

Minutes of the
Eighth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Ninth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
April 12 and 19, 2010
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of March 15, 2010
3. Acceptance of the agenda – B. Abbott
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – R. Barrett
 - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – S. Davis
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-18) – N. Adilov
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 09-3) – B. Abbott
 - c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 09-11) – B. Abbott
 - d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 09-12) – B. Abbott
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 09-13) – B. Abbott
 - f. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 09-14) – B. Abbott
 - g. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 09-15) – P. Dragnev
7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 09-19)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-20) – B. Abbott
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-21) – B. Abbott
 - c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-22) – A. Livschiz
 - d. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-23) – A. Livschiz
 - e. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-24) – R. Barrett
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment*

*The meeting will recess or adjourn by 1:15 p.m.

Presiding Officer: S. Davis
Parliamentarian: A. Downs
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen (absent)
Secretary: J. Petersen

Attachments:

- “Results of Senate Committee and Subcommittee Elections” (SR No. 09-25)
- “Proposal for Regional Proportional Faculty Representation on Purdue University Senate” (SD 09-3)
- “Amendment to the Bylaws: Dissolution of Distance Education Subcommittee” (SD 09-11)
- “Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Proposal to change Academic Regulation 6.4 – Incompletes” (SD 09-12)
- “Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Proposal to change Academic Regulation 3.8.4 – Change of auditing option” (SD 09-13)
- “Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Proposal to change Academic Regulation 3.8.2 – Course drops” (SD 09-14)
- “Proposed amendment to the Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy” (SD 09-15)
- “Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy” (SD 07-9)

*Note: The Bylaws of the Senate will be distributed Fall 2010.

*Note: The Academic Regulations revisions will be effective Fall 2011.

Session I
(April 12, 2010)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, N. Adilov, A. Argast, S. Ashur, R. Barrett, S. Beckman, A. Benito, W. Branson, J. Burg, J. Dalby, Y. Deng, S. Dhawale, P. Dragnev, E. Foley, J. Garrison, J. Grant, R. Gregory, R. Hile, L. Hite, P. Iadicola, J. Jackson, R. Jensen, K. Moustafa Leonard, D. Liu, A. Livschiz, H. Luo, G. McClellan, D. Miller, G. Mourad, D. Mueller, C. Nicholson, M. Nusbaumer, K. Pollock, D. Redett, M. Ridgeway, J. Tankel, C. Thompson, Z. Todorovic, J. Toole, A. Ushenko, W. Utesch, G. Volland, G. Wang (ENGR), L. Wark, R. Weiner

Senate Members Absent:

S. Batagiannis, C. Crisler, C. Drummond, R. Elaver, W. McKinney, D. Moore, P. Ng, G. Wang (PHYS), M. Wartell, M. Wolf

Faculty Members Present: A. Coffman, L. Finke, P. Lin

Visitors Present: J. Cramer, C. Elick, D. Haynie (*Journal Gazette*), R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin, K. Tolliver, representatives from Follett’s Bookstore

Acta

1. Call to order: S. Davis called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of March 15, 2010: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

B. Abbott moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

B. Abbott presented M. Nusbaumer with a plaque in recognition of his recent terms of service as the Indiana University Speaker.

B. Abbott presented S. Davis with an engraved gavel in recognition of his years of service as Presiding Officer of the Senate.

S. Davis presented J. Tankel with a certificate in recognition of his years of service on the Senate and its various committees, as he is retiring from the university.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Purdue University:

R. Barrett: It has been nice working with Mike Nusbaumer and Stan Davis this year on the Senate. Please know that they really have your best interests at heart.

The Intercampus Faculty Council finally met, and they are the faculty representatives from all the regional campuses plus the two main departments at IUPUI. We sent two items out of that committee to the president on Thursday.

The first item is a Hewitt report. A company named Hewitt did a report for Purdue University on compensation before they got into making the final plan. It really does not pertain all that well to the regional campuses. Their peer group has nothing to do with us. We have asked the president to have a second study done relating to regional campuses, and maybe we will learn some things out of that.

The second thing we requested is that a salary compensation explanation page be given to every faculty member, sometime around the time when the benefits package comes out, that will clearly explain all of the withdrawal options. Some people will get added salary money to make them whole. We assume we will get a positive response. With regard to the Sustaining New Synergies Committee, the faculty salary issue is now over. They are going to be meeting all through the summer and work on healthcare, staff salaries, compensation, and part-time staff issues. I am assuming, between Mike and me, we will make every meeting, and Walt Branson will make the meetings also. We will have good representation.

The Intercampus Faculty Council is scheduled to meet the very first part of September because there will be a lot of things that take place over the summer. We will then get our act together on that as faculty. It will be a busy summer. If you have questions, I will answer them the best I can after the meeting.

b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: I, too, would like to thank Bob Barrett and Stan Davis and have enjoyed working with them. Also, thanks to Andy Downs for the help and support that he has provided. Of course Jacqui Petersen always makes us look good every year. I was going to thank Gary Steffen, but we do not have our sergeant-at-arms here today, so hopefully we can keep you all in line.

This is my last Senate meeting as Speaker of the Indiana University faculty. I have occupied this position for six out of the last eight years. I would like to take this opportunity to thank not only the faculty, but also the administration, for their support and encouragement while I have been in this position.

If I am not mistaken, I am only the fourth person to occupy this position in the history of this campus. I hope I have successfully maintained the legacy of those who preceded me, in terms of both service and integrity, and I thank them for setting the standard so high.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – S. Davis:

I would like to echo what Bob Barrett and Mike Nusbaumer said. It was a pleasure for them to work with me for the last year ;-) and likewise. Thanks, also, to Jacqui Petersen and Andy Downs. I can e-mail or call Andy anytime, and he is always available. Thanks also to Gary Steffen who is our sergeant-at-arms. Jacqui is the glue that keeps this thing together. We get together once a month, and she is what keeps us cohesive the other 29 days.

Bob, Mike, and I are going down to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education conference, and we are going to ask them why they see our role as being a regional research campus. We just want to pin them down and see exactly what they are talking about when they issue the white paper on it. That will be one of the things we will be doing.

In response to this, Purdue and Indiana Universities started commissions to deal with the regional campuses. The Indiana University effort is being run by John Applegate, who is vice president of the Regional Affairs Planning Policy Committee. He is going to be visiting IPFW in the next week or so and will be meeting with me and with some other people. We also have a committee under John Applegate that is made up of all the regional faculty speakers. We will start meeting this summer. I will let you know when these meetings occur and what comes of them. I believe in transparency and am quick to share any information that I receive.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee (SR 09-18) – N. Adilov:

The Nominations and Elections Committee conducted the election to fill vacancies on Senate committees and subcommittees. There was a call for nominations from the floor. (For results, see SR No. 09-25, attached).

b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 09-3) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve Senate Document SD 09-3 (Proposal for Regional Proportional Faculty Representation on Purdue University Senate).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 09-11) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve Senate Document SD 09-11 (Amendment to the Bylaws: Dissolution of Distance Education Subcommittee).

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

d. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 09-12) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve Senate Document SD 09-12 (Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Proposal to change Academic Regulation 6.4 – Incompletes).

M. Nusbaumer moved to suspend the rules of the “IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures, Section 14.2 **Voting**. A final vote on proposed amendments may not be taken at the meeting or convocation in which the proposals are introduced.” Seconded.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

R. Hile moved to amend SD 09-12 as follows: The time limit allowed for completion of the course, ~~such time limit shall~~ not to exceed one calendar year. (page 2). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

Z. Todorovic moved to amend SD 09-12 by substituting **a majority** in place of **at least 75%** in the proposed paragraph 6.4 *Incompletes*. Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

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

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 09-13) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve Senate Document SD 09-13 (Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Proposal to change Academic Regulation 3.8.4 – Change of auditing option).

M. Nusbaumer moved to suspend the rules of the “IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures, Section 14.2**Voting**. A final vote on proposed amendments may not be taken at the meeting or convocation in which the proposals are introduced.” Seconded.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote. (J. Tankel voted “nay.”)

f. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 09-14) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott moved to approve Senate Document SD 09-14 (Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures: Proposal to change Academic Regulation 3.8.2 – Course drops).

M. Nusbaumer moved to suspend the rules of the “IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures, Section 14.2**Voting**. A final vote on proposed amendments may not be taken at the meeting or convocation in which the proposals are introduced.” Seconded.

Motion to suspend the rules passed on a voice vote.

R. Hile moved to amend SD 09-14 by deleting the section under “Weeks,” second section, and also to delete “5” in the next section (so it reads 2 through 9). Seconded.

Motion to amend SD 09-14 passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 09-14, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 until noon, Monday, April 19.

Session II
(April 19)

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, N. Adilov, A. Argast, S. Ashur, R. Barrett, S. Beckman, W. Branson, J. Burg, J. Dalby, Y. Deng, S. Dhawale, P. Dragnev, C. Drummond, J. Garrison, R. Hile, L. Hite, P. Iadicola, J. Jackson, R. Jensen, A. Livschiz, H. Luo, G. McClellan, D. Miller, D. Mueller, K. Pollock, D. Redett, M. Ridgeway, J. Tankel, Z. Todorovic, J. Toole, A. Ushenko, W. Utesch, G. Wang (PHYS), G. Wang, (ENGR), L. Wark, M. Wartell, R. Weiner, M. Wolf

Senate Members Absent:

S. Batagiannis, A. Benito, C. Crisler, R. Elaver, E. Foley, J. Grant, R. Gregory,
K. Leonard, D. Liu, W. McKinney, D. Moore, G. Mourad, P. Ng,
C. Nicholson, M. Nusbaumer, C. Thompson, G. Voland

Faculty Members Present: A. Coffman, L. Finke, P. Lin, K. O'Connell

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, R. Kostrubanic, J. Kraus (Follett's), P. McLaughlin, R. McMakin
(Follett's), K. Tolliver

Acta

S. Davis reconvened the meeting at 12:00 noon on April 19, 2010.

6. Committee reports requiring action: (cont'd)

g. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 09-15) – P. Dragnev:

P. Dragnev moved to approve SD 09-15 (Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy).

Motion to approve SD 09-15 passed on a voice vote.

7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 09-19):

Could the administration reconsider the pay schedule for faculty teaching Summer II courses? The current pay schedule does not pay faculty any significant amount until the end of July even though the Summer II session begins at the end of June (last year there was no pay until the end of July). In effect, faculty teach 80% of their Summer II courses before they are paid, plus serve numerous other faculty roles such as advising for SOAR. This can be a particular hardship for faculties' families since the previous pay period is in May. While it is understood that pay schedules are connected to OnePurdue, new technology programs should not be more restrictive than flexible.

**Michael Wolf
Department of Political Science**

M. Wolf: This question comes out of having taught Summer Session II. Since we switched over to OnePurdue and the pay period change, faculty members last year (and likely this year) have not received Summer Session II pay until the end of July, which is equivalent to having 80 percent of the job done before they get paid. I was wondering if this is a conscious decision, or if this is just a strange artifact of technology that could be fixed consciously. Part of it certainly is my own pay issues. We have not had an increase in pay. We get capped if we have ten students, and if we have a greater number of students, we do not receive extra pay.

Secondly, as mentioned here, we certainly have a very stressful time in the summer. It is compacted as we have orientation and a lot of extra duties. This fits with the second part, not just my own pay issues. Summer sessions come into play for our real goals here as far as retention. This is a tremendous opportunity for students to X out their poor grades earlier. We

do a good job of orienting students and advising them. Really, this is stressful but vital for the university. Additionally, to get students through, as is our stated goal, in four or five years, we need these classes in the summer.

W. Branson: Prior to July 2007, Purdue-paid faculty were paid biweekly during the summer. This required a significant amount of manual intervention to move faculty from the monthly to biweekly payroll for the summer. With the OnePurdue system implementation, the decision was made Purdue system-wide, to pay at the end of each month, and to pay based upon the number of work days in that month. With this in mind, the bulk of workdays in the Summer II session are in July. In 2010, for example, three days of Summer II will fall in June; 22 days in July; and five days in August.

Further distorting the problem is the lateness in which summer enrollment decisions must be made. Final decisions about whether a class will carry due to low enrollments, or whether a pro-rated stipend will be paid for the same reason, are often not made until the Wednesday of the first week of classes (this year, on June 30). However, summer pay information must be entered into the payroll system two weeks before that in order to be included in the June payroll. Because of this, many faculty receive, at the end of July, not only the pay for the days worked in July, but also the pay for the few days worked in June.

A Purdue task force has been meeting for several months to investigate moving to a semi-monthly pay schedule for all employees. Semi-monthly pay dates would help to alleviate the problem of inconsistent pay amounts, and long periods between pays, during the summer months.

In the meantime, Purdue continues to offer a “Summer Salary Savings” program that allows faculty to set aside a portion of pay each month during the academic year in order to receive checks throughout the summer. Because the “Summer Salary Savings” program does not pay interest, however, an individual would be better off setting aside a portion of each monthly pay and investing this amount in an interest-bearing account.

M. Wolf: Is there any way to accelerate and do the prorating at the back end? Maybe the task force can look into accelerating it to the June payment. It is a real concern.

W. Branson: I think we need to look at what the task force is looking at.

K. Tolliver: I think that just about sums it up, other than Purdue’s philosophy, and not just Purdue’s philosophy, that we, being a state-supported agency, have to be very careful about not paying for work in advance of when it is being done. That is why Purdue very heavily relies on the number of work days in a month in setting pay amounts.

A. Ushenko: Will we still be getting a double paycheck in May? In other words, we typically get, at the end of May, the last paycheck. Will that still be happening?

K. Tolliver: That will still happen. The last paycheck for IU-paid faculty will include the first half of Summer I. For Purdue-paid faculty, it will include roughly the first third of Summer I. Purdue uses actual days, but IU divides the Summer I amount into equal parts.

A. Ushenko: Whether you teach Summer or not, I think getting that last check at the end of May, and I know it is rough in the summer, but if you can kind of hang on to that and use it through June. It can kind of help, if that is possible to do.

A. Livschiz: I am just curious if the task force has some kind of timeline for when they are done, since this has been going on for a couple of years. It was stated that it started in 2007.

K. Tolliver: The Pay Frequency committee began meeting in December of 2009. We do not have a timeline at this point. I can tell you it is not going to happen by July 1 certainly. The earliest I can see it happening is the fiscal year 2011-12.

W. Branson: I sat in OnePurdue meetings where they talk about system modifications, and this is a high priority.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”:

a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-20) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott presented SR No. 09-20 (Senate Membership, 2010-2011) for information only.

b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-21) – B. Abbott:

B. Abbott presented SR No. 09-21 (End-of-the-Year Committee Reports) for information only.

c. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-22) – A. Livschiz:

A. Livschiz presented SR 09-22 (Proposal for the “Certificate in Small Business Management”) for information only.

d. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 09-23) – A. Livschiz:

A. Livschiz presented SR 09-23 (Proposal for the “Bachelor of Science with a Major in Information Technology (IT)”) for information only.

e. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 09-24) – R. Barrett:

R. Barrett presented SR 09-24 (Helmke Library Funding Concerns and Recommendations) for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

S. Davis: We have an opportunity here, as one of the Follett campuses, to get into a program where we can rent books rather than have students purchase them. There are some commitments from the faculty on this, so I will let Cyndy Elick and the representatives from Follett's give us a quick explanation and answer any questions that you may have.

C. Elick: I think many of you might have seen the e-mail that Jacqui was kind enough to send that had documents explaining the program. In a nutshell, many of our books would be able to be a part of the rental program. Students would then have the option to rent books instead of purchasing them.

Typically, students might see a savings of around 50% per book. If your textbook happens to be in a national rental title database, it really is easy for Follett's to add it to the rental program. If they are not, you would still have the option to perhaps be a part of the rental program, but it would require a four-term commitment by the faculty member; summer terms would count in that four-term adoption. If that does not work for the faculty member, the students would still have the option of buying new or used textbooks as they do now. It is just another option for students to save money on their textbooks.

J. Kraus: I am sure you have all read about it in the news: Follett's operates 850 college bookstores throughout the country and Canada, and 447 of them are going to be in this program in the fall. It is an excellent opportunity for students to save money up front. There will still be the used textbook that a student can purchase and sell back for half.

Although the used textbook purchased and then sold back is still the most frugal purchase, in the 13 stores we tested in the fall and spring, the students still wanted that up-front savings and it has been tremendously important for them. It is very nice for someone to come into the bookstore and not complain about the price of the book, but say "thank you" for having a cheaper opportunity.

S. Davis: John is the regional manager of Follett's.

J. Kraus: Many of you probably know me because I was the store manager here for several years.

C. Elick: And Rusty McMakin is our store manager.

B. Abbott: There are some publishers that are moving toward publishers actually renting textbooks. How does this program interface with that?

J. Kraus: It does not necessarily interface with that. What you have to remember is that a textbook that is rented here can be picked up here. They do not need to go to a publisher website to order the book and pick that up. We still purchase the books from a publisher;

or, in many cases, from a student at buy-back. There really is no camaraderie between the publisher and the bookstore that way.

S. Davis: If you do not have it, get a hold of Jacqui Petersen because there is a nice slide presentation that will explain the program in more detail.

J. Kraus: We did make a website that is totally devoted to textbook rental. It is www.rent-a-text.com. There is faculty information, frequently asked questions, and soon-to-come national database, so please feel free to peruse that.

S. Davis: If I adopt a book this year, and they go to a new edition before the second year that I use it, will Follett's guarantee that we can get the same edition from year to year, or would it switch to the new edition?

J. Kraus: Typically, those books are rented. We are going to get those back. If someone does not return a book, there are surcharges involved. Hopefully we would have those books for you, but it is a case-by-case basis. Sometimes you, as a professor, can coerce the publisher into making that book available, where we cannot.

A. Argast: I appreciate you coming, and I would like to offer some criticism. It is incredibly annoying to get broadcasted e-mails from Follett's advising everybody that somebody's book has not been ordered yet for the next semester. It is a privilege that faculty do not have (broadcasted e-mails). I know other faculty have complained about it, and I do not understand why Follett's gets to send e-mail broadcasts across campus several times a semester. I would ask that you stop doing that.

A. Livschiz: Earlier on the agenda, we had an item "for information only" where a new program was approved at IPFW that used Purdue Calumet and North Central standards rather than the West Lafayette higher standards as requirements. [Senate Reference No. 09-23 "Proposal for the Bachelor of Science with a Major in Information Technology (IT)"]

The vote of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee: to support the proposal for the BS with a Major in Information Technology, and to find that the proposal requires no Senate review—was NOT unanimous.

At the meeting during which the vote was taken, the vote was 4-3. When the votes of those members who could not attend the meeting were included, the final vote was 6-3.

I would like to explain to the members of the Senate why three members of the committee did not vote in favor of the proposal.

1. One member of the subcommittee expressed "serious concern about the Mathematics and Science requirements of this program." The IPFW requirements are not as rigorous as those for a similar program at West Lafayette.

Just to offer one example: at West Lafayette, the program's Math requirement is Calculus. The IPFW program's Math requirement is only College Algebra.

After the initial proposal was sent back by the subcommittee for clarification, the response from Gary Steffen was to compare the IPFW program with Purdue Calumet and North Central, but not with West Lafayette, and to say that the proposed (and now approved) requirements satisfy the appropriate accrediting agency.

The dissenting members of the subcommittee are concerned about putting our students at a disadvantage vis-à-vis Purdue WL graduates.

The dissenting members of the subcommittee also believe that meeting the minimum standard of accrediting agencies should not be the limit of our aspirations as a community of scholars.

2. Another member of the subcommittee expressed concern that there is “no tenure-track librarian position for Engineering Technology; librarian subject expertise is needed in the areas of reference, collection development, and library instruction.” This was noted in a previous accreditation review.

The recent ABET Accreditation report for the Computer Science Department noted that further expansion of programs (without any additional resources for the library) might cause the ability of the library to support these programs to drop to an unsatisfactory level.

It is in the best interest of this institution's overall reputation that we should be looking to the highest standards for our academic programs. I hope this is not the beginning of a trend, a trend that would be detrimental to our university's image and mission.

On behalf of the dissenting members of the Curriculum Review Subcommittee, I would like to ask the vice chancellor for academic affairs to take another closer look at this proposed program.

J. Garrison: I just went through the “for information only” items pretty quickly, but I just wanted to reinforce the importance of library funding, and it explains very clearly what the trend is in that information only” report that is included in your packet. It took the Library Subcommittee a full year to draft the document that was succinct and precise and gave a clear picture of what was happening to this important resource on campus. Please take the time to read this report and think about how the faculty Senate can support the library, so they can support the classes that you teach.

S. Davis: As we get into our community service stuff, we have quite a few programs going. I did want to note for the Senate that Irene Walters received the 2010 Athena Award for her efforts in the community. I think she deserves our recognition for a job well done.

P. Lin: I would like to talk about the supplementary material in the “for information only” item, Senate Reference No. 09-23.

A. Downs: The purpose of the general good and welfare of the university is to discuss things that are of general interest to the body as a whole or the institution as a whole. It is

not the place where debate is typically supposed to take place. As far as the presiding officer is concerned, if there is a debate to be had, this is not the appropriate place for it. If it is a comment about the general good and welfare of the university, then that would be a good place.

P. Lin: It is not about debate. As far as the first concern about the math department, in there it does ask for two additional courses. One is statistics, which is above the current requirement. The other one is discrete math. When we looked at calculus, the committee decided every time to wait. It is always under consideration.

R. Barrett: For clarification, West Lafayette's program is accredited in information technology, and calculus was a requirement by ABET.

S. Davis: What can be done next year is that this can be brought forward again through the process next year.

P. Dragnev: With regard to the statement regarding the Indiana Commission for Higher Education document: our university has outgrown that regional campus group. We are definitely driving towards West Lafayette and Indiana University, so I think next year you may wish to consider the requirements to be more in line with what is done at those institutions.

S. Davis: Speakers Barrett, Nusbaumer, and I are going down this Friday to Indianapolis, so we will be in on the ICHE presentation. They have done a whole program, and one of the things about this program is that it is very interactive. I have heard some of your concerns, and I know Bob Barrett has heard some of your concerns, and we will take them forward into the discussion. If you have any more concerns, just e-mail them any time before Friday.

M. Wartell: I am sorry that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs was not here to hear what you had to say. I suggest you send him a copy of it and have it in the minutes.

Budget issues: We submitted a budget for next year. As usual, it is a very conservative budget based on enrollments, fundamentally what we had this year. For those of you who get the data, our enrollments for next year are right now at about 12.5 percent ahead in terms of credit hours. I do not expect that to hold. On the other hand, it is gratifying that apparently we are retaining more students than we were before, and that is exactly where we want to be going. That really is good news.

With respect to the New Synergies Steering Committee, it had a great effect on most everybody's retirement benefits, except for the 70 faculty members who are paid by Indiana University. I believe we finally have a resolution, and I think we owe thanks to Robert Barrett because he has been heavily involved in discussions with West Lafayette, and also thanks to our other two faculty leaders. Bob has been most involved. The decision was made to cut the Purdue contribution to ten percent TIAA-CREF and to give the difference back in terms of a mandatory contribution that you will make,

which essentially leaves you whole in terms of retirement. It is different than giving you the choice.

W. Branson: It is still a little unclear whether or not that four percent will be a new account.

M. Wartell: It will be a mandatory account within a TIAA-CREF account, but it will be a different account. That is my understanding.

R. Barrett: That is what the treasurer said.

M. Wartell: As most of you know, we had a student death, not on campus, but off campus. It is tragic. I think it was handled very well by the campus. The entire set of support systems that we have come into play in order to support other students with counseling. Coaches and faculty members were provided counseling support as well. I really think that we did a good job and were closely involved in that. We know that this does happen, and I think we responded well to the situation.

Projects are going as expected. I think you will see dirt start to be pushed, and the area start to be cleared, for the Alumni Center very quickly. I do not think we have quite seen that yet.

W. Branson: We are waiting on one more permit.

M. Wartell: Hopefully we will see that building begin to go up right across from the hotel. Unlike many of our other projects, this will be finished in less than two years. We should see the Alumni Center at the beginning of the fall semester.

In case you did not see the invitation, there is an end-of-the-year celebration at the Holiday Inn just like we had last year. It is April 28. You are welcome to come to that.

The Indiana University Board will be on campus Tuesday, June 22. There will be a good deal of individual meetings and committees, and then there will be a business meeting. We have an opportunity to present to the external relations committee for about 45 minutes. We will be updating that committee on the progress of our strategic plan. Otherwise, it will be very open to all in attendance.

Other than that, this has been a very productive year in terms of what the university has accomplished. Thank you for everything that you have done. If you have any other questions, I would be glad to answer them.

M. Wolf: I am on the Indiana University Faculty Council, and I understand that there is now a vice president who is really taking over the relationship between the campuses.

M. Wartell: John Applegate is going to visit us tomorrow. He is the vice president who is now in charge of the regional campuses. Since we are a Purdue campus, that has less effect on us.

M. Wolf: I did ask about the fact that they do not list us as a regional campus on their website, and those of us in Indiana University departments want to have a relationship with them. Will there be any changes?

M. Wartell: None as far as I know.

P. Dragnev: When is the committee going to consider the change in health benefits?

M. Wartell: They are continuously looking at that, but they now have a set of consultants.

W. Branson: That will play out over the next several months. They do have consultants in reviewing things, and looking at best practices at other universities. This is similar to what they did before they made the retirement recommendations. They are actually looking at using a health insurance committee on which Carol Sternberger had represented this campus in the past as being the committee that really dives into the health insurance.

P. Dragnev: The reason I am asking is because the suggested change will be disproportionate because the university picked up the tab last year of the increase in health care benefits. Pretty much, that is the reason for this proportion. We have no increase in salary. That will most probably be about two years?

W. Branson: The effect last year only made a one or two percent difference. The trustees of the university are saying that best practice is somewhere around 80 percent university or organization contribution and 20 percent employee contribution. They want to move to that. It looks like they are working hard to do that by reducing the cost of the plan so that the university saves money. The employee portion will stay similar to what it is today. That way you are not paying more, but it moves that ratio.

P. Dragnev: Is it as big of an increase as last year? One percent is awfully small.

M. Wartell: We will get the number for you. I believe it was 85/15 before the change. Now it is 87/13. Another point worth making is that we keep using the expression "best practice." "Common practice" would be a much more accurate statement.


R. Barrett: For the Senate's information, Mike Nusbaumer and I are joining Walt Branson on the New Synergies Steering Committee. We are going to continue to meet right through the summer, if I read the schedules right. As things happen on the Steering Committee level, we will send updates to the Senate members. Watch your e-mail, and, if anything becomes firm, we will help get that information to you.

M. Wartell: We will try to keep everybody informed. Realize that the SNS committee is looking at much more than just the health issues. It is also looking at the possibility of retirement incentives, part-time benefits, and a number of different possible changes.

Again, thank you.

S. Davis: As the chancellor stated, you as the Senate deserve a lot of thanks for the time you spent in here and time spent on committees for the good of the university: both the administrators and the faculty. You all deserve a lot of thanks for the time and effort that you put in.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jacqueline J. Petersen".

Jacqueline J. Petersen
Secretary of the Faculty

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Nominations and Elections
Nodir Adilov, Chair
Mark Ridgeway
Zelimir Todorovic

DATE: April 19, 2010

SUBJECT: Senate Election Results

Here are the results of elections conducted recently by the Nominations and Elections Committee. In interpreting these election results, please remember that in some cases faculty were elected but were eliminated because their particular school had reached its maximum number of members on that committee.

SPEAKER OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY FACULTY
Stanley Davis, 2010-12

PRESIDING OFFICER
Michael Nusbaumer, 2010-2011

ATHLETICS (SUBCOMMITTEE ON)
I. Dan Coroian, 2010-13
Kimberly McDonald, 2010-13
Nashwan Younis, 2010-13

BUDGETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE
Mark Jordan, 2010-13
Donald Linn, 2010-13
Ali Rassuli, 2010-13

CALENDAR SUBCOMMITTEE
Nodir Adilov, 2010-12
Gail Hickey, 2010-12

CAMPUS APPEALS BOARD
Robert Gillespie, 2010-12

CONTINUING EDUCATION ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
Debrah Huffman, 2010-13

CURRICULUM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Il-Hee Kim, 2010-13

Becky Salmon, 2010-13

Ann Livschiz, 2010-13

Lubomir Stanchev, 2010-13

DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Stevens Amidon, 2010-13

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

David Liu, 2010-11

Duston Moore, 2010-11

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Marcia Dixson, 2010-12

David Liu, 2010-11

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Peter Dragev, 2010-13

Donald Mueller, 2010-11

GENERAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mark Masters, 2010-13

Janet Papiernik, 2010-13

GRADE APPEALS SUBCOMMITTEE

Jun Ma, 2010-13

John O'Connell, 2010-13

GRADUATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Shannon Johnson, 2010-13

David Liu, 2010-13

HONORS PROGRAM COUNCIL

Timothy Grove, 2010-12

Gail Hickey, 2010-12

Beth Kaskel, 2010-12

INDIANA UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Ana Benito, 2010-12

INTERNATIONAL SERVICES ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

Sheena Choi, 2010-13

Mark Jordan, 2010-13

LIBRARY SUBCOMMITTEE

Chao Chen, 2010-13

Donald Linn, 2010-13

Kathleen Murphey, 2010-13

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Suining Ding, 2010-13

Myeong Hwan Kim, 2010-13

Alice Merz, 2010-13

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Margit Codispoti, 2010-12

Matthew Walsh, 2010-12

David Young, 2010-12

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Ana Benito, 2010-12

Jeffrey Casazza, 2010-13

Suzanne LaVere, 2010-13

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

Peter Dragnev, 2010-13

Alice Merz, 2010-13

David Liu, 2010-11

Donald Mueller, 2010-11

Ann Livschiz, 2010-12



THE SENATE
260-481-4160 • FAX: 260-481-6880

TO: IPFW Senate

FROM: Executive Committee
Bruce Abbott, Chair

DATE: April 12, 2010

SUBJECT: Proposal for Regional Proportional Faculty Representation on Purdue
University Senate

WHEREAS, the President of Purdue University has indicated the Purdue University Senate President is responsible for representing all faculty to the University; and

WHEREAS, we support the principle of fair and equitable representation of all faculty; and

WHEREAS, the regional campuses currently have only one representative each on the Purdue University Senate; and

WHEREAS, one representative per regional campus does not reflect a fair and equal representation of regional campus faculty among the Purdue University managed faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED, the IPFW Senate requests proportional representation of all faculty from regional campuses on the Purdue University Senate.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Executive Committee
Bruce Abbott, Chair

DATE: 16 March 2010

SUBJ: Amendment to the Bylaws: Dissolution of Distance Education Subcommittee

DISPOSITION: To the presiding officer for implementation

WHEREAS, the Distance Education Subcommittee has not had business to conduct for several years; and

WHEREAS, the Distance Education Coordinating Committee (DECCO), a committee under the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, has oversight responsibility over Distance Education; and

WHEREAS, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has agreed to give the Educational Policy Committee the power to appoint four members of the voting faculty to DECCO (as specified in the memo) and has revised the DECCO document to reflect this change; and

WHEREAS, the Distance Education Subcommittee voted unanimously to disband as part of the Educational Policy Committee and of the Senate;

BE IT RESOLVED, that Section 5.3.3 of the Bylaws be amended as follows:

Educational Policy Committee

5.3.3 This Committee shall establish ~~eleven~~ **ten** subcommittees: a Calendar Subcommittee, a Developmental Studies Advisory Subcommittee, a Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee, a ~~Distance Education Subcommittee~~, a Grade Appeals Subcommittee, an Honors Program Council, an International Services Advisory Subcommittee, a Curriculum Review Subcommittee, a Graduate Subcommittee, a Campus Appeals Board, and a General Education Subcommittee.

~~5.3.3.4 ***The Distance Education Subcommittee***~~

~~5.3.3.4.1 Membership. This subcommittee shall be composed of seven Voting Faculty elected by the Senate to staggered three year terms in such manner that at least four of the major academic units shall be represented, the chief academic officer or a designee, and the following ex officio, nonvoting members: the admissions officer or a designee, the chief administrator of student counseling or a designee, the chief administrator of continuing education or a designee, and the chief administrator of the learning resource center or a designee. The subcommittee shall elect a chair annually from among its elected members.~~

~~5.3.3.4.2 Charge. Reporting through the Educational Policy Committee, this subcommittee shall advise the Senate concerning policies, procedures, and opportunities related to the offering of credit courses (1) by technological means or (2) in high schools.~~

The Grade Appeals Subcommittee, Honors Program Council, International Services Advisory Subcommittee, Curriculum Review Subcommittee, Graduate Subcommittee, Campus Appeals Board, and the General Education Subcommittee will be renumbered in the Bylaws.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Bruce Abbott, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

DATE: 25 March 2010

SUBJ: Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures:
Proposal to change Academic Regulation 6.4 – Incompletes

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

WHEREAS, Academic Regulation 6.4 currently fails to define the grade of I (Incomplete) and the circumstances under which such a grade is to be awarded; and

WHEREAS, having such a definition would make it easier for instructors to defend their decision to grant or not grant a student's request for a grade of incomplete;

BE IT RESOLVED, that Academic Regulation 6.4 – Incompletes be amended as follows:

6.4 Incompletes. A grade of I is a temporary record of passing work which (1) was interrupted by circumstances beyond the student's control or (2) represents satisfactory work-in-progress in an independent-study or self-paced course. A student must have at least 75% a majority of the required coursework completed (as determined by the instructor) before the instructor is permitted to assign the grade of incomplete. The instructor who reports a grade of I shall file in the Registrar's Office a statement that includes the following information:

- The reason for the incomplete
- The requirements for completion of the course
- The grade for the course to date

The time limit allowed for completion of the course, ~~such time limit shall~~ not to exceed one calendar year. An instructor may change the incomplete to a regular letter grade if requirements for completion of the course are not met within the specified period.

Given extenuating circumstances, and approval of the instructor and the instructor's dean/division director, the time limit may be extended for a period not to exceed one additional calendar year.

The Registrar's Office shall change the I to an IF unless the student graduates or removes the incomplete within the time allowed. Indiana University students who receive this grade will have a grade of F recorded on official transcripts.

If the student re-enrolls in the same course while the incomplete is still on the record, and the course is not repeatable for credit, the original incomplete shall remain on the record permanently.

Students transferring resident credit for a course bearing an unremoved incomplete shall have the grade of I recorded for up to one calendar year from the date of admission to IPFW. At the end of this period, if the student has not graduated or provided evidence that the incomplete has been changed to a permanent grade, the Registrar's Office shall change any such unremoved incomplete to IF.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Bruce Abbott, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

DATE: 25 March 2010

SUBJ: Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures:
Proposal to change Academic Regulation 3.8.4 – Change of auditing option

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

WHEREAS, course instructors have a legitimate interest in knowing when a student changes status from credit to audit or from audit to credit;

BE IT RESOLVED, that Academic Regulation 3.8.4 – Change of auditing option be amended as follows:

3.8.4 Change of auditing option. A student may alternate between audit and credit status during an academic session. A change from audit to credit may occur only during the first four weeks; a change from credit to audit may occur only during the first nine weeks. Changes of auditing status require the signature of the **course instructor and** academic advisor next to the appropriate notation on the schedule-revision form.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Bruce Abbott, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

DATE: 25 March 2010

SUBJ: Proposed Amendments to the IPFW Academic Regulations and Procedures:
Proposal to change Academic Regulation 3.8.2 – Course drops

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

WHEREAS, the current practice of allowing students to withdraw from class up through the fourth week of classes, without recording the course on the student record, is inconsistent with common practice at other universities, which typically allow such withdrawals only within the first few meetings of the course; and

WHEREAS, the current regulation encourages the practice of registering for extra courses with the intention of later withdrawing from those that prove to be problematic for the student; and

WHEREAS, the current regulation imposes an extra burden on Financial Aid to identify courses withdrawn from and not recorded on the transcript as courses attempted;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Proposal to Change Academic Regulation 3.8.2 – Course Drops be amended as follows:

3.8.2 Course drops (cancellations of registration). A student may drop a course, subject to the time limits below and the restrictions described in this section and in section 3.9 by presenting a request at the Registrar's Office, ~~or~~ the student's department, **or through self-service in the on-line registration system.**

Weeks	Restrictions
First week of classes (or equivalent, based on course length. See chart below.)	College/School/Division policy determines whether an academic advisor's approval is required. Course is not recorded on the student record.
Up through the 4th week of classes	School/division policy determines whether an academic advisor's approval is required. Course is not recorded on the student record.
5 2 through 9	College/School/Division policy determines whether an academic advisor's approval is required. Course is recorded with grade of W on the student record.
10 through 16	Courses cannot normally be dropped during this period. If a drop is approved, the course is recorded with a grade of W on the student record.

The following table displays the point in time a withdraw grade will be recorded on the permanent record, based on course length.

Number of Weeks the course meets	Course Drop without Withdraw Grade	Withdraw Grade Recorded
9 or more	Days 1-7	Day 8 and thereafter
3 to 8	Days 1-3	Day 4 and thereafter
2	Days 1-2	Day 3 and thereafter
1 or Less	Day 1	Day 2 and thereafter

Day 1 of a course is the first day of the term or part of term. All calendar days are counted, including weekends.

The opportunity to drop a class is restricted as specified below:

3.8.2.1 Alleged academic dishonesty. Students will not be permitted to drop a class in which there is an allegation of academic dishonesty.

3.8.2.2 Late-term drops related to academic performance. After the ninth week (**or equivalent**), students will not be permitted to drop a class due to poor academic performance in the class.

3.8.2.3 Late-term drops unrelated to academic performance. After the ninth week (**or equivalent**), and with the approval of the student's academic advisor and the student's dean/division director, a student may drop a course when the reason for requesting the drop is unrelated to the student's academic performance in the course.

3.8.2.4. Post-term drops. After the end of the sixteenth week, a course may be dropped only by following the procedure for a change of grade (see Section 6.6).

Senate Document SD 09-15
(Amends SD 07-09)
(Approved, 4/19/2010)

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM : Faculty Affairs Committee
Peter Dragnev, Chair

SUBJECT: Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy

DATE: March 29, 2010

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for implementation

WHEREAS, there is ambiguity about the Pre-Disciplinary Letter procedures;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the IPFW Senate here approve the following amendment to SD 07-09 "Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy":

Senate Document SD 09-15
(Amends SD 07-09)
(Approved, 4/19/2010)

Senate Document SD 07-9
(Approved, 4/14/2008)
(Amended 4/19/2010)

Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy

Except in situations addressed in other University policies and in emergency situations that could affect student or faculty safety, academic administrators must provide a pre-disciplinary letter to a faculty member prior to issuing a disciplinary action. Disciplinary actions DO NOT include the following: administrative actions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion, or workload assignments with the exception of summer and overload.

The purpose of a Pre-Disciplinary Letter is to ensure that a faculty member has the opportunity to present information and facts, and is not wrongfully disciplined. The Pre-Disciplinary Letter describes the nature and basis for the potential disciplinary action.

The faculty member has the opportunity to respond in writing within ~~ten (10) work~~ **fourteen (14) calendar** days to the Pre-Disciplinary Letter and provide information on his or her behalf. At the option of the academic administrator or the faculty member, a meeting may be arranged to discuss the Pre-Disciplinary Letter; however, the inability of either party to meet prior to the end of the ~~ten (10) work~~ **fourteen (14) calendar** days does not provide an extension of time for the submission of a response.

After receiving the faculty member's response, and after the meeting if one took place, the academic administrator will consider all the information presented by the faculty member and determine if the potential disciplinary action should be implemented, should be modified, or is unjustified. The academic administrator ~~may~~ **must** issue a letter stating the final disposition as early as ~~the next work day following submission of the faculty member's response. The latest such a letter may be issued is~~ **by** the end of ~~ten (10) work~~ **fourteen (14) calendar** days from receipt of the faculty member's response.

In order that the process may proceed expeditiously, extensions of the faculty response and administrator final letter time lines will be granted only in rare circumstances by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

This policy in no way impedes faculty from grieving a disciplinary action, filing under an appropriate IU or PU complaint procedure, or in any way exercising a right to which they are entitled.

Senate Document SD 07-9
(Approved, 4/14/2008)
(Amended, 4/19/2010)

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee
Craig Hill, Chair

SUBJECT: Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy

DATE: March 24, 2008

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for implementation

WHEREAS, procedural standards set the basis of trust and respect between the university faculty and administration;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the IPFW Senate here approve the following
“Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy”:

Pre-Disciplinary Letter Policy

Except in situations addressed in other University policies and in emergency situations that could affect student or faculty safety, academic administrators must provide a pre-disciplinary letter to a faculty member prior to issuing a disciplinary action. Disciplinary actions DO NOT include the following: administrative actions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion, or workload assignments with the exception of summer and overload.

The purpose of a Pre-Disciplinary Letter is to ensure that a faculty member has the opportunity to present information and facts, and is not wrongfully disciplined. The Pre-Disciplinary Letter describes the nature and basis for the potential disciplinary action.

The faculty member has the opportunity to respond in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days to the Pre-Disciplinary Letter and provide information on his or her behalf. At the option of the academic administrator or the faculty member, a meeting may be arranged to discuss the Pre-Disciplinary Letter; however, the inability of either party to meet prior to the end of the fourteen (14) calendar days does not provide an extension of time for the submission of a response.

After receiving the faculty member's response, and after the meeting if one took place, the academic administrator will consider all the information presented by the faculty member and determine if the potential disciplinary action should be implemented, should be modified, or is unjustified. The academic administrator must issue a letter stating the final disposition by the end of fourteen (14) calendar days from receipt of the faculty member's response.

In order that the process may proceed expeditiously, extensions of the faculty response and administrator final letter time lines will be granted only in rare circumstances by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

This policy in no way impedes faculty from grieving a disciplinary action, filing under an appropriate IU or PU complaint procedure, or in any way exercising a right to which they are entitled.