came late Friday afternoon. I

think, as we speak and as soon as e-mail is up and going, you will have that on your machines and we will make hard copies as fast as possible. We will have the first interview this Friday. That has been scheduled, but there is a very short turn-around time. I cannot tell you the other dates. I can't remember when they are. As soon as those are established they will also be out to you. The problem we had to address this morning is the vita of the first candidate. They were handed to me and I was asked if I could give an abbreviated resume. I decided that I could not. We will be sending to you the cover letter and the resume of each of the candidates. They will be printed back to back. Because they are fairly long, we have decided to send one to each department. We don't want to keep you from making copies; it is just that we needed to get a quick turn around time. As soon as the print shop can get them out, you will have them.

J. Smulkstys: How many candidates are there?

J. Lantz: That's a very difficult question to answer at the moment. We have made arrangements for four, but one at this point is not definite.

S. Hollander: When the Chancellor Selection Advisory Committee was named I assumed, foolish me, that they would continue to do their work until they had made a recommendation to President Beering about candidates for the job. My understanding is that as soon as they sent down the names of people they wished to be interviewed for the job, they were thanked for their work and dismissed. Does anyone present know whether what occurred about the Committee being dismissed and not being asked to make a recommendation after candidates have been interviewed is true?

S. Argast: The Committee is not at liberty to talk about that. You could address your questions to the chairman of the Committee, Walter Helmke.

R. Hess: Since we have about 45 minutes remaining, I would propose a ten-minute recess at which time the chair can see if he can ask Mr. Helmke the question.

S. Hollander made a motion to recess for 10 minutes. Seconded.

Motion to recess passed on a voice vote.

F. Kirchhoff called the meeting back to order.

F. Kirchhoff-. Mr. Helmke is at lunch.

J. Smulkstys: I have a number of questions. I assume Committee members can talk about the initial stages of the search process. When Walter Helmke addressed the Convocation, a very strong indication was that the Committee would not end its work at this stage and that the Committee would make recommendations after the interviews to President Beering. Is this true? Did the Committee discuss the specific function of making recommendations after interviews, or did it not?

J. Bell: I am also on that Committee. We have not officially been notified that we no longer are involved in this search process. From what the Chancellor has just said, there is a strong indication that it is going on without our input because there are candidates coming and we are not privy to that. I assume those rumors are true. Now, about the whole question of confidentiality, I really don't know what to say. I didn't take any specific pledge. I know of no background check having been made. I think faculty should become very much involved now since we see candidates coming and the Committee members are not privy to that. I think faculty should be concerned and find out what's going on.

S. Hollander: The more I hear the more I am worried. Has the chancellor's office, which has been asked to arrange for these interviews, been asked to provide for any kind of feedback form that people present at the interviews can fill out, or is feedback among the things that have been dismissed?

J. Lantz: We did ask that question and were told that Vice Chancellor Bennett would put that together and we would have a form.

J. Smulkstys: Since my question was not answered I assume that the Committee members are not at liberty to talk about whether the Committee made any decisions or made any assumptions at the beginning of the process with regard to its role after the interviews.

S. Argast: It is my understanding as a member of the Committee and, I think, the understanding of the Committee as a whole, that our work as a decision-making body would not be complete at this point in time.

J. Bell: I second what Scott has replied. We assumed we were part and our chair assured us we were part of making specific recommendations. In other words, we would recommend people for interviews and we would be part of the interviewing process and then we would reach conclusions based on those interviews. Since we haven't been formally dismissed, maybe we can still do this.

J. Smulkstys: Did Committee members find out about your non-involvement at this point from the Chancellor's comments today, or was there any other communication, probably from West Lafayette, before? Did you come to this meeting today with the knowledge that you're no longer involved, or was this a complete surprise after Joanne gave the information that she did?

S. Argast: A letter was prepared and given to the Committee members thanking them for their service and requesting future service from us. It is unclear of what the nature of that future service is. My suggestion to ask Mr. Helmke that was not meant to be funny, but I think it is fair to say there remains hopefulness in our Committee that we merely misunderstand the text of the letter.

M. Downs: We are assured, however, that the candidates who are going to be invited are the candidates that the Committee recommended?

J. Lantz: I think that is a reasonable assumption.

J. Bell: I agree with Scott that we shouldn't have too much levity in connection with this except tragedy and comedy. As far as the names of the candidates, I think that is one thing we should be confidential about until they have accepted an interview. So, until they have accepted, I don't think members of the Committee can say what names have been sent forward because, if someone decides they don't want to be interviewed and no longer be considered for the job, I think they have the right to remain unnamed.

R. Barrett: Are they also going to West Lafayette for a day?

J. Lantz: That's my understanding.

A. Dirkes: I am just wondering if there is a reason why we are having this conversation right now. It seems that the options are extremely limited. Yet, if you are supposing that the Committee hasn't had enough say so in the deliberations, then you have a choice of accepting it or going public ... or are you thinking that you don't have enough information to make such a decision?

J. Chandler: If we have a number of unanswered questions at this point, would it be in order to recess this meeting until next week? Our next regular meeting is April 11. Could we get some answers to all these questions between now and next Monday to go forward?

M. Downs moved to recess until Monday, March 21. Seconded.

Motion to recess passed unanimously.

The meeting recessed at 1:08 p.m. until Monday, March 21.

Session II
(March 21)

Senate Members Present:

S. Argast, R. Barrett, J. Bell, E. Blumenthal, F. Borelli, N. Bradley, W. Branson, J. Brennan, B. Bulmahn, C. Butler, C. Champion, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, D. Cox, L. DeFonso, A. Dirkes, J. Grant, R. Hawley, R. Hess, C. Hill, S. Hollander, L. Kuznar, J. Lantz, C. Lawton, D. Legg, M. Mansfield, L. Meyer, R. Ramsey, A. Rassuli, L. Schlager, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, C. Sternberger, W. Tsai, W. Utesch, M. Wartell, E. Waters, L. Wootton, N. Younis, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

M. Downs, R. Gillespie, R. Kendall, M. Laudeman, P. Lin, D. Linn, J. Meyers, R. Miers, R. Pacer, S. Sarratore, D. Schmidt, R. Sriram, C. White

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Craig, L. Griffin, T. Guthrie, R. Novak, H. van Nuis

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, C. Rowand, J. Scher, J. Silva, R. Steiner, T. Van Moorlehem

Acta

F. Kirchoff reconvened the meeting at 12:02 p. m.

9. The general good and welfare of the University: (cont'd)

F. Kirchhoff: I was asked to contact Walter Helmke, which I have done. I also have a letter which I will read to you. The letter is from President Beering to Walter Helmke, the chair of the search committee, dated March 7. President Beering gave us permission to read this letter to the faculty.

Dear Walter,

Thank you for your letter of March 1. In confirmation of our telephone discussion, I shall invite the first four candidates recommended by the Committee for in-depth interviews, as soon as mutually convenient schedules can be arranged.

In addition to the members of the central administration, I will ask representatives of the Chancellor's office, faculty, students, and administrative, clerical, and service staffs, as well as the Selection Advisory Committee, to assist me in the interviews. I expect each interviewer to provide me with an evaluation of the candidates.

You asked about compensation. I shall discuss pay, benefits and other conditions of employment with each candidate personally.

9

Thank you, Walter, for your diligence in bringing the search to this point in such a timely manner. While the Committee's work is now concluded, I am counting on the individual members to help assess the candidate's qualifications when they visit Fort Wayne.

Sincerely,
Steve (Beering)

F. Kirchhoff: In my conversation with Mr. Helmke, he affirmed more or less the wording of this letter. He said that this was not what he and other members of the Committee expected, as you recall. When visiting us for a convocation he indicated that he expected the Committee would make a final recommendation of three candidates to the President--that that would be their last action. Obviously, this has been precluded by President Beering's decision. Mr. Helmke told me, though, that although it was an unexpected decision by the President, he felt it was within the prerogative of the President. He also said that President Beering had urged the

individual members of the search Committee as individuals to take part in the interview process and to communicate their response to the candidates to him. The floor is open.

B. Bulmahn: Could you read again that line that says he hopes the Committee will evaluate the candidates here?

F. Kirchhoff: "While the Committee's work is now concluded, I am counting on the individual members to help assess the candidate's qualifications when they visit Fort Wayne."

B. Bulmahn: So he is not expecting to be able to share those opinions with him?

F. Kirchhoff: I assume he is expecting to be able to share them in the same way that you or I would share our opinions with President Beering, through the forms we were asked to complete about the candidates, or some other method, e.g., if an individual wants to send a letter or call on the phone I suppose they could.

J. Brennan: Maybe members of the Committee might comment on this. Mr. Helmke said he did not expect this, but it was the prerogative of the President. Does this mean that there was a change in procedure that had been previously announced, or that the procedure had not been defined after the initial screening?

F. Kirchhoff-. That's a question that Mr. Helmke could answer, and I could not. In my talk with Mr. Helmke we referred to the fact that in previous searches the Committee had made a final recommendation and that precedent was what he had in mind, but it is not clear to me that there was an initial written charge to the Committee that had been changed. He did not say that although that may have been the case. I don't know.

J. Smulkstys: When I examined the minutes of the Faculty Convocation which Mr. Helmke addressed, he clearly indicated that the Committee's work would not stop before the coming of candidates to campus. He clearly indicated he expected the Committee to be involved in campus interviews and in the mechanics of candidate interviews and then make recommendations to the President. I am sorry that I was a few minutes late, but when you relayed your conversation with Mr. Helmke did he deviate from this position?

F. Kirchhoff. When this letter came he said it was not what he expected. That this was a change that was unexpected. When you receive the minutes of the Convocation you will see that he does indeed say that the Committee will act throughout the search process up to the very last stage. There is no question about what he, and I suppose the rest of the Committee, had in mind.

R. Hess: President Beering can obviously conduct this search anyway he chooses to, but it is a departure from the role of the faculty and the recommending committees in the past.

One of the things that we are asked to do is, in a very brief period of time, to fill out our own personal evaluations of the candidates with the scales to be checked and that sort of thing. I would suggest, for the good and welfare of the university, that at the end when all the candidates have been seen that you do what I intend to do which is to list all the candidates in terms of my preference, explain that that listing is how I view the candidates, and that I object to dismissing the search-and-screen committee in the fashion it has been dismissed....

J. Smulkstys: I want to react to Dick's comment. I have a dilemma filling out these evaluation forms. Only this morning there was a reminder that we should do that. If I praise the candidate then I am almost sure that his candidacy would be killed in West Lafayette. On the other hand, if I criticize somebody the chances of that candidate would presumably increase. Maybe I should criticize candidates I like and praise those I don't. It may or may not work. I don't want to engage in this kind of circus because, when President Beering terminated the Committee, this meant not only that no recommendations would be made, but that the whole process of interviews have been taken over by West Lafayette. So I agree with Dick that maybe we should say that we protest this act, but as far as recommendations of candidates are concerned, I think that is a very risky business if you are genuinely interested in certain candidacies and want to see them seriously considered.

B. Bulmahn: I want a clarification on those forms. We are sending them to Dottie Bassett. Have they always been sent on to Beering or have they just been looked at here.

J. Lantz: I can't answer that. I don't know.

R. Hess: Maybe the question is, what is the procedure for handling those forms this year? Are they to be forwarded to the President, or what?

J. Lantz: They are not coming to me.

F. Kirchhoff- They are to be forwarded to Vice President Bennett.

S. Hollander: In the past, to answer your earlier question, the evaluation forms have gone to the search Committee, which was still in existence....

C. Butler: What is to prevent the members of the Committee as individuals from coordinating their evaluations and sending in a sealed document their individual evaluations with a tally of where the majority lies to the President? ...

F. Kirchhoff. They could do that if they choose to do it. I don't think they've chosen to do that. Perhaps someone from the Committee would like to address that question.

S. Argast: There is no plan to do that. Of course, the Committee didn't think it was still operating in an advisory mode. We thought we were operating in a decision-making mode at this stage. So we all have the right and privilege of all other faculty and staff to make

individual assessments. I am not sure a Committee assessment is particularly desired, wanted or would do any good.

J. Smulkstys: Would it be in order to take an informal straw vote on how this body feels about President Beering's action of terminating the Committee's activities.

F. Kirchhoff- We can do that. We can't take any action, but we can take a straw vote.

J. Smulkstys: I propose that this body disapprove of President Beering's action terminating the search Committee's activities in violation of this campus's traditions.

R. Barrett: Could we use the word approve instead of disapprove so it is a positive and then vote yes or no based on that?

F. Kirchhoff- Julius seems to want to use that word. The result of the straw vote was 33 ayes, 0 nays and 5 abstentions.

F. Borelli: This has to do with the item on the agenda that came from the Student Affairs Committee last Monday and which this body decided not to consider. The document had to do with revising the student code in order to accommodate the revised sexual harassment policy. This is a personal comment from me that I regret that the Fort Wayne Senate chose not to deal with this and, I assume, subsequent changes to the Code which have to be brought forward because of federal legislation or for some other reason. I will talk to the Students' Government Association next Monday and forward these changes to West Lafayette for incorporation into the Code. That is the procedure; that is what we will be following: I hope in the future when we have other recommendations for action coming from the Student Affairs Committee on the Code that this body would deem it appropriate to discuss them in the spirit of collegiality that we have had in crafting and approving this Code.

S. Hollander: I was under the impression from the text of the new Management Agreement that changes to the Code are made by the local administration and wondered why we were forwarding changes to West Lafayette for incorporation into the IPFW Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

F. Borelli: My understanding of that section says that Purdue University does have the authority on all matters of student life and it goes on to say that campus administrators consult the faculty, students and the Community Advisor on changes or additions to that Code. It does go beyond that as to the final authority. I think the opening statement has Purdue University, and the precedents set by the Board of Trustees approving this document, establishing the precedent where all final policy is going to be approved.

B. Bulmahn: At the previous session of this Senate meeting I asked the question relating to associate faculty stipends. I thank the person who, in the intervening time, sent me a copy of Senate Document SD 89-30. Four years ago this body passed a

four-statement document that says in the second part "associate faculty should receive an increase in stipends from one year to the next. Furthermore, unless special monies are appropriated by the state, it may prove necessary for full-time faculty to receive a somewhat lower percentage increase in order to increase associate faculty stipends." That is what this body approved about four years ago. I am wondering, did we change our minds? Would some member of the present Faculty Affairs Committee like to respond to that?

J. Clausen: We haven't discussed it. We have discussed a lot of things, but we haven't discussed that. Are you going to ask us to?

B. Bulmahn: If the present Faculty Affairs has not discussed this--this other statement did come from Budgetary Affairs--who did it? Who recommended that the associate faculty get no raise? Someone must have done it.

F. Kirchhoff: I don't know that anyone has recommended it. I am aware of the fact that next year's budget has not been finalized. There was a recommendation from the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee that we looked at for information only at our last meeting. That is simply a recommendation and I believe I am correct in saying that the budget remains undecided.

B. Bulmahn: Would someone from the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee then like to say how they arrived at that?

R. Barrett: I don't think we did. We have supported the administration's decision of a few years ago when the administration took a look at associate faculty salaries and found they had not gone up in recent years. There is still a great disparity in what associate faculty do and the salaries that they receive. I know they're still looking at that. We endorse what they did. We thought that was a really good idea, but as we looked at the budgets this year--it is such a crunch and everybody is competing--and I think Budgetary Affairs will put it back on its discussion agenda at the end of this semester. But as we looked at the issue, one of the biggest things that up for us, besides faculty and staff salaries was S&E. I can tell you it will get discussed again, but we do have very limited resources and a great degree of competition for that money. All we can do is recommend; we don't make any decisions. They do listen to us, however.

B. Bulmahn: I would suggest that given that the Senate has never taken back these words that these are still our words.

F. Kirchhoff: They indeed are the Senate's words, but the Senate does not decide the budget.

S. Hollander: I ask unanimous consent to yield to a non-Senator, Jeff Wilson. [No objection was voiced.]

J. Wilson: I have had reason over the past week and a half to refer to SD 91-15 which is the document which deals with research misconduct on this campus. I discovered that that document applies to faculty and professional staff, but not to students. Because there are many students involved in academic research on this campus, I believe they should also be covered by the policies and procedures outlined in SD 91-15. I don't know the proper mechanism for having that document amended, but I would like to call it to the attention of this body that students are not included in our campus policy on research misconduct. I believe they should be and I would like to see whichever committee is appropriate review that policy and amend it to include students.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty