

Minutes of the
Eighth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Third Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
April 12 and 19, 2004
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of March 15, 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 – R. Hess
6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 03-28) – R. Friedman
7. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-29) – R. Friedman
 - b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-19) – G. Bullion
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 03-20) – D. Oberstar
 - d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-21) – B. Abbott
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-22) – B. Abbott
 - f. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-23) – B. Abbott
8. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 03-30)
9. New business
Senate Document SD 03-24 – D. Oberstar
10. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-31) – J. Grant
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-32) – J. Grant
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment

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

Attachments:

- “[Results of Senate Committee and Subcommittee Elections](#)” (SR No. 03-33)
“[Metrics for DI Program](#)” (SD 03-19)
“[Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Health Sciences](#)” (SD 03-20, supersedes SD 89-5)
“[Establishment of a Diversity Component in Baccalaureate Degree Programs](#)” (SD 03-21, postponed)

- “Revisions to Senate Document 85-18 [Academic Regulations]” (SD 03-22, withdrawn [not attached])
- “Revisions to Senate Document 88-33 [Goals and Objectives from the IPFW Baccalaureate Degree]” (SD 03-23, withdrawn [not attached])
- “[Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Arts and Sciences](#)” (SD 03-24)
- “[Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Arts and Sciences](#)” (SD 89-13, revised)
- “Associate Faculty Pay Rate Policy” (Attachment A)

Session I
April 12

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, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, A. Karim, J. Knight, M. Lipman, M. Montesino, G. Mourad, A. Mustafa, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Perez, J. Purse-Wiedenhoeft, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, G. Volland, M. Wartell, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

J. Brennan, N. Cothorn McFarland, D. Goodman, L. Kuznar, Z. Liang, L. Lin, D. Marshall, L. Meyer, M. Myers, E. Neal

Faculty Members Present: G. Blumenshine, J. Clausen, B. Fischer, B. Hancock, J. Haw, C. Mulder, A. Sandstrom, S. Sarratore, R. Sutter

Visitors Present: S. Alderman, D. Danielson, K. Folkerts, K. Kilbane, R. Kostrubanic, T. Lewandowski, P. McLaughlin, L. Moran, K. Stockman

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Hess called the meeting to order at 12:00 noon.
2. Approval of the minutes of March 15, 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: I would like to say “thank you” to the people I have worked with this year as Purdue Speaker; particularly, Michael Nusbaumer, Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty. This is his last meeting in his term as Indiana University Speaker. He is going to be succeeded by Brian Fife. I have also enjoyed working with Richard Hess as Presiding Officer and Jane Grant as chair of the Executive Committee. I want particularly to thank Jacqui Petersen who is both cheerful and competent and wonderful to work with.

b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: For those of you who may have missed it, IU Bloomington's University Faculty Council took a vote opposing the creation of a federal panel that would monitor international studies programs for anti-American bias. I support those folks in their standing up for academic freedom issues.

As this is my last meeting, I would like to thank all the folks I work with and I would also have to echo Elaine's comments. Jacqui, you have worked out very well, made me look good numerous times . . . I appreciate that. I think the creation of your position and your performance in it has served this Senate extremely well.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – R. Hess:

Ditto to all that has been said by Elaine and Mike. I especially want to thank the Sergeant-at-Arms, Josh Njock Libii, for being especially diligent in keeping you all under control. I think the threat of the staff worked. Also, our Parliamentarian, David Turnipseed, has done an excellent job of keeping us in good shape.

I especially want to thank the committees and the chair of the Senate because we have had a very smooth year. The people on the committees have done their work and brought us documents that were in good shape. To prove that, I think we have an agenda full of such documents today and, although Mike is looking forward to next Monday's meeting, perhaps we will not have to have it.

6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 03-28):

R. Friedman read the memorial resolution for Joseph Davis. A moment of silence was observed.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-29) – R. Friedman:

The Nominations and Elections Committee conducted the election to fill vacancies on Senate committees and subcommittees. (For results, see SR No. 03-33, attached.)

b. University Resources Policy Committee (SD 03-19) – G. Bullion:

G. Bullion moved to approve SD 03-19 (Metrics for DI Program).

Motion to approve SD 03-19 passed on a voice vote.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 03-20) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 03-20 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Health Sciences).

Motion to approve SD 03-20 passed on a voice vote.

d. Educational Policy Committee (SD 03-21) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve SD 03-21 (Establishment of a Diversity Component in Baccalaureate Degree Programs).

D. Erbach moved for a secret ballot vote on SD 03-21. Seconded.

Motion for a secret ballot failed on a show of hands. (ayes: 15; nays: 23)

A motion was made to close debate. Seconded.

Motion to close debate failed on a show of hands.

J. Grant moved to table SD 03-21. Seconded.

Motion to table SD 03-21 failed on a show of hands. (ayes: 14; nays: 19)

E. Blakemore moved to postpone consideration of SD 03-21 until the October 18, 2004 meeting in order to allow for the Educational Policy Committee to refine the implementation process. Seconded.

Motion to postpone consideration of SD 03-21 until the October 18, 2004 meeting passed on a show of hands.

The meeting recessed at 1:11 until noon, Monday, April 19.

Session II
April 19, 2004

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, W. Branson, J. Brennan, G. Bullion, C. Carlson, C. Chauhan, M. Codispoti, N. Cothorn McFarland, C. Erickson, L. Fox, R. Friedman, P. Goodmann, J. Grant, T. Grove, S. Hannah, L. Hess, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, J. Knight, L. Lin, M. Lipman, , L. Meyer, M. Montesino, G. Mourad, E. Neal, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, G. Volland, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

R. Bean, D. Erbach, D. Goodman, A. Karim, L. Kuznar, Z. Liang, D. Marshall, A. Mustafa, M. Myers, A. Perez, J. Purse-Wiedenhoeft, N. Younis

Faculty Members Present:

K. Bordens, J. Clausen, M. Crouch, S. Davis, C. Mulder, K. O'Connell, D. Young

Visitors Present:

S. Alderman, K. Casey, D. Danielson, C. Douse, R. Eshcoff, K. Folkerts, C. Fordyce,
K. Graf, J. Henson, A. Hoff, K. Kilbane, R. Kostrubanic, S. Lawson, T. Lewandowski,
N. Lickey, J. Luu, L. Moran, K. Stockman, S. Wahlberg, J. Wilson

Acta

R. Hess reconvened the meeting at 12:05 p.m. on April 19, 2004.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

e. Educational Policy Committee (SD 03-22) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott withdrew SD 03-22 (Revisions to SD 85-18 [Academic Regulations]) from consideration by the Senate.

f. Educational Policy Committee (SD 03-23) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott withdrew SD 03-23 (Revisions to SD 88-33 [Goals and Objectives from the IPFW Baccalaureate Degree]) from consideration by the Senate.

8. Question Time:

- 1. Would you please explain why there was a move to adopt a new compensation policy for associate faculty and why it is being implemented at this time?**
- 2. What are the implications for the current and future associate faculty?**
- 3. Can the current associate faculty on campus be grandfathered in with their current salaries, if those salaries are higher than the new policy would permit?**

S. Hannah: There have been long-time concerns about inconsistencies in associate faculty pay rates and pay variables across departments and schools. It was virtually impossible to predict what our associate faculty needs were from time to time.

We are dependent on associate faculty. They deliver a significant part of our academic program. Our Strategic Plan goal is that 80% of our faculty would be full-time faculty. We are not making progress – we actually slipped last year from 77% to 76% full-time faculty despite adding 16 new faculty positions (from 340 to 356), while adding 40 new associate faculty, (from 311 to 351) – because our enrollment growth is running ahead of our faculty resources. We are proud of the work that the associate faculty do; many of them bring an expertise that for various reasons we do not have, and are very committed and work very hard.

Significant deficits this year and last year in associate faculty accounts prompted action now in order to get a firmer grasp on what we really needed. Inconsistent pay rates made prediction that much harder.

As a result, I have set two goals:

1. We want to treat these important folks fairly and consistently. We need to have an explainable system – I want to have a system that is explainable to the world at large.
2. I also wanted a system in place that provides better control and deployment of our resources and a better basis for planning.

We started a long process, beginning last fall. We established an Academic Officers Council Task Force at the August 28, 2003 Academic Officers Council retreat. In September, each department was asked to provide detailed information about their associate faculty, such as who they are, how long they have been teaching here, their credentials, what they teach, how many sections, and how much they are paid. They were also asked about policies, if they had them, about the variables affecting pay rates: credentials, experience, number of sections, etc.

I worked with a subcommittee of the AOC to review the reports at meetings in September, October, and November, and we kept the Faculty Affairs Committee informed that the discussion was proceeding. The goal was to try to codify something based on our current practice in order to develop consistency.

We came up with these conclusions:

1. Discipline matters; market makes a difference. Engineering and the Health Sciences associates are paid the most, and Visual and Performing Arts are paid the least. That is a fact of life when we hire full-time faculty and when we hire associate faculty.
2. Credentials matter. Faculty with a Ph.D. or other terminal credentials are paid more than those without.
3. Experience matters. Long-term associate faculty make more than new faculty.
4. English Composition had a special rate system that we had put in place about four years ago at the request of the director of the writing program, in order to prevent the revolving door in English Composition. We need a stable, qualified group of folks who are working with our freshmen to teach those courses. The number of sections taught matters: more for the second section, and more for the third. The goal was to reduce the turnover and enhance student success.
5. Any rate plan should be financially neutral; that is, not cost significantly more than now currently since the goal was to develop a more equitable system, not necessarily one that cost either less or more.

Using these principles, the committee developed a Pay Rate proposal that presented different pay rates for each school/department, credentials, and experience based on current practice. A draft was distributed to the deans on October 20 with the request that they calculate what the financial impact would have been if their departments had used the proposed Pay Rate Plan for Fall 2003.

Reports came back showing that, for the most part, the proposed system was indeed revenue neutral. The costs in Visual and Performing Arts went up slightly and costs per department

in Arts and Sciences shifted somewhat, but the bottom line cost was around \$26,000. After further opportunities for comment at AOC, and the deans with department heads, we decided to go ahead with this Pay Rate Plan, effective next fall.

On March 3, 2004, the Pay Rate Plan was distributed and the deans were asked to begin the implementation process. On the grandfathering issue, I authorized the deans that, in those circumstances where a long-term associate faculty member would see a decline, they could adjust minor cases themselves and come to me if the difference was going to be dramatic; i.e., +/- \$500.

The only area I know that it would be a significant change is with the associate faculty in English. We had already accommodated the composition faculty in the plan by setting those rates higher than the rest of Arts and Sciences, but the graduated pay scale would be gone. Roughly, rather than having a 3-level graduated scheme, we set the rate at the middle for all courses. I met with the chair of the English department and subsequently with representatives of the associate faculty and have asked for additional information and an alternative proposal if they still have concerns. We will undoubtedly come up with something that will be amicable for them and for the university.

I would like to have an internal control system so we would be assured that we have funds to hire before we make a hire and that all that would happen before classes start. Phil Grote and his staff are working with me on that and hopefully we will have better procedures in place before Fall.

The question of associate faculty pay rates raises the larger issue of balance between regular faculty and part-time faculty. The Strategic Plan Goal is 80% full-time faculty; last fall we estimate that we were at 76%, down from 77% the year before. Clearly we are not there yet.

I see the Pay Rate Plan as a step in the right direction of facing up to this critical question because it gives us a handle on exactly who is teaching and what the cost is in a predictable manner. Knowing that will help us set priorities and make key decisions about how to spend new monies: whether for new positions, for more money for current faculty, for more associate faculty, for more money for associate faculty, etc. We will be tracking the results carefully – it will not be smooth, there will be bumps in the road – but we figure it will take a couple of years before we get it all smoothly in place. I will be happy to share our findings and discuss options with the Faculty Affairs Committee or any other interested group.

If you would like a copy of the plan, I would be happy to make it available perhaps on the web page. It is a public document. (See also Attachment A – Associate Faculty Pay Rate Policy.)

M. Nusbaumer: Would you be a little more explicit in the issue of grandfathering current faculty? Generally, in the university, when policies shift, we usually grandfather folks in one way or another – tenure and promotion, for example.

S. Hannah: Within the \$500 mark, I told the deans that below that do what they think is fair, above that we will talk about it. The only people who have called me so far are the English associate faculty. No one else has called me, so, if there is another problem, I would be happy to talk about it. There is a good bit of turnover in that group, so grandfathering is not as critical an issue.

9. New business:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 03-24 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the School of Arts and Sciences).

Motion to approve SD 03-24 passed on a voice vote.

10. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-31) – J. Grant:

J. Grant presented SR No. 03-31 (Senate Membership, 2004-2005) for information only.

b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-32) – J. Grant:

J. Grant presented SR No. 03-32 (End-of-the-Year Committee Reports) for information only.

11. The general good and welfare of the University:

B. Abbott: At our previous meeting, we were discussing a document for the establishment of a diversity component in baccalaureate degree programs and, as chair of the Senate Educational Policy Committee, I would like to thank all of you for your input; and I would like you to be aware of the fact that from these discussions, the committee has identified four basic concerns with the proposal as we provided it at the last meeting.

1. Why is General Education Area III not sufficient to provide for the diversity component?
2. How could programs use the General Education alternative provided in the proposal?
3. How will diversity be assessed?
4. How do we recognize how, when a program as articulated, it will include a diversity component?

We are going to be thinking about those issues and try to clarify them for you. In addition, I would like to remind you that the committee has asked you for your input on this. If you have any constructive suggestions with regard to the proposal, we would be more than happy to hear from you and discuss them with you if you wish.

D. Oberstar: I would like to add to what Bruce said that if people would concentrate on those four issues, which is what we seem to have isolated from the discussion last time,

address yourselves to any of those issues to the committee to give us some grist to work with when we get back into session next September. It was left in our laps, but at the same time it would be helpful so that we do not have to go through the same grinding process of having hearings and all sorts of things when we could easily get all the input we need. We would like to bring to the table the concerns of everybody. Please think of that, and think of passing that on to your colleagues in your departments.

J. Grant: On behalf of the Executive Committee and the entire Senate, I would like to present these plaques to Richard Hess for his contribution as Presiding Officer, 2003-2004 and to Michael Nusbaumer as the Speaker of the Indiana faculty, 2002-2004. These will commemorate you in our hearts. (J. Grant distributed individual plaques to R. Hess and M. Nusbaumer for their service as Presiding Officer and IU Speaker of the Senate, respectively.)

R. Hess: We have had a request from Assistant Professor of Labor Studies, Catherine Mulder, to present some information to the Senate that is relevant to Senate business. I have a request today from Professor Ken Bordens of the Psychology Department for speaking privileges, which I granted.

C. Mulder: Thank you for having me. My name is Cathy Mulder. I have been meeting weekly with community activists, tradesmen, and dorm workers since July regarding the many concerns with the student housing. Those concerns include worker safety, wages, overtime, lost tax revenues, etc. A *Journal Gazette* article on March 16 prompted me to come to you because it said that IPFW assured the faculty on the student housing work. I was not assured, so I thought I would come to you and show you why I am not assured – I have pictures. My presentation is divided into three sections: craftsmanship, resident safety, and mold. (C. Mulder gave a PowerPoint presentation including pictures of the student housing site.)

1. Craftsmanship: There are different height differences between one side of the door (picture) and the other. One side has about two inches and the other side has about four or five inches. The door is out of alignment, given the gaps. The windows (picture) have a wavy line and corner, and it is tapered down. You can also notice a gap in the floor (picture). Either the walls are not aligned or the floor is not aligned. Also, any time you see gaps, there could be a fire draft problem. These, of course, have since been carpeted over. Here is another picture of a floor with a considerably bigger gap. The plywood does not meet to touch and is not nailed to the floor. This is a crack in the floor and it is not being held up.
2. Resident safety: We take issue with the staircase construction. You can see (picture) there are gaps because they did not fit properly. The treads do not meet. That is also a fire draft issue. The experts I have talked to question the use of plywood staircases anyway. In a residential housing project, wooden staircases are code. They also said that they should be commercial where you have metal staircases filled in with concrete. There also are no fire escapes on either side. So these staircases on either end of the student housing are wooden. The gaps on the sides of the staircases were

fixed with wood shims, but that still left some gaps. They used a kind of adhesive which is typically flammable, and then they are covered with carpet.

3. The biggest problem I see is the mold. There is evidence of mold throughout. You have all seen a clean piece of wood in Home Depot. They are not supposed to be black like this (picture). It is throughout. We have people who are signing affidavits regarding how much mold they saw. You can see that the mold is on the 2x4s (or 2x6s), and it is on the ceiling, the floor, and it has even gone into some of the cinder block. One of the possible reasons for mold is because of the way things were treated there. When the roof was not yet put on, the rain would come in. Whenever you have wood, cellulose, and water it creates mold. I do have signed affidavits from student housing workers already, stating the quality of the student housing, and am willing to share those with anybody. We are getting more as we speak.

Thank you very much for listening to me. I will take questions, if you have any. I may have to defer to some of the experts here with me today.

M. Nusbaumer: Can you talk at all about the implications of having black mold?

C. Mulder: I, myself, am not allergic to mold. Mold can be toxic or non toxic. If it is there, we should get it tested. It might not be a problem, but I think any mold is problematic because it could be detrimental to some people's health if they have allergies.

J. Grant: What do you see as the implications of the craftsmanship problems for the safety of the student housing?

C. Mulder: I have affidavits saying that some of the 2x4s, to make them fit, have been shimmed down, so the structure may be compromised in the future. That is not my major concern. If you are paying \$16.3 million for good craftsmanship, then you expect it. I have not seen that, with the pictures I have. I would not accept that kind of craftsmanship in my home.

P. Iadicola: Can you give me some insight if the issues that you raise are in violation of standards that are enforced for building in this area? If you ask me, in terms of whether the distance or the unevenness of these things is really a problem, I am not an expert – I do not know if it is a problem in terms of how it is established by experts.

C. Mulder: Any time there is a gap, it is a fire hazard.

P. Iadicola: So that would be in violation of local building codes?

C. Mulder: So far, with the code system, I do not believe that there has been any investigation done yet. There might have been some.

J. Grant made a motion to provide speaking privileges to people who came here as experts in support of Cathy's presentation. (L. Moran – Carpenters, K. Folkerts – Painters, T.

Lewandowski – President of Central Labor Council, M. Crouch – Department of Labor Studies). Seconded.

Motion to provide speaking privileges to those listed passed on a voice vote.

L. Moran: Concerning the code violations, those really have not been documented. In my opinion only, and from the knowledge that I have gathered on this project, I have not seen any documentation that inspection has been performed on those buildings. In a typical situation, what is being constructed on your property, Allen County has instituted a series of code inspections, actually from excavation on up to the finished building. These are documented by the County Building Department. Typically, on a Purdue-site project, there is a very careful system of inspection and documentation that goes on. Typically, on every one of these buildings around here, they are very stringent. Our concern is that we have not been able to have documented proof that these things have been looked into and authorized or not authorized. As far as what is documented, we cannot speak to that right now.

G. Voland: Have you presented this material and specific locations and concerns about these issues to Dave Danielson or to other people who are associated with the construction project so that they can actually address this in a detailed and specific way?

C. Mulder: As to the specific locations, I have hundreds of photos from all over the job site. I am going to try to make all of this available on a web site soon. I do not know the gentleman to whom you are referring, Dave Danielson. I would be happy to share with him anything he would like to see.

G. Voland: What has been the response from those who are in charge of this site to the concerns that you have identified? Have you spoken with them about your concerns? In order to address a concern, people need to know the location and details. They basically have to work with you to identify the problem and then hopefully resolve it in a happy and appropriate way. I am wondering what process you followed to work with those who are in charge of the site.

C. Mulder: I read in the paper that the faculty were assured – I am not assured. I questioned the project, giving what I have. Therefore, I am just sharing it with you. You are the faculty Senate. If you have more questions for me and you have questions about the concerns, I would think that would be up to you to do something about it, not me per se. If somebody in power wants to see this information, I would be happy to share it with them. In fact, we are going to put it on the web.

L. Vartanian: Where did you get the pictures from?

C. Mulder: Tradespeople and various people who are working on the project; some from painters, some from carpenters, and other laborers. There have been concerns all over the place.

L. Vartanian: To follow up on something that Gerard said, it concerns me that one of the first places I read about your concerns, which of course you are entitled to have, was in one of our local newspapers. I think it speaks against a sense of community at a university when such concerns, especially because they are potentially concerning, would not be shared within first. Buildings can be repaired, reputations are very hard to repair. My concern as a member of the faculty of this university is that this has created, in the minds of our constituents, the notion that we are putting up buildings that are not safe. You are telling me that you do not know whether inspections have occurred, and yet this is making it sound as if what is there is unsafe. I take issue with that as a member of this community.

C. Mulder: I was supposed to give this presentation to this community before it got out in the press. I did not give this presentation to the press before it got here.

L. Vartanian: But you still spoke with them?

C. Mulder: Well, they asked me questions about what to look for, and I said "Here is what to look for because this is what I have been told." I am here as a member of the community to say that I do not think this is right, and I think that the way the group of us has been received with other issues on the project such as overtime wages, being paid the common wage, and safety issues, etc., that we have been received very negatively from everybody from President Jischke to Chancellor Wartell, meaning it is not our problem, it is a Purdue problem, or it is a Department of Labor problem, or it is with somebody else. Maybe I should have said something to Dave Danielson, but I did not.

J. Brennan: I would like to say that I congratulate you, Catherine, on doing this. The university is not an isolated community. The university is a public university. It belongs to the public, and I would not even object if you had gone to the newspapers first. The idea that things should be covered up and we should not make any waves, and should not let any dissent be heard is despicable in a university community. So, congratulations, Catherine.

G. Mourad: How old are these pictures? How long ago were they taken?

C. Mulder: They were taken at various times, but we started taking them in August and then all throughout this year.

G. Mourad: I am just concerned how far some of these buildings have come.

C. Mulder: They are covered now. The sheetrock and drywall have been placed, carpeting has been placed. I understand that some of the carpeting is being ripped up.

G. Mourad: The mold that you showed there would be masked by the covering up and present a serious problem.

C. Mulder: Right. That is what I have been thinking.

B. Abbott: A while ago, you said that the pictures had been taken by workers on the site. These are the people who are building the place. It is a curious concern of mine as to why it is that people who are building this site are providing photographs about how bad they are being built. These are people who are supposed to be doing the job and constructing it correctly.

C. Mulder: Yes, I had the same question. Mark, would you like to speak to that?

M. Crouch: I am Mark Crouch from Labor Studies. Much in the photographs that we saw was done in the early stage of the building process. You will note that they are three-story wood-frame buildings. The contractor appears to have brought in a crew that included a significant number of undocumented workers whose skills were questionable. From the time the buildings were going up, the electrical, plumbing, and brick layer subcontractors were coming across what they thought were horrendous quality problems, including things like how can you put brick on a building when the wall is crooked or put siding on a building when the walls are crooked. Problems occur when the walls at one end of a hallway from the other are three inches off, so that the measurements you use to cut your drywall on one end of the building do not work on the other end of the building. There are all kinds of structural problems done by the basic framing crew, the roofing crew, those folks that were undocumented workers.

C. Mulder: The people, especially the local people, are really craftsmen, and they really care about their craft and want to do it right. A lot of times they were not provided with the material in good condition, and the quality of the wood was questionable. These people care because it is their sons and daughters who may stay in the student housing.

J. Grant: I was wondering if Vice Chancellor Branson could speak to the issue raised by the president of the carpenters' union about why there is not ongoing inspection. We were told that that kind of inspection was going to take place. We were not using city and county inspectors because it is a state project, and why is ongoing inspection not going on? That would seem to be the role of the inspector as the building is being constructed.

W. Branson: May I wait to speak to that?

R. Hess: Yes, that would be fine.

J. Tankel: In response to Senator Brennan's statement, has anyone prevented you at any point from presenting this information to the college community, the community at large, or the faculty Senate?

C. Mulder: No. As soon as I saw that we were assured, I e-mailed Mike as IU Speaker, then went through a process to allow me to speak.

J. Tankel: So you had full opportunity to present this material to the community?

C. Mulder: Our community here?

J. Tankel: Yes.

C. Mulder: Yes.

J. Tankel: I just wanted to be sure.

C. Mulder: No one tried to prevent me from coming here.

L. Fox: I just want to make one comment about the mold issue, if there is one. I am not an expert, and I am not going to say what that (picture) was, but I have a student this semester who has had to move four times because of mold, and she had to get rid of all her belongings as well because the mold had gone into their belongings as well. When they moved – she is a married woman with a child – the problem was not solved because it was in their possessions as well. I have never seen anything quite like it in my entire life. So I know that there are people which mold will make very sick. Furthermore, she is pregnant, and she has complications with her pregnancy now – all kinds of issues. Mold is a real problem for many people.

C. Mulder: I just think that we should test for it. If it is not a problem, then it is not a problem. I do believe it is problematic and that we should test for it, and it should be corrected before we have students moving in there.

H. Samavati: Thank you for coming here and sharing this information with us. As opposed to my colleague, I do not think this would be negatively viewed by the community of us. We are the faculty, we care about the quality of student housing here, and we are not putting a negative picture of it outside. We want to know what is going on. If Mr. Danielson perhaps knew about this information being discussed, it would have been very useful for him to also present information to convince us that these potential or possible problems do not exist. By just not responding, it does not mean we are not discussing it. It does not mean that we are not protecting the students at IPFW; on the contrary, we care.

G. Voland: I am the one who brought up Dave Danielson's name. Let me just clarify the situation. I would not use such words as "despicable," but I do think it is poor judgment to not follow a process in which those who are informed and can provide information and perhaps resolve the situation are not at least brought into the discussion. Now you are bringing up, and I think it is a good point, that Mr. Danielson could provide perhaps a balanced perspective and some responses to these concerns which we all would be interested in. On the other hand, Cathy, you did not even know who Dave Danielson is. You had not done the homework, frankly, before you gave this presentation. I would not expect that from my students. I am disappointed in that.

The issue that was brought up earlier about when these photographs were taken and such, this is a work in progress. I do not know about the stairwells – they may be permanent stairwells or maybe the pictures were taken of temporary stairwells that were in place. Much of the work that is done on a construction site is done at the very end in order to

satisfy the inspector's desire to have everything according to code and spec. So adjustments are made at the end of the project, and I think we should have Dave Danielson and perhaps other people at least review these issues and also be told where the mold or other problems may lie. People need specific information on which to act. To bring Dave into the conversation, I think, was one of the early steps that had to be taken in addressing these concerns. I do appreciate the fact that you are concerned about the safety of the student housing and our students. I think we all agree with your concern about any hazards. I teach hazards analysis to my engineering classes. I am very concerned about hazards. On the other hand, I think the process leaves something to be desired. I would like to have either Walt Branson or Dave Danielson or someone with knowledge address these issues in an informed way. I would like that to be done in a public form so at least we can have a balanced view and hopefully resolutions come forward.

E. Blakemore moved to grant speaking privileges to David Danielson. Seconded.

Motion to grant speaking privileges to David Danielson passed on a voice vote.

W. Branson: May I speak before Dave?

R. Hess: Yes.

P. Iadicola: I think we have to be concerned because there is some history with this issue. This is not the first time I had heard about the quality of the student housing. I heard about concerns raised in the community about craftsmanship, about wages, about undocumented workers. It seems to me that the administrators who are in charge of this university would also have heard these things since I had heard of them. Cathy, you mentioned that some of these issues were brought to the attention to the chancellor and vice chancellor.

C. Mulder: Yes, and President Jischke.

P. Iadicola: Cathy is not here today for the first time raising these issues. I think there have been attempts to make contact; and obviously faculty are not really in the building inspecting area of expertise and generally trust the administration to make sure that our building construction will be carried out appropriately. Now, there are obviously some issues here in terms of whether this particular construction followed the standard operating procedures as related to inspections. I do not know if that is true. I just heard from someone from the carpenters' trade union who basically claims that that process did not appear to be going on. My concern is to make sure that the structure is good and meets the local codes, and I would assume that the local administration, as well as other faculty ought to be concerned about that as well, and the community as a whole. I guess my point is that this presentation is sort of not at the beginning of a process. There have been other things that have taken place, and I had heard some of these issues months before.

C. Mulder: There has been a petition circulated by Jim Moore, a plumbers and steamfitters member insisting on inspections of this site. That is now with the State Board of Accounts.

The governor is now being involved in it. That is what I have heard. I signed that petition. If there is nothing to hide, let us have this investigation, and let us have this inspection. I understand the mold is pervasive. I am told it is everywhere, especially in Building 4, which was the first building that went up. I hope that is more specific. I also have one person who will be signing an affidavit tonight regarding the mold, and there are pictures of the mold. As for the process, we have been involved weekly since July. I have a stack of lawsuit papers – that seems to be the way to get through to people, do a lawsuit.

Thank you for having me.

W. Branson: If you could provide us with copies of the pictures – this is the first time we have seen the pictures – dates, times, locations, we would be happy to look into those. We have looked into everything we have heard about that has come up so far. Safety has been one of our foremost concerns as we have done this project. It has been from the very start, and it will continue to be. We had the inspections, they are current. They are not being done at the city or local level because this is a state project, so the inspections are being handled through Purdue, really with the same diligence although in a slightly different method that Purdue normally does inspections. Normally Purdue would handle the inspections. This time they delegated much of the inspection work to the architect; so between Purdue University, the local architect, and ourselves, we believe that we are going to have a very safe environment. There is no reason to doubt that this is going to be a safe environment for the students. We do follow the state building codes which, as I have said before, really are the same codes as the local, city, and county codes. In fact, I can give you one example where we are going beyond code in fire protection: because it is a way that the codes are going to change in the future, we went ahead and implemented the change now.

Again, I think we have a very safe environment. I do not know how to assure you more. I would invite you all to take a tour over there and take a look at it. It gives you firsthand knowledge of the construction of the craftsmanship. The only comment I would make about the pictures now is, early on, as Senator Voland said, the project is different than it is in the later stages. There is a lot of cleanup, a lot of fixing and replacement that happened as the project went on.

D. Danielson: I am the Director of the Physical Plant and Public Safety for the campus. Public Safety is involved with the mold issue. We would have to address these concerns with Renee Eshcoff, who is responsible for radiological and environmental management on campus. I would never allow buildings to be built that would have mold in them. We have done some research on the types of mold and, if there is any in there, it is not a problem. We have a report that was done by a certified industrial hygienist. There are over a million different kinds of mold. There are two kinds that impact lumber. These kinds can show up when it is being shipped on a railroad car to the site. There was a photograph that showed some lumber in some water. I can assure you that that lumber was not used on the site. If they did not store it properly, then they would not be allowed to use it. Purdue would send inspectors up probably two days a week. We had our structural engineer and design architects there on a daily basis. Nothing was covered up. Unless it was inspected by the structural engineer, no carpet was put in, and no sheetrock was put on unless he inspected

that. They had to sign off on it – it was documented, all those inspection sheets. Last week,

we had the state inspectors come up. It may have been because of this petition that went down to them. They were up last week, and they did not find anything wrong. We have had the local fire people in to review the situation to make sure we were not missing anything. They came in and gave us a clean bill. We are going to invite them back – we are being proactive in this. We want them to come through and make sure everything is safe for our students.

M. Crouch: Can we address questions to Mr. Branson and Mr. Danielson?

R. Hess: Sure.

M. Crouch: Will you release all inspection documents done by both your internal and external inspectors? My understanding is that as trade union leaders attempted to get requested copies of these things, they were told such things did not exist.

W. Branson: Unless Dave knows differently, I would have to check through Purdue. I believe those would be considered public documents. If they are, they would be released.

M. Crouch: Will you make a commitment to check for mold in all the buildings?

D. Danielson: We have not tested for mold, but we certainly can.

M. Crouch: Will you make a commitment to do that?

D. Danielson: Yes, I will make a commitment to test the mold.

M. Crouch: In all the buildings and multiple sites?

D. Danielson: In all the buildings and multiple sites. Whatever the requirements say, a certain percentage of the facility, 10 % of the building, something like that, we will be glad to do that.

J. Grant: Vice Chancellor Branson, is it unusual to have a local architect serving as an inspector as opposed to a public entity that is accountable to the legislature and ultimately the citizens? Why is a local architect serving in that capacity?

W. Branson: In Purdue's way of doing things, it is not usual to have a local architect do that. In other public projects, it is very common to have that done. We asked to do it this way because we wanted to make sure there were daily inspections and, in a project of this size, we are never quite sure how often Purdue is going to be on a project. The other issue is Purdue has a multitude of projects right now, and their inspectors were being stretched fairly thin. So we worked with them to use this as a candidate to kind of help relieve their workload.

P. Agness: I very much appreciated the opportunity that was made for the senators last week to visit the student housing. I did take advantage of that. I would encourage everyone to do that. Many of my questions were answered, and I think it is very difficult for anybody to make any judgments or discuss a topic where they have not been there, seen the issues,

discussed it, asked their own questions. It certainly provided a great deal of assurance for me, and I would encourage everyone to make a tour of the student housing before they make judgments.

D. Oberstar: I would like to echo Phyllis' comments. I also went on one of those tours, and I realize I only looked at a small portion of the total picture, but the things that I saw showed none of the flaws that were shown; for example, with the doors or in the inconsistencies of crookedness with regard to one side versus the other side of the door frame or from the mold up to the ceiling. I saw none of that. I cannot talk to the issue of mold because everything we saw was all closed in and everything, so there is no way we saw any wood exposed. In terms of the general workmanship of the places we looked at, I was very impressed. It is not the student housing I remember.

S. Isiorho: I would like to echo what David said. We were privileged to look at the facility.

M. Nusbaumer: My concerns about this whole project, as stated over the past two or three months in this body, and what is most troubling to me at some level, are when we talk about issues of sincerity and concern and who should have made the first move here, so to speak. I am troubled by the fact that it appears that it was not until, despite Purdue's control over this entire project, an external group of folks began raising questions about issues of equal pay, appropriate pay, etc. that Purdue started checking their records and becoming concerned. My concern is that we are discussing who the first people are to step up and take responsibility for this, at a time when we are discussing issues of diversity and issues of non English-speaking folks – people who do not understand what the codes are. I am troubled by the lack of leadership, and that is where the first issue, to me, of stepping up and taking responsibility for what is going on in this project belongs.

R. Hess: I have been privileged to work with you all this year because you have done your work in committees exceedingly well. I have been very much impressed and proud of the degree of civility in discussing, particularly, diversity and now housing, where tempers could flare, and where people could feel that they were verbally abused. I think you have done a magnificent job of speaking to the good will of the institution with grace and with humor. For that, I thank you.

12. The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty