

Minutes of the
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Twelfth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
March 15, 1993
Noon, Kettler G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of February 8, 1993
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Switzer
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - S. Hollander
 - b. Purdue University - A. Finco
 - c. Report on visitation by S. Beering and F. Ford to present their views on the management agreement - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 92-25) - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (SD 92-16) - B. Bulmahn
 - b. Student Affairs Committee (SD 92-17) - J. Schez Question time - (Senate Reference No. 92-26)
7. Question time – (Senate Reference No. 02-26)
8. New business
 - a. Senate Document SD 92-18 - J. Smulkstys/M. Mansfield
 - b. Senate Document SD 92-19 - S. Hollander Committee reports "for information only"
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 92-27) - D. McCants
 - b. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-28) - J. Switzer
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick
Parliamentarian: S. Harroff
Sergeant-at-arms: R. Barrett

Senate Members Present:

S. Argast, E. Blumenthal, W. Branson, B. Bulmahn, J. Chandler, J. Clausen, A. Dirkes, J. Dunlap, A. Finco, E. Foley, J. Grant, R. Hawley, S. Hollander, R. Jeske, A. Karim, N. Kelley, F. Kirchhoff, D. Kruse, L. Kuznar, J. Lantz, C. Lawton, D. Legg, D. McCants, R. Miens, A. Pugh, R. Ramsey, S. Sar atore, J. Scherz, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, C. Stenberger, J. Switzer, W. Unsell, W. Utesch, W. Walker, E. Waters, L. Wootton, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

F. Borelli, J. Brennan, A. Chatterjea, D. Cox, S. Dhawale, J. Haw, P. Lin, D. Linn, M. Mansfield, L. Meyer, J. Meyers, R. Pacer, A. Rassuli, W. Tsai

Representative from Medical Education: D. Bell

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, M. Downs, J. Hostetter, R. Svoboda

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

Attachments:

["Proposed amendment to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures \(SD 85-18\) - change in rules relating to the re-entry of students after prolonged absence"](#) (SD 92-16)

"Position description for NCAA Compliance Coordinator" (SD 92-17)

"Resolution concerning the relationship between this campus and West Lafayette" (SD 92-18)

["University affiliation of IPFW Faculty"](#) (SD 92-19)

"Recommendations of President Beering's Purdue University TIAA-CREF Retirement Task Force," and "Report of the Committee on the Impact on Purdue University of Elimination of Mandatory Retirement for Tenured Faculty [University Senate 92-3]" (Senate Reference No. 92-29)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 8, 1993: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the Agenda:

J. Switzer moved to accept the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

S. Hollander: Both speakers met with President Bearing and a distinguished group on February 24. We have asked Professor Downs to report on that meeting for both of us under item 4.c.

At the most recent meeting of the University Faculty Council there were three resolutions that were approved and of some interest to the faculty on this campus. One was a resolution from the IU Committee on Institutional Affairs petitioning the President and the Board of Trustees of IU not to

approve a Management Agreement for this campus unless it accorded to IU faculty and students here the kind of pro-faction--namely, protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation--that is provided to IU faculty and students everywhere else in the IU system. It passed unanimously. There was one abstention. The second item that was passed was a so-called "balanced case" amendment to the promotion criteria. Currently IU requires two areas of competence and one of excellence. The balanced case thing says essentially that if there is a strength in all three areas, but perhaps excellence in none, the case can still be successful. I have asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to look at that resolution and examine what changes might be necessary in IPFW policies and procedures. Finally, also approved was a resolution which will eventually enable some transferability of TIAA-CREF money to other financial funds other than TIAA-CREF.

b. Purdue University:

A. Finco: Due to the weather, Wayne Unsell and I aborted our planned trip to West Lafayette to attend an Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) meeting. You may recall that at the February FW Senate meeting I mentioned that the transfer of credits in junior-senior engineering courses in the Purdue system was to be discussed at the meeting we missed. According to the minutes of the IFC meeting, Professor H. Oner Yurtseven described the problem associated with intercampus transfer of credits in junior-senior engineering courses. Evidently, approximately, three or four years ago, in connection with course equivalency discussions, some informal agreements between EE and ME departments on the various campuses were made which limited, to some extent, the free transferability of credits, particularly at the junior-senior level engineering courses. Evidently, the IFC has reacted by directing the acting chair to form two committees--one for EE and one for ME--by inviting the four department heads (Fort Wayne, Calumet, IUPUI and WL) in both EE and ME to send a representative to these two committees. Each would be chaired by Professor H. Oner Yurtseven and charged to reconsider the problem of course equivalences in these two areas. The two main issues to be addressed are: 1) to give common numbers to courses on different campuses which are equivalent but at present carry different numbers; and 2) to modify appropriately those courses on different campuses which currently have the same number but which, in the course of time, have diverged in their respective contents.

Following this IFC outcome the IFC agreed to encourage the WL Educational Policy Committee (EPC) and other campuses to initiate faculty approvals of the WL EPC "transfer credit" proposal. I have sent a copy of the proposal to the EPC on this campus.

Two items on the February 22nd WL University Senate agenda could have a significant impact on the lives of IPFW Faculty, of PTA affiliation. The first is the "Report of the Committee on the Impact of the Elimination of Mandatory Retirement for Tenured Faculty" which was presented to the WL Senate for information. I ask the FW Senate Secretary to include a copy of the comments of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC--WL) about this report in the minutes of this meeting. (See SR No. 92-29 attached)

The second item is University Senate Document 92-9, reference University Senate Document, which is the US FAC's recommendation that Purdue University adopt the cashability option for TIAA-CREF funds for active faculty. Specifically the University senate FAC recommendations read as follows:

1. The committee endorses "cashability" and "transferability" of CREF at age 59'A, as recommended by the TIAA-CREF Retirement Task Force, and requests that the Task Force Recommendations be released to Purdue contract holders.
2. The committee believes there should be a wider public hearing of the issues regarding cashability and transferability to promote better understanding regarding individual management of retirement funds. We propose that University-wide forum(s) should be held on this subject.
3. The committee recommends to the Board of Trustees that upcoming decisions on cashability/transferability should be made based on consensus of Purdue TIAA-CREF contract holders.

It has been suggested that denial of cashability and transferability would protect retirement assets from loss through legal proceedings. There is no guarantee that denial of cashability and transferability will give protection in any future legal proceedings. A ruling by the Board of Trustees to deny cashability and transferability would irrevocably affect all money heretofore invested by retirement contract holders.

The US FAC also voted to withdraw UNSD 91-15, which had recommended postponing for two years consideration of cashability--the Senate voted to withdraw that document.

Upon hearing of the WL Senate's actions on these issues I took it upon myself to write a letter to President Beering and Vice-President and Treasurer Ford, carboning the members of the PU Board of Trustees, the Chair of the WL Senate FAC, the Presiding Officer of the WL Senate, Dr. Bernard Liska and Mr. Howard Lyon, Co-Chairs of the TIAA-CREF Task

Force, in which I reminded them that the PU Committee on Institutional Affairs, FW FAC, and the FW Senate all gave approval and support to the recommendations of the Task Force in December 1991. I will also include a copy of this letter in the minutes of this meeting. (See SR No. 92-29 attached)

c. M. Downs: My report will cover what has happened regarding the Management Agreement since my last appearance here. On February 9, Bill Frederick and I went to Indianapolis to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of H.B. 1806, the bill which would have mandated the changes in the Management Agreement already recommended by this campus. The bill's primary sponsor, Representative Winfield Moses, spoke first and called the Committee's attention to the chronic underfunding of this campus during the period of Purdue University's fiscal agency and the resulting contraction of education opportunities here because of the lack of support. Representative Phyllis Pond, a co-sponsor, called attention to the inequality with which faculty and students are treated under the current arrangement.

Bill recounted the process which had led to the development of H.B. 1806. In particular he drew the Committee's attention to the unwillingness of Purdue administrators to discuss the campus recommendations or to take note of the problems which the recommendations address. At one point Bill was interrupted by a member of the Committee, Representative Kruzan, who asked if he was correct in assuming that President Beering was opposed to the bill and would be angry with him if he supported it. Bill reluctantly admitted that this was probably true. Kruzan then said,

Good, that makes it much easier for me to vote yes." For me, it was a delicious moment.

I said that H.B. 1806 was good public policy because it would place responsibility in the hands of those who were best qualified by knowledge and interest to use it well; that this would clarify lines of accountability and communication; that approving the bill would recognize the size, maturity, and uniqueness of IPFW.

The questions and comments which followed this part of the hearing were mostly friendly and favorable; several representatives did wonder if other regional campuses would be affected, or would also ask for the same treatment. We said that H.B. 1806 concerned IPFW alone and that other campuses would watch carefully and make their own cases.

Vice President Fred Ford appeared to speak in opposition to the bill. He said that IPFW was already 95 % financially autonomous except for salaries, fringe benefits, new construction, purchasing, retrofits and rehabilitation, and program improvement. To be any more autonomous would be disastrous. He also said that for a campus to have a Purdue franchise meant that the campus would have to accept Purdue policies and Purdue control.

When he was asked why this situation was being discussed in the General Assembly, Vice President Ford said that the source of the problems was the failure of the Fort Wayne Chancellor to communicate accurately the views of Purdue's President to the campus. He said that the Purdue administration had always planned to come to Fort Wayne to discuss all these matters with the IPFW faculty and administration. When pressed by committee members, he promised he would arrange to meet with us soon.

In the hall after the hearing, Bill and I, each in his own way, took Vice President Ford to task for blaming Chancellor Lantz for the current unpleasantness. Bill Frederick told him the accusation was a lie; I suggested that anyone who knew both principals; would find it hard to credit the Ford version of who was at fault. The Vice President admitted that he knew only one side of the story.

Subsequently, the Ways and Means Committee, heavily involved in other budgetary problems, let H.B. 1806 die for this session, but not before offering us an opportunity to return for another hearing next year. The letters from members of the campus community resulted in written commitments of support from four of the county's representatives and oral commitments from two others. State Senators from the county and area were also favorably interested. There may still be a joint resolution creating a legislative study committee to consider regional campus relations with West Lafayette and Bloomington. On this matter we must, and will, be like bulldogs.

Vice President Ford was as good as his word and he and President Beering came to Fort Wayne on February 24 to meet with administrators and student and faculty representatives--Raj Sun, Frederick, Hollander, Finco, and myself. The meeting was notable for two reasons: the uniform and vocal resistance of the IPFW community to President Beering's proposals for this campus (he is advocating an analog to the Indianapolis model) and the predictability of President Beering's response to the list of problems and concerns--these are all the result of a lack of communication--and of Vice President Ford's too,--we are taking issue with long-standing Purdue University policies which must be uniform throughout the system. My own estimate is, that at this time, there is very little budge in their position.

Nevertheless, there were moments during this interchange, that I will cherish for a long time: Abe Bassett telling President Beering that Purdue's management style is "heavy handed;" David Cox telling both of our distinguished visitors that they should "get out of our way and let us do our job," Bill Frederick saying how much he resented Vice President Ford's efforts to blame Chancellor Lantz for these problems; David McCants recounting the bullying tactics used by West Lafayette regarding our graduate assistants and the local tenure-stop-out policy; Hollander, Finco, and Jack Dahl correcting the record and our guests a number of times; everyone in the room shouting down an ill-informed comment; and the quiet but insistent questions put by Josh Libii and Raj Suri. And when President Beering

demanded, after an account of a particularly embarrassing problem, "Why wasn't I informed?"--Joanne Lantz, on this issue, Joanne of Arc, calmly replied, I did tell you and I wrote you a letter and I handed you the letter." The truth was loose in that room--and some courage, too. I have never been prouder of people. You should have been there.

Throughout it all President Beering declined to discuss in detail our proposal, which asks for a devolution of authority to this campus, nor did he discuss in detail his own proposal, which is pushing a kind of ethnic cleansing for us wherein all new hires would become Purdue employees. He is coming back to see some of us on March 29. I'll report to you again after that meeting.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer: W. Frederick presented SR No. 92-25 (Report on the Status of Senate Documents) for information. W. Frederick added that as a result of the issues and discussions with President Beering, the Presiding Officer from each campus, West Lafayette included, will be given speaking privileges on a rotating basis before the Board of Trustees. W. Frederick will speak for the first time on May 14. The Presiding Officers and Presidents of Faculty Senates from around Purdue campuses will now have the same access that Student Body Presidents have.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

- a. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document 92-16) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 92-16 (Proposed amendment to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures (SD 85-18) - change in rules relating to the re-entry of students after prolonged absence). Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to suspend the rules so that the body could vote on SD 92-16.

Seconded.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 92-16 passed on a voice vote.

- b. J. Scherz moved to approve SD 92-17 (Position description for NCAA Compliance Coordinator). Seconded

J. Silver moved to amend SD 92-17 by striking the words "as a 0.25 FTE administrative assignment." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

7. Question time-

Q: Last year this body passed two pieces of legislation: one dealing with the tenure stop-out and a second dealing with research misconduct. I have heard rumors to the effect that either or both of these pieces of legislation are running into some difficulty being implemented because of pressures from Purdue University West Lafayette. I don't know if this is true or not, but I would appreciate a report on the status of these two documents.

J. Lantz: Last academic year I received C22 from Vice President Greenkorn and it had to do with integrity in research. The document suggested that regional campuses should, in fact, have a procedure to implement it. I asked the Fort Wayne Senate to recommend procedures on C22. The document was reviewed by campus committee and the document was sent to this body and passed. When I went to West Lafayette last summer to discuss the Management Agreement, after the committees on this campus had finished their work, I was given our Senate document back and it was suggested that it did not coincide with West Lafayette policy. I discussed the concerns about the document at this point with our Presiding Officer and, I believe, at various times with both of the Speakers of the Faculty. It is my understanding that when we have concluded the discussions with President Beering (he will be back here on March 29, at which time the Senate people will be in discussion about these documents with the President) they will be brought back for any changes that would be necessary to make them working documents.

The second document that was reported back to me had to do with the IPFW stop-out procedure. You will recall that over the last year-and-a-half to two years, the Intercampus Faculty Council discussed a stop-out policy that has been brought up and discussed many times. There was a document that was brought to this Senate that spelled out the procedures. In our document in Fort Wayne the request went from the faculty member asking for the stop-out, to the chair, to the dean, to the academic vice chancellor. When I went to West Lafayette to discuss promotion and tenure cases with Vice President Ringel, he gave me a copy of our Senate document and some other papers that spelled out a slightly different procedure. Let me tell you what the difference in the procedures are and what happened as a result of that. The difference is that the first group to act on the request for stop-out is the primary promotion and tenure committee and the last part of the procedure was that the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs would approve. I did look for the documents and was not able to locate them. I could not ascertain when the documents were ever sent to Fort Wayne. (I did receive copies in February.) In the meantime one of our colleagues had asked for a stop-out and we had proceeded under our own approved policy; but, in fact, because they did not comply with West Lafayette, we went back and redid them. I felt that we should not hold any of our colleagues in a position which would jeopardize them because of the discussion of the two documents. The affected department did have a primary promotion and tenure committee and they recommended a stop-out and we, in fact, abided by the policy. We will be discussing these and other documents at the meeting on March 29. It would be my hope, in this process of the discussions with the President, that we would come to a resolution of how all documents are transmitted and presented to this body, and we would then take any steps necessary to make our documents workable documents.

8. New business•

- a. J. Smulkstys moved SD 92-18 (Resolution concerning the relationship between this campus and West Lafayette). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote with J. Lantz abstaining.

- b. S. Hollander moved to approve SD 92-19 (University affiliation of IPFW Faculty). Seconded.

Motion to a p p r o v e p a s s e d on a voice vote.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

- a. D. McCants presented SR No. 92-27 (Environmental Geology Option in Geology B.S. Degree and Supervisory Leadership Certificate in Department of Organizational Leadership) for information only.

- b. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 92-28).- J. Switzer:

J. Switzer presented SR No. 92-28 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

D. Legg: On behalf of the Nominations and Elections Committee I would like to ask anyone who has not sent in their committee preference forms to send those in today. We still need one I.U. faculty member for the Rules Committee.

J. Lantz: I would like to introduce Walter Branson, Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs.... This is the first official meeting he has attended.

S. Hollander: To follow up on what Professor Legg was saying, the Rules Committee seldom meets. It's a real easy committee.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty