

Minutes of the
Seventh Regular Meeting of the Sixth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
March 16, 1987
Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of February 9 and 16, 1987
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - S. Hollander
 - b. Purdue University - D. McCants
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Student Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 86-13) - A. Friedel
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-14) - M. Downs
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-15; see also Senate Reference No. 86-11, "Administrative Understandings Relative to SO 86-15") - M. Downs
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 86-12, "Documents under Deliberation in Senate Committees and Subcommittees") - M. Downs The general good and welfare of the University
9. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

G. Bell, J. Bell, J. Carnaghi, J. Clausen, F. Codispoti, L. DeFonso, R. Detraz, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, H. Garcia, L. Graham, S; Harroff, M. Hayden, J. Hersberw, R. Hess, S. Hockemeyer, S. Hollander, A. Karna, R. Kovara, M. Laudeman, S. Manheimer, D. Mauritzen, D. McCants, E. Nicholson, D. Oberst p, D. Onwood, R. Otten, J. Outland, J. Owen, K. Perry, R. Ramsey~,M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, S. Sayegh,,D. Schmidt, J. Silver, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Stevenson, J. Sunderman, M. Temte, S. Usman, J. Violette, K. Wakley, T. Wallace, J. Wilson, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

J. Chandler, F. Kirchhoff, M. Kubik, C. Maile, J. Ulmer, D. Wartzok

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Attachments:

["Amendments to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Administrative/Professional Staff Membership on the Subcommittee on Athletics"](#) (SD 86-13)

["Academic calendar for 1988-1989"](#) (SD 86-14)

["Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures \[SD 85-18\]"](#) (SD 86-15)

["Academic Regulations"](#) (SD 85-18)

"Responsibilities of the Academic Officers Committee" (SR No. 86-13)

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, G. B'lumenshine, D. Cannon, V. Coufoudakis, T. Guthrie, Lantz, G. Parsons, M. Souers, R. Svoboda

Visitors Present:

J. Clinton, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, A. Federman, M. Hile, V. Lansky, A. Montgomery, R. Steiner

Acta

1. Call to order: T. Wallace called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of February 9 and 16, 1987: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

M. Downs moved acceptance of the agenda. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. S. Hollander:

The Indiana University Board of Trustees met on March 7. I understand they approved the state-wide M.B.A. program at that time.

- b. David McCants:

The Intercampus Faculty Council met in February. I wish to report on four items from that meeting:

1. The Council has completed a proposal to change the composition of the Intercampus Faculty Council. I am forwarding: the document' to our Agenda Committee for consideration by this body.

2. Other campuses represented at the meeting showed interest in the fee assessment proposal approved by this Senate in February. Even the University Registrar referred to some fees as nuisance fees.
3. Vice President Ringel related activities of his office to the regional campuses. He reported that he is serving on budget review committees for each campus. He reported that he has served on Panel D for each campus. In this regard, he observed that the campuses have different, desirable expectations for promotion and tenure, depending upon the campus's stage of development. As a result, he found his participation challenging. He was critical of the inadequacy of evidence in behalf of excellence in teaching in many cases which he saw.
4. The West Lafayette Educational Policy Committee is debating a policy on transfer of credits from technical and vocational colleges. In its current draft, acceptability is keyed to the type of accreditation the college holds.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

T. Wallace:

1. I have talked with Bill Frederick and have sent to him and the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee (CUAS) some thoughts I have about using computing in the curriculum. I am asking that a two-phase study be done on that subject. In Phase I, the AOC, working with Vice Chancellor Nicholson, will review, discipline by discipline, department by department, how computing is integrated currently into the curriculum. I am not referring to the use of computers; I am talking more about computing. Phase II asks the CUAS to review the reports of the AOC to see where we are compared to what other institutions are doing nationally. I see a need to do this because I have run into some seniors and talked to them about computing. I have found that some of them don't know even the names of some of the software that should be an integral part of their curriculum. CAD/CAM, for example, in many universities, is a required part of the engineering program. We need to do this assessment, but I know it will take a while.
2. John Gardner will be here next Monday at noon for our faculty convocation this spring. Dr. Gardner gives a fantastic talk. He has been very successful working on the freshman experience. He will also be meeting with the freshman orientation committee and the committee dealing with the nature and quality of the undergraduate experience.

6. Committee reports requiring action

- a. University Resources Policy Committee (SD 86-13)- A. Friedel:

A. Friedel moved to approve SD 86-13 (Amendments to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: Administrative/Professional Staff Membership on the Subcommittee on Athletics). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 86-13 passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-14) - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 86-14 (Academic calendar for 1988-1989).
Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 86-14 passed on a voice vote.

c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 86-15; see also Senate Reference No. 86-11) – M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 86-15 (Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures [SD 85-18]). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 86-15 passed on a voice vote.

7. New business:

There was no new business.

8. Committee reports "for information only" - Educational Policy Committee (SR No. 86-12) - M. Downs:

M. Downs presented SR No. 86-12 (Documents under Deliberation in Senate Committees and Subcommittees) to the Senate for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

T. Wallace:

(a) We are in the process of joining the National University Technical Network, which is a satellite capability that stresses business courses, but also includes other kinds of programs. The Chamber of Commerce, in agreement with us, paid our initiation fee and our annual cost, and we will jointly sponsor some business-related, noncredit business conferencing. Of course we will be able to use the network for other things as well.

(b) I would like to provide you with a list of functions and responsibilities of the Academic Officers Committee [See SR No. 86-13, attached]. I think it is important because I would like to see the AOC, as well as a number of other bodies--for example, Senate committees--give me more creative ideas on what

can be done here, as well as get an official consulting capacity of various groups on campus before things are done.

I am also in the process of establishing a chancellor's advisory committee consisting of six to eight students, six to eight faculty, two deans, and the vice chancellor. This informal group will sit around a table with me once a month for the simple agenda of making suggestions for improving the university, but with the understanding that people who make suggestions must also present solutions and: be willing to work on behalf of those solutions. I have felt a real handicap in not having students around the table with faculty and administrators to discuss how things are going. I think the latest business with the student union plans have made me even more aware of the necessity for more student input.

- (c) The M.B.A. was approved by the IU Board of Trustees. It is now being referred to as a university-wide M.B.A. There seems to be some confusion regarding the plan of implementation. We have been inundated with telephone calls about when we will be starting to offer the degree. We just have not been able to respond with much information.
- (d) I am pleased to be able to announce that I have been informed by President Beering that an academic reorganization plan has been approved in principle for IPFW, with implementation this fall. President Beering has met with Indiana University administrators to gain approval. The reorganization plan calls for academic departments to be grouped into six divisions, each headed by a director: Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Technology, Fine and Performing Arts, Business Administration, Health Sciences, and Education. The plan is basically that which came out of this institution. Obviously, one difference is that they are not using schools and deans as has been the Purdue University custom on campus.

Also, as part of this plan, we will be starting a department of computer science. We'll be analyzing what I call the continuum in computing from what is usually done in business school through computer sciences and laboratory science dealing with applications, system software, and all the way to the other end to electrical engineering and architecture configuration and that sort of thing. We will be getting computing in the proper category, whether it be in the business school, in the school of arts and sciences, or in engineering and technology.

The organization plan does not change present Indiana University or Purdue University policies and procedures on faculty personnel matters, control of curriculum, or financial management.

We are also talking with Indiana University about the possibility of officially coming under the system program for allied health and making the nursing department an Indiana University mission. This is very preliminary. We have not made a decision. We are trying to work out what the ground rules would be

if we were to join the IU allied health nursing system. There are some benefits for not doing that. . . . There is a list of pluses and minuses for both. Our desire is to create a school of health professions and health programming that should be found in most urban areas.

We will be embarking on a search for director of the Division of Arts and Sciences, and we would like to get an ad out very quickly. A search-and-screen committee will be formed soon and will be asked to develop some specific evaluation criteria. You will be hearing more about that in the very near future.

I want to express my appreciation to an awful lot of faculty and administrators here. I think they have worked very creatively and constructively to make this occur. I think President Beering has done a good job on both campuses because there have been a lot of deans and vice presidents on both campuses vitally interested in our reorganization.

In the afternoon mail there will be a memorandum to all faculty with a list of the departments under each division.

H. Garcia: If academic policies and budgetary policies are pretty much the same, why are we bothering changing, if we're still in divisions and not in schools?

T. Wallace: I think what we got here was the substance; we didn't get the labels. I think to me the greatest achievement is to get people in arts and sciences together-- particularly to see how that would impact on our future planning around the undergraduate efforts. And, although allied health and fine and performing arts are small, I believe they can make great progress in moving their units ahead. We have gotten the substance; we didn't get the labels. If I had to choose one or the other, I would choose what we got. I think it is a good step forward. I think we'll have a good basis on which to continue our academic development.

R. Hess: You said there is going to be a search for a director of Arts and Sciences. Are we going to have a search for director of any of the other divisions?

T. Wallace: No, I'd rather not do that because the strategic-planning process is not yet completed. It should impact, I would hope, on the fine and performing arts group and the health professions group. I think, until we get that mission established, we will have some acting directors there. I don't think there are those kinds of uncertainties in Arts and Sciences.

S. Harroff: Did President Beering or any of the other groups that studied our document give any reasons for their unwillingness to go with labels that we thought were best under the circumstances?

T. Wallace: I would say I think I know what some of those arguments were, but I think it would be counterproductive to reveal everybody's position on both campuses on the

document. I will tell you, though, that I was a little surprised at the depth of the review. It got the attention of deans and vice presidents. I had many telephone conversations with these people, and I know Ed Nicholson did. There are a lot of different points of view from one extreme to another. . .

M. Downs: I noticed that you said it had been accepted "in principle." What does that mean?

T. Wallace: I think there is interest by both presidents in continuing to review our implementation plan. It's been approved in principle for implementation this fall, which means we go ahead and do it and keep everybody advised as to what is happening.

D. McCants: What parts of the plan require board of trustees approval?

T. Wallace: Apparently nothing. The point is that none of the things that we are talking about are in conflict with the management agreement. So the two presidents felt that they could approve this without the board. You can be assured that it has been discussed with both boards informally.

S. Hollander: You mentioned that the M.B.A. program has been made into a state-wide M.B.A. program. Does that mean that the budget for the program will be controlled out of Bloomington?

T. Wallace: We don't know right now. It's a university-wide program. There is just a lot of different points of view on budget and implementation. In the appropriation passed by the House, there is \$225,000 earmarked for the Fort Wayne M.B.A.

R. Hess: As I understand it, there are three divisions in the proposed scheme for which we'll be looking for either a director or someone to fill in temporarily. What will be the role of the faculty in the selection of those individuals?

T. Wallace: The usual kind of search-and-screen committee process and the usual kinds of things one would expect.

R. Hess: Is there going to be an election of those individuals to serve on those search-and-screen committees?

T. Wallace: Yes.

R. Hess: And an election of the chair, then, by the people who are serving on them?

T. Wallace: I can't tell you all the details. We will get from Science and Humanities and Arts and Letters elected representatives from the departments. I have not in my thinking gone beyond what that committee does. We'll work that out in the next day or two.

R. Hess: What would be a reporting date for such a committee?

T. Wallace: We haven't gone into that level of detail yet.

R. Hess: Yet they want to have someone by August 1?

T. Wallace: Yes, we can have an ad in the Chronicle within ten days to two weeks. It would have been nice if we could have started earlier, but we are where we are. Of course, if we don't get a pool of candidates we're happy with, we don't have to make an appointment.

J. Silver: You mentioned the proposed establishment of a computer science department. Does that involve any assumption about change of mission in the existing department?

T. Wallace: I really don't know. I would say that my hoped outcome would be that we as an institution go through a process in which we look at this continuum that I described and just see where the business school is doing that part of it; where the department of computer science is doing computer science as a laboratory science; and then we move to the technology and engineering. I think it is a pretty well-described continuum, and I think we just divide up the territory. I don't know in really any great detail, although I've read some descriptions of what the department of computer technology is now doing. I really couldn't say to you whether there is any movement that would occur. We're just going to have to look at that and see how we can best do the job for students.

J. Silver: I think the Senate proposal specifically asked for a single department doing computing as opposed to dividing up the territory. Was that question addressed at the main campuses?

T. Wallace: That question has been an historic problem on the main campus. I'd rather not get into it today; we could spend an hour and a half on it. And I know less about it, probably, than other people in the room. I would like to approach it by getting everybody around the table and see what needs to be done. . . . We have had in the past, as I am sure you know, a difficult time in getting approval for a B.S. in computer science. I think that has changed.

M. Downs: Last fall when President Beering was here and we received a report from his meeting with the search-and-screen committee for chancellor, he said before implementation took place that he would preside over hearings on this campus about the reorganization. That is no longer a part of the plan?

T. Wallace: He may view his trip up here next week, particularly the faculty convocation, as that meeting. If there is something else you would like to have and suggest it, I'm sure he would be willing to do it. If you do want something like that, be sure to tell me soon so I can tell him next week.

M. Downs: That is not something I am going to ask for.

J. Owen: . . . What units would come under Business Administration?

T. Wallace: Now that you mention it, I realize that I have left out some details. Labor Studies, the Medical School, and the School of Public and Environmental Affairs are not part of our reorganization plan.

S. Sayegh: Since we have a computer technology department and a computer science option, and since we are about to have a computer science department, and since physicists, chemists, and biologists use computing, do you think there will be any possibility of having a small number of terminals open 24 hours a day?

T. Wallace: If there is a need for it, we'll do it. We are looking at this whole question for next year in terms of location, e.g. in the student union plan it calls for taking the music room, which is not being used, and making a terminal room. Dick Ritchie has thought through this. He has some ideas about where we would have only terminal facilities and where we would mix terminals and PC's. If you have any suggestions like this, get them to Dick Ritchie. We're looking at a lot of these things. For example, library hours for final exams need to be extended. The increased hours at the athletic facility have been very successful, and the fees have more than doubled.

M. Downs: I just read this morning the memorandum you sent to the Senate members regarding reallocation. I have to observe that if your intention was to lay to rest rumors and controversy, you missed at least by a little. I would like to ask about this list of tables. These are accurate predictions of vacancies and reallocations?

T. Wallace: You mean an exhaustive list or specifically accurate?

M. Downs: Specifically accurate.

T. Wallace: To my knowledge they are. Let me comment on that. Whether you are satisfied or unsatisfied with it has to do with your view of the role of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee or the role of Senator and faculty member. My intention in sending that information out was 1) to bring to your attention a draft statement on the 1987-88 priorities document that was sent to the Senate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee and the AOC in November. They discussed the academic priorities. I thought that there wasn't great disagreement on budget priorities for next year. If there were, I didn't hear about them; 2) in case there was confusion on the process of establishing the budget that was laid out to the Senate; and 3) to give examples of areas where positions were not filled and indicated where the money went. The planning document that we sent out was to be used by the vice chancellor in working with the deans and directors. That doesn't mean that every dean and director got what he wanted. I don't know of anybody who got that. Those who expected that the process would be one where each budget transfer would be voted on and approved, or where the process would be that each day at 4 o'clock the committee would sit and review expenditures of the administration that day, are not going to be happy. The process is--

and I said this when I interviewed with you, and I have done it for years--that I lay out what I think the priorities of the budget should be. The departments should be involved with their chairs, and the chairs with the deans and the directors on their priorities, and they send that through the vice chancellor. Then the vice chancellor sits with me and we make decisions.

I don't see where there was great disparity between what people asked for and what people got. . . . I thought that the monies were reallocated pretty closely according to what came through the departments to the vice chancellor.

I don't know much more than that to do. I did ask the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee to indicate specifically what it is they see as their role. I think this would probably be true in our whole governance structure here. I don't see where the roles of subcommittees are specified to the point where it makes me feel comfortable with knowing what the expectations are for involvement in some of these questions. I am sure there is room for improvement. I am certainly willing to work with that and improve upon that, but I need something coming up and I am not getting much coming up from the subcommittees, to be quite honest with you. I am really at a quandry on the question of reallocation, as to what people want and expect. I am asking for your help in this matter.

M. Downs: My question wasn't that cosmic, although I appreciate the answer very much. My question had to do with the accuracy of the table. Calls I have received, which have been critical of the document, questioned that accuracy. I think it is good that the information about the process is being widespread, but the final test of credibility, if there's more than one, is whether or not this is what was done--if this is an accurate representation of what was done or whether it is not. That's the question.

T. Wallace: I think that this would be the forum. If people want to question the accuracy of the list, I would be happy to have that brought up and discussed.

M. Downs: I am at the point with the university where I don't really know very much except what I'm told: That there are positions that have been lost that are not reflected either as vacant or as reallocated. Specifically, positions in chemistry and psychology are a couple of areas that have been called to my attention, as well as the chair's position in sociology, which is equated to two vacancies in sociology, but in fact, is not. Maybe there is a problem here in talking about lines and in talking about money that may have escaped some people. In other words this may be accurate, but not a fully explained reallocation.

T. Wallace: You touch on a very real problem. These budgets change almost daily in terms of people continuing to leave and things being added and things changing. The chemistry position is a good example. People who knew what that position was about knew that that was not an ordinary faculty position. As a matter of fact, as I am told, it had no teaching responsibility. For the sociology chair's position, what was allocated for that position did exceed the high salary of one person who left. . . .

[The next few minutes of the meeting were not recorded. The transcript is not, therefore, verbatim.]

S. Hollander: Perhaps the confusion results from various ways of reading Table 1 of your report. Are we supposed to read this line by line, equating each item in the left-hand column with the item to its right? Or do we take things as groups, and equate the block of items on the left with the block on the right?

T. Wallace: The latter. . . .

A. Dirkes: The IU newspaper dated February 20 reported that \$4 1/2 million have been provided for part-time faculty replacement. Will that affect us?

J. Carnaghi: Our budget goes through Purdue University, not Indiana University. That information pertains to all IU campuses except this one.

R. Hess: Did I understand you to say that the amount of money reported on the left-hand side of Table 1 is equivalent to the right-hand side?

T. Wallace: Yes.

R. Hess: At the end of page two, it says stabilization of enrollment should be a high priority. Has it been?

T. Wallace: I think so.

(The tape begins again at this point.)

R. Hess: Is there any information concerning how successful we are at this time in stabilizing fall enrollment?

T. Wallace: No. Spring enrollment was up as a result of a variety of things.

R. Hess: Well, I think one of the differences for spring was the advertising, and when I asked a question about advertising for spring we really didn't have any means to measure the effectiveness of the advertising.

T. Wallace: Unless I was asked, I would never want to say that enrollments went up for any particular reason, because you never do know. If you're put on the spot and something positive happens, you might as well take credit for it.

R. Hess: I am trying to figure out whether this particular highest-priority item appears to be worthwhile.

T. Wallace: I would say so. I think the allocation for communication and the position for speech and audiology were because we looked at the evidence and saw the ability to get more majors. We were not doing the kind of job in advertising and recruiting that we could do if we spent some more money. I think if we put it all together, we did put that as a highest priority. At the time, I felt, and others felt, that research and scholarly kinds of things were also important.

R. Hess. Beyond advertising, what have we done to stabilize fall enrollment?

T. Wallace: I think that the space plan we started in the spring--the one Jack Dahl and Joanne Lantz were responsible for-- will help us to offer more courses and not say no to people. You might say that that doesn't take faculty dollars, but that is at least something that we're doing to get the fall enrollment up. I will be disappointed if our fall enrollment this year isn't above last year's.

R. Hess: Do we have a recruitment enrollment plan that is new?

T. Wallace: Yes, we do have some new and different things. I think the advertising campaign that we've just begun to do will be increased for next year.

D. McCants: Am I to understand that the mass-media position referred to in the table is a newly created position?

E. Nicholson: In terms of budgetary monies that are recurring.

A. Finco: Where would that position be located?

E. Nicholson: Communication and theatre.

T. Wallace: I don't think they're quite happy with that. I think they think they had a position, not really a reallocated position.

E. Nicholson: Yes, they had a position, but not with recurring funds. It had been funded in the past with nonrecurring funds.

T. Wallace: Part of this is blamed on my philosophy of budgeting. I do not accept not putting on hard-based dollars what we know we have to do in the next year. There are things that have been done--we might say, "Well, we'll probably have some attrition money, and we can cover that," and I say no, we're not doing that. I have had Ed and others putting a budget together in a different way by saying, "Let's cover with base dollars what we know we're going to do, and not be in the dark as to how commitments we make will be covered." So there may well be in this budget some things people are doing on nonrecurring dollars where every year they have to go back and see if those dollars are going to be available. We're going to put that in the base budget and say it's there on a continuing basis, and we're not going to do this every year. So maybe this is one of them.

S. Hollander: If we will not fund faculty positions out of nonrecurring or attrition dollars, and yet we know such dollars occur in large numbers every year, for what will that money be used?

T. Wallace: We can answer that question when we see what the rest of the budget will look like. For example, if we took all the new money that came to us out of the original budgetary committee of the legislature, which is where we were when we started the process, all of the money that we had would have given us 1.3% for faculty raises because, remember, we took a cut for our enrollment loss. . . . I don't think anybody wants to get 1.3%. . . .

I pointed out to the budgetary committee that there has been a practice that I think is very unhealthy. We have shown the Senate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee some data over the past week that indicates that for a number of years we have been taking nonpersonnel dollars and putting them into salaries. People ought to be aware of what that does to an organization every year that we do that. So the answer to your question is, "God only knows," because we don't have a budget yet. Until the budget is firm we don't know. We are trying to get the advertising out for new positions as best we can. . . .

S. Hollander: In Table I, when I count, I see nine full-time faculty positions in the left-hand column and six in the right-hand column. Am I counting correctly?

T. Wallace: I would never say you weren't counting correctly. I assume you are counting correctly. I don't have it in front of me. I thought it was seven out of nine. One of the interesting pieces of information that I saw was the changes in the number of positions by divisions during the years 1983-86. Are those the years, Julius?

J. Smulkstys: I can't recall the exact years.

T. Wallace: How many increases in positions did you have over that time frame?

J. Smulkstys: I would say that we received several positions in English and linguistics. The state gave us money to improve the quality of teaching by replacing associate faculty with full-time faculty. Then we had a new program approved in anthropology, so we added one position there. We are revitalizing the graphic-design program in fine arts, so we added two positions there. I would say over a period of a half dozen years we added approximately 5-6 positions.

T. Wallace: I think people are surprised to hear that Arts and Letters saw an increase. I would hope that we would continue to be able to do something about converting part-time to full-time faculty. That really bothers me that we have that large number, although I am told we have the best picture of any of the regional campuses, i.e., we have the smallest amount of part-time relative to full-time faculty. That would be the kind of thing I think that the Senate Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee could certainly help the administration with. It could also help with the other issue I raised about continuing to

take nonpersonnel dollars from the budget and shift them into personnel year after year to get the raise money up to where it should be. Maybe we need another tack, like getting more money. You've heard me say this before, coming from a state where we gave 10%, 10%, 12%, and 12% for four years, to look at 2% is unbelievable, but looking at even 4 or 5% doesn't get me excited. I think somehow we have to tackle that problem. I am not sure what the answer is.

J. Wilson: I have a question with regard to the Life Sciences Resource Center. The building was opened in January. There are at least three labs at work in there now, and a number of animal rooms in use. No money was allocated for housekeeping for the building. I wonder if that was an oversight and it's going to be corrected, or if we're expected to clean bathrooms ourselves.

J. Carnaghi: Money was allocated for that. In fact I shared copies of correspondence with Bruce Abbott last week. I think the problem will be getting addressed in the right places. Money was allocated, but the building wasn't ready, so the dean, Jim Bundschuh, decided to use the money for some other things. Now the question is how you recover those monies.

J. Wilson: Someone will be sweeping the floors and cleaning the bathrooms at some point?

J. Carnaghi: The money is in the school. They didn't want physical plant staff to go in there. They wanted the money put in the school. I agreed to do that and now, frankly, the question is, "Would you put physical plant people in there to clean it?" And I said, "Certainly, give me the money back, and I'll be glad to put physical plant people in there." So we're kind of in between that discussion.

T. Wallace: I think the whole question of the use of that building is also being discussed, so that we get it fully utilized.

R. Hess: Is it standard procedure for schools to have allocations for custodial services?

J. Carnaghi: No, this particular building is different than any other because of its nature. The thought was that, for security reasons, they didn't want outsiders, in this case physical plant, to go in there except by invitation. We would do the heavy cleaning, but Dean Bundschuh thought that students could be hired to take care of minimal tasks. Apparently, now some people are having second thoughts about this.

J. Wilson: I was on the committee that was involved in designing the building, and Bruce Abbott was chair of that committee. We don't recall not wanting physical plant in to clean the bathrooms and corridors. The animal quarters are a different matter. Those quarters should be cleaned by the people who are hired to take care of the animals.

T. Wallace: We'll look at it.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt, Secretary