

Minutes of the
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Third Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
March 15, 2004
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of February 9, 2004
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – E. Blakemore
 - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 03-21) – R. Hess
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Document SD 03-15) – E. Blakemore
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-16) – B. Abbott
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-17) – B. Abbott
 - d. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 03-18) – D. Oberstar
7. Question Time
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-22)
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-23)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 03-24) – D. Oberstar
 - b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 03-25) – D. Oberstar
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-26) – B. Abbott
 - d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-27) – J. Grant
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: R. Hess
Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed
Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Njock Libii
Secretary: J. Petersen

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, R. Bean, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, W. Branson,
G. Bullion, C. Carlson, C. Chauhan, M. Codispoti, D. Erbach, C. Erickson, L. Fox,
R. Friedman, P. Goodmann, J. Grant, T. Grove, S. Hannah, L. Hess, S. Isiorho, J. Knight,
L. Kuznar, M. Lipman, M. Montesino, G. Mourad, A. Mustafa, E. Neal, M. Nusbaumer,
D. Oberstar, A. Perez, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, J. Toole,
L. Vartanian, G. Voland, M. Wartell, N. Younis

Attachments:

[“Fort Wayne Faculty Representation on the \[Purdue University West Lafayette\] University Senate” \[Recission of SD 90-15\]](#) (SD 03-15)

[“Academic Calendar, 2006-2007”](#) (SD 03-16)

[“Amendments to the Academic Calendars, 2004-2005 \[amends SD 01-10, last amended 1/13/2003\] and 2005-2006 \[SD 02-10\]”](#) (SD 03-17)
[“Academic Calendar, 2004-2005”](#) (SD 01-10, as amended)
[“Academic Calendar, 2005-2006”](#) (SD 02-10, as amended)
[“Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Library \[amends SD 89-4\]”](#) (SD 03-18)
[“Procedures for Librarians’ Promotion and Tenure”](#) (SD 89-4, as revised)
[“Letter of thanks from Patricia Hudson”](#) (Attachment A)

Senate Members Absent:

J. Brennan, N. Cothorn, D. Goodman, P. Iadicola, A. Karim, Z. Liang, L. Lin, D. Marshall,
L. Meyer, M. Myers, J. Purse-Wiedenhoft

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, S. Sarratore

Visitors Present: S. Alderman, K. Kilbane, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin, K. Stockman,
P. Wilder

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Hess called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 9, 2004: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Grant moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University:

E. Blakemore: Purdue employees should have received information about a new universal life insurance, and there are sessions for you to hear about that on Thursday, March 18 at 10:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. in Kettler G46. Other than that I have nothing to say. I will have something to say about another item.

- b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: As many of you are aware, the Indiana University University Faculty Council met on campus over spring break. At the agenda committee meeting, I presented President Herbert with a letter concerning what I consider to be the decline of an Indiana University presence on campus. I made four requests in the letter. Those requests are as follows:

- 1) Provide an opportunity for Indiana University faculty on the campus to have input into the content of the next IPFW management agreement with Purdue University.
- 2) Designate an Indiana University system administrator as the Indiana University contact person for Indiana University faculty on the Fort Wayne campus.
- 3) Make arrangements for this Indiana University contact person to visit the Fort Wayne campus at least once per academic year to meet with the Indiana University faculty.
- 4) Reevaluate the policy requiring all new Indiana University faculty hired on the Fort Wayne campus to become Purdue University employees.

R. Hess: Are there any questions or comments?

There were none.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 03-21) – R. Hess:

My report is contained, in part, in Senate Reference No. 03-21, which is a report on Senate documents.

The other aspect of my report is a letter from Pat Hudson in response to our resolution. (R. Hess read the attached letter).

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SD 03-15) – E. Blakemore:

E. Blakemore moved to approve SD 03-15 (Fort Wayne Faculty Representation on the [Purdue University West Lafayette] University Senate [Recission of SD 90-13]).
Seconded.

M. Nusbaumer moved to make a friendly amendment to SD 03-15 as follows (changes in bold):

Be It Further Resolved ... select a member of the Purdue-**employed** Voting Faculty, elected by the Purdue-**employed** Voting Faculty ...

Motion to approve SD 03-15 passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 03-16) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve SD 03-16 (Academic Calendar, 2006-2007).

Motion to approve SD 03-16 passed on a voice vote.

c. Educational Policy Committee (SD 03-17) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve SD 03-17 (Amendments to the Academic Calendars 2004-2005 [amends SD 01-10] and 2005-2006 [amends SD 02-10]).

Motion to approve SD 03-17 passed on a voice vote.

d. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 03-18) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 03-18 (Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Library).

Motion to approve SD 03-18 passed on a voice vote.

7. Question Time:

a. Senate Reference No. 03-22:

1. **From salary increment money available this year, what proportion will be kept by the chancellor and vice chancellor for equity adjustments and merit awards?**
2. **Of the amount kept by the chancellor and vice chancellor, what proportion of the dollar amount will go to equity and what proportion to merit?**
3. **What criteria will be used for equity, and what criteria for merit?**

S. Hannah: (Question 1) Last year the number was 1percent. We are using that as a planning number. The Purdue Board of Trustees meets April 9 and will finalize how much is available. The governor is writing letters about tuition increases, so the budget is still under discussion about how much money is going to be available and how much we can prognosticate. It would be our hope - and I told the deans this - to continue what we did last year which was 2 percent to be handed out to the departments and 1 percent for exceptional merit and equity. But we do not know – that is a planning number. I am sorry to be so vague, but when the Board of Trustees acts here in a couple of weeks, we will know for sure.

(Question 2) We have done this the past two years, and it has been about 50/50. The first year was about 56 percent equity, and the next year it ended up the other way. It has roughly ended up to be about 50/50. You can go back and look at your Senate minutes – they were remarkably consistent. About one-third of the faculty got an award each year – 114 the first year and 112 the second year. Interestingly enough, the outcome has been roughly 50/50. I think that represents in many ways a policy balance we are trying to make. As you recall from the Strategic Plan (those of you on SPARC), we are trying to reach national averages, or 90 percent of national averages, by discipline and by rank in terms of faculty salaries. We are not there yet. We are further behind at full professor levels than in other levels. So, we are trying to go up in that respect, and at the same time we want to recognize faculty for exceptional merit. So, we are trying to balance two things at once: move forward and at the same time recognize exceptional folks. I think our balance, which has worked out to be 50/50, has been very appropriate.

(Question 3) Again, following what we have done the last couple of years, for equity I am looking at the percentage below the national mean. I am looking particularly at those that are 15 percent or so below the national mean for their rank. I am also looking at

years in rank and at people whose performance has been, over the long haul, a satisfactory performance. So you are looking at performance, percentage difference away from national means, and years in rank. That is exactly what I looked at last year.

You can find the criteria for merit in your own promotion and tenure documents because that is where those recommendations come from – the recommendations come from department chairs to deans and from deans to me, exactly as they have done in the past.

M. Nusbaumer: The legislature did not open the university budgets this year, so my question to you is, “Do you think it is plausible to have less than 3 percent come as faculty increments, or are we talking about that more as a base with potential for more?”

S. Hannah: The driver here is tuition increase. The goal would certainly be to keep faculty and staff salaries a high priority at this university. We have made that priority with the agreement to favor salaries over equipment over the last several years to the point that it is frustrating for me, along with some of your departments and faculty who are in equipment-intensive programs. But that has been our balance. What is driving it is really how much do we think we can charge for tuition; and once you have that number, it drives it down. Then you set priorities within that number.

M. Wartell: I will talk about that during the general good and welfare.

J. Grant: When you say that the merit recommendations come from department chairs and deans and then they go to you based on what department or division you are in, then how do you then make decisions?

S. Hannah: I ask them to give me roughly their top 10-15 percent in rank order. Then I go until I do not have any more money. I start at around \$500 – I do not give awards of \$.50. I do not see the point of that. If you divide \$500 dollars by 12, you are hardly going to see that. Using the priority order that comes from the deans, I start at the top and I go until I do not have any more money, then I draw the line, just like points and grant awards. But I depend on the department chairs and the deans to tell me what that rank order is. I have no way of knowing.

It is a tough decision: spending money on salary or buying that piece of equipment.

b. Senate Reference No. 03-23:

1. **What is being done to ensure that the new student housing is in compliance with the building codes of the City of Fort Wayne and also Allen County?**
2. **What is the university doing to ensure that the student housing facilities at IPFW are being built with integrity? (This question was expanded in a later communication to include issues of worker safety and wage rates.)**

W. Branson: (Question 1) IPFW projects are built as State projects so the City of Fort Wayne and Allen County are not part of the construction process. However, the State of

Indiana, City of Fort Wayne and Allen County all adhere to the same International Building Code requirements and guidelines – including the Indiana amendments. Therefore, this project is being constructed to the same standards as city and county facilities.

(Question 2) The student housing project was designed and is being built per all applicable state and federal building codes. The Construction Administration Department at Purdue University typically handles the construction inspection. However, in this case, while still very involved, Construction Administration has taken a lesser role and assigned much of this responsibility to the architect of the project – Design

Collaborative. Design Collaborative is a local firm with student housing design experience and a significant inspection background. In addition, the IPFW Physical Plant is also monitoring this project daily.

Per the construction contract, the contractors are responsible for the wage rates paid to the employees. If employees feel that they are inappropriately paid they are instructed to file a complaint with the Indiana Department of Labor. The Department of Labor will then conduct an investigation of the complaint. If their findings reveal inappropriate pay practices that are not remedied to their satisfaction they then turn their case over to the county prosecutor's office for legal action.

Similarly, the contractors are responsible for worker safety. IOSHA would not typically inspect a project for safety violations unless they receive a complaint. To our knowledge they are actively investigating the complaints they have received to date.

To conclude, we are confident that the proper safeguards are in place to guarantee a quality facility and that the worker issues will be addressed through the appropriate processes.

J. Grant: When I heard the gentleman from the Indiana Department of Labor interviewed on TV, he said something to the effect that it was not their responsibility to ensure that the contract wages were being met. They were called in, but he seemed to indicate that that was the university's responsibility, and he said that nobody was taking responsibility for it, which concerned him. They had gone about as far as they could go, but they were not really the responsible agency.

W. Branson: Part of the process with the contract is that the contractors have to provide Purdue with a certification that says they will pay the common wage. Once they do that, that sets forth the process with the Department of Labor, and at that point, Purdue cannot go back in and do anything more. The other process has to happen. Once they have the certification, the contractor has fulfilled his legal requirement for the contract.

J. Grant: So then is it not incumbent upon the employees to bring a lawsuit? Is that the only way they can have fair wages met? Why was a lawsuit necessary for them to have their appropriate wages given to them?

W. Branson: I do not know, because everything is under investigation by the Department of Labor, and we need to wait on the outcome first to see if the employees are happy with the outcome of the investigation.

L. Kuznar: You mentioned that Physical Plant is inspecting daily. What powers do they have if they see something that they think might be problematic or just something that they do not like in terms of future maintenance? What power do they have to enforce any input?

W. Branson: They can talk to the contractor and either get the contractor to change something or go back to Design Collaborative or go back to the Purdue inspectors and get something enforced if there is an issue left unresolved.

L. Kuznar: Do you know if they have had any problems? I find it very encouraging that we have our people on site because eventually they will inherit it. Have they had any problems with getting cooperation that you are aware of?

W. Branson: No, not at all.

J. Grant: I guess as part of the Executive Committee, the heart of the question was the last phrase in the expanded question, as to what extent does the university feel assured – and can assure us – that this will really be a safe and secure living environment for students. I think that is the bottom line for all faculty and for all members of the university. To what degree can you speak with assurance that this will be a safe and secure living facility?

W. Branson: I have great confidence in that. Having worked with Purdue inspectors in the past on other facilities – admittedly this is a different kind of construction – but they are a very rigid set of individuals. There is a lot of pre-testing of materials. There is a lot of fixing, and if anything does not meet the very detailed specifications provided as part of the contract, it is changed without question. They are very, very thorough. Things that affect safety: fire systems and those sorts of things, are reviewed even more thoroughly than other things are. So we are very confident – it should be a very, very safe and secure environment.

H. Samavati: The issues that came up about it would project a negative image of IPFW relative to the labor community. The IPFW community and students care about working people and labor standards. That is also a significant issue, other than safety of the housing building. They do deserve fair wages, and somehow, if the Physical Plant people

can have some say with the contractors and we can have some say in making sure that workers do get a fair wage, that would be wonderful for us.

W. Branson: Contractually again, that is where our hands are tied. It really has to go through the process.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 03-24) – D. Oberstar:

SR No. 03-24 (Proposed Business Option for Mathematical Sciences Majors) was presented for information only.

b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 03-25) – D. Oberstar:

SR No. 03-25 (Proposal for Name Change of Department of Manufacturing Technology) was presented for information only.

c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-26) – B. Abbott:

SR No. 03-26 (Updates to Senate Reference No. 00-11 [IPFW Academic Calendar Formula]) was presented for information only.

d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-27) – J. Grant:

SR No. 03-27 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) was presented for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

(The tape did not record on the second side so, from this point on, the remarks under the general good and welfare are not verbatim.)

R. Friedman: We still need nominees for the following Senate committees for the slate in April: Student Affairs Committee – 1 nominee, University Resources Policy Committee – 2 nominees, Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs – 3 nominees.

M. Wartell: The governor called for no more than a 4 percent increase in tuition. Purdue's Board of Trustees is expected to vote April 9 on the tuition-increase proposal.

Tuesday, March 23 from 3:00-5:00 p.m., Indiana University President Adam Herbert and the Indiana University Board of Trustees will hold a public forum regarding tuition rates for next year. Potential and current students are welcome to speak. The forum will be held at

the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis campus; however, it will be available to us via video and teleconference hook-up in Kettler Hall, Room G22.

There will also be a Purdue University public forum April 8 on a proposed 4 percent increase for next school year in the tuition and mandatory fees paid by Indiana resident students. The forum will be held by the Purdue Board of Trustees' Finance Committee in the Stewart Center, with videoconference connections to the university's regional campuses in Fort Wayne, Hammond and Westville.

There is a concern from the legislature with fees. It is difficult because the state is in financial difficulty. The governor is letting his opinion be known.

M. Nusbaumer: Regarding these conferences, is the TV hook-up with IPFW, Indiana University or Purdue University?

M. Wartell: The Boards of Trustees are responsible for setting tuition. Therefore, the video conference will include the respective boards.

M. Nusbaumer: I am troubled by an article on the front page of the *Journal Gazette* where it mentions Mexicans are dying while working in the United States due to unsafe working conditions. It mentions Mexicans working in the United States have twice the rate of work-related deaths than United States-born workers due to unsafe working conditions. Given the fact that contractors on the IPFW housing project have already been fined over \$100,000 for worker-safety violations and employ many Mexican workers, I find this situation to be deeply troubling.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty