

Minutes of the  
Eighth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Second Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne  
April 14 and 21, 2003  
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda\*

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of March 17, 2003
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
  - b. Purdue University – P. Hamburger
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – R. Sedlmeyer
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-28) – R. Friedman
  - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 02-16) – L. Hite
  - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 02-17) – E. Blakemore
  - d. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 02-18) – E. Blakemore
7. New business
8. Committee reports “for information only”
  - a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-29) – J. Grant
  - b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-30) – E. Blakemore
  - c. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-31) – J. Grant
  - d. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 02-32) – G. Bullion
  - e. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 02-33) – D. Oberstar
  - f. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 02-34) – D. Oberstar
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

\* As amended

Presiding Officer: R. Sedlmeyer  
Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed  
Sergeant-at-Arms: D. Marshall  
Secretary: J. Petersen

Attachments:

- [“Results of the election of Senate Committees and Subcommittees”](#) (SR No. 02-35)
- [“Amendment to the Bylaws: Composition of Calendar Subcommittee”](#) (SD 02-16)
- [“School of Education Promotion and Tenure Policies \[supersedes SD 88-35\]”](#) (SD 02-17)
- [“Proposed amendment to SD 88-13 \(Procedures for Promotion and Tenure\)”](#) (SD 02-18)
- [“Procedures for Promotion and Tenure”](#) (SD 88-13)
- [“Resolution to Office of Academic Affairs Regarding Continuing Lecturers”](#) (SD 02-19)
- [“Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering Technology”](#) (SR No. 02-33)

“Proposal for Minor in Film and Media Studies” (SR No. 02-34)

Session I  
April 14

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, R. Barrett, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, M. Bookout, W. Branson, J. Brennan,  
G. Bullion, C. Carlson, C. Chauhan, S. Choi, M. Codispoti, C. Erickson, L. Fox, R. Friedman, J. Grant, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, L. Hite, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, A. Karim, M. Kimble, J. Knight, L. Kuznar, L. Lin, M. Lipman, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Perez, J. Purse-Wiedenhoeft, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, N. Younis, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

H. Broberg, T. Grove, J. Hrehov, D. Marshall, A. Mustafa, M. Myers, E. Neal, K. Squadrito, W. Unsell

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, L. DeFonso, K. Murphey, J. Nichols, W. Utesch

Visitors Present: S. Alderman, J. Dahl, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Sedlmeyer called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of March 17, 2003: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Grant moved to amend the agenda to include Senate Reference Nos. 33 and 34 under Committee reports “for information only” as e. and f., respectively.

Seconded.

Motion to amend the agenda passed on a voice vote.

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

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: There was an article in the *Journal Gazette* about a week or so ago regarding the presidential search at Indiana University. They are going to be interviewing between 9 and 12 folks. There is diversity in terms of sex, race and ethnicity, and background of candidates, some of whom have academic backgrounds, and

some of whom have non-academic backgrounds. That is all the information they are giving.

b. Purdue University:

P. Hamburger: The Board of Trustees of Purdue University will meet in July 2004 in Fort Wayne. In my presentation I again raised the question of funding. They were very sympathetic. There was a lively discussion, and a couple of members of the Board of Trustees said that we should bring this up regularly so that in the next session they will be aware of it and try to help and work with us.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

R. Sedlmeyer: First, I want to say it has been a privilege being able to serve the faculty in the Senate in this way. I entered this year with great fear and trembling. I had never ascended to such a position of leadership before, and I thank all the members of the faculty and Senate for their help and direction. I want to especially thank our new secretary of the Senate, Jacqui Petersen. She has been wonderful in assuming the secretary of the Senate position and has been extremely helpful to me.

I want to talk a little bit about a vision for the campus. As I mentioned to the chancellor in a meeting the other day, I think IPFW is on the verge of greatness. I want to give you my personal perspective on why I think that.

(PowerPoint presentation):

On the Verge of Greatness

- One university – Two great names
- One great university
  - Great environment
  - Great programs
  - Great faculty
  - Great students
- One great university
  - Great leadership

“True greatness is the ability to serve,  
The capacity to lead  
Not by the exercise of power,  
But by love.”

--From Sundays at the Magic Mountain

We have a tagline that says that we are one university and two great names. Indeed, we do have two great traditions: Purdue University and Indiana University. I look at it like this: I would rather we be known eventually as just one great university, regardless of the names

with whom we are associated. I think we are on the verge of that. We have a great environment. We have a great physical campus here – it is beautiful. This is one of the most beautiful times of the year. I see the forsythias blooming, and I do not know the names of all those bulbs that pop up, but they sure are beautiful – the smells and the sight. The bridge is just beautiful. I cannot wait for the residence halls to come. We are going to enhance the campus – the grounds have always been great. Our facilities are great. I know from talking with students who visit other campuses, one of the things that really turns them off is an ugly campus. I do not think any student can say that of our campus. It is beautiful, and it is a great environment.

Second, I think we have great programs. We have, over the years that I have been here, grown by leaps and bounds in terms of the nature of the undergraduate programs that we have provided, and now by the increasing numbers of graduate programs we provide. I believe that there is no other university close to us that can meet the great diversity we have in our programs. That is entirely due to forward-looking faculty and administration who see the needs of this region, and they move with great vigor to supply them.

I also think that to create one great university we need a great faculty. I have been incredibly impressed this year by the accomplishments of our faculty. I look at and review in my school people who are up for awards for excellence in service, teaching, and research. I think sometimes about applying myself, but when I review the accomplishments of my peers, I cannot hold a candle to you. I think I do a pretty good job, but I am humbled by the accomplishments of my faculty, my peers. It is not just the accomplishments that you have made in terms of publications you have produced or of reports in the newspaper of all the people coming to IPFW for the expertise we have, but I hear a lot of reports from students. They come to my office all the time and tell me about people like Peter Hamburger, how he has stretched them in the classroom. I have a son and daughter who go here, and they tell me how much Kathy Squadrito has stretched them. To be a great university we have to be a great faculty, and that requires great commitment on the part of everyone, not only to serve our students but to serve our profession.

A great university also takes great students. I have seen some of the accomplishments of our students. We have an outstanding record for students who take licensing and professional exams. I think that is another aspect of a great faculty that prepares them for such things. To become a great university we need to attract those students, and I think our efforts in the three things above (great environment, great programs, great faculty) will attract the greater students and will continue to enhance our reputation. I was talking with one of my colleagues the other day. He said, “You know 15-20 years ago they used to refer to us as Bypass High. I don’t hear that anymore.”

I would like to end with something that I think is most important. If we are going to become one great university, I think that requires great leadership. It requires people, both administrators and faculty, who are willing to take risks, who are willing to look out and not see just where we came from or where we are today, but how great we can become. If you are going to be a great leader, I believe true greatness has to be founded on the ability to serve, the capacity to lead not by the exercise of power, but by love. I do not want to get

ooey gooey about this, but what I mean by love is that we have a deep, profound respect for the talent and ability of everyone who is part of this campus community. If you want to be a great leader, you first need to learn how to serve.

I thank you all for your service here in the Senate. I thank you all for the service you give to the students in your classrooms every day, for serving in various ways in departments and schools, and for serving our community. I applaud you all for that and I hope, as we continue on this mission to become one great university, that I can leave a small contribution to that. Thank you all.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee (SR No. 02-28) – R. Friedman:

The Nominations and Elections Committee conducted the elections to fill vacancies on Senate committees and subcommittees. (For results, see SR No. 02-35 attached.)

b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 02-16) – L. Hite:

L. Hite moved to approve SD 02-16 (Amendment to the Bylaws: Composition of Calendar Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 02-17) – E. Blakemore:

E. Blakemore moved to approve SD 02-17 with the following amendments under VI. Promotion and Tenure Documents: Process and Procedures:

2. The Candidate for promotion and/or tenure should ... the case to be submitted to the **department** ~~School of Education~~....

7. The SOE P&T Committee shall review P&T cases, ~~solicit input from the rest of the tenured and tenure-track faculty~~, and vote on the case(s). The vote ....

9. ~~The Campus Promotion and Tenure Sub Committee will assess the candidate and forward it and all previous assessments to the VCAA. The VCAA will make an assessment and forward it, along with all previous assessments, to the Chancellor.~~

Seconded.

R. Barrett moved to amend the amendment to read as follows:

7. The SOE P&T Committee shall review P&T cases, solicit input from the rest of the tenured and tenure-track faculty not from the department from which the case comes and vote on the case(s). ....

Seconded.

A motion was made to close debate. Seconded.

Motion to close debate passed on a voice vote.

Motion to amend the amendment failed on a voice vote.

R. Barrett moved to divide the question into three.

Seconded.

Motion to divide the question passed on a voice vote.

R. Barrett moved to close debate on item number 2.

Motion to close debate on item number 2 passed on a voice vote.

Motion to strike the words “School of Education” and to replace them with “department” passed on a voice vote.

Motion to strike the words “solicit input from the rest of the tenured and tenure-track faculty” from paragraph 7 failed on a voice vote.

Motion to strike paragraph 9 passed on a voice vote.

M. Nusbaumer moved to amend SD 02-17 by deleting the appendices.

Motion to amend SD 02-17 by deleting the appendices passed on a voice vote.

A motion was made to close debate.

Motion to close debate passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 02-17, as amended, passed on a show of hands.

The meeting recessed at 1:14 until April 21.



Session II  
April 21

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, M. Bookout, W. Branson, J. Brennan, H. Broberg,  
G. Bullion, C. Carlson, S. Choi, M. Codispoti, C. Erickson, L. Fox, R. Friedman, T. Grove, P. Hambruger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, L. Hite, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, J. Knight, L. Kuznar, L. Lin, M. Lipman, D. Marshall, M. Nusbaumer,  
D. Oberstar, A. Perez, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, K. Squadrito, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, N. Younis, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

R. Barrett, C. Chauhan, J. Grant, J. Hrehov, A. Karim, M. Kimble, A. Mustafa, M. Myers, E. Neal, J. Purse-Wiedenhoft, W. Unsell

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, L. DeFonso

Visitors Present: B. Blauvelt, J. Dahl

Acta

R. Sedlmeyer reconvened the meeting at 12:03 p.m. on April 21, 2003.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

d. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 02-18) – E. Blakemore:

E. Blakemore moved to approve SD 02-18 (Proposed amendment to SD 88-13 [Procedures for Promotion and Tenure]). Seconded.

P. Hamburger moved to amend SD 02-18 to read as follows (changes in bold):

- 2.2 The administrator or committee chair ... to the next level. When the vote is not unanimous, **separate written statements** stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may ....

Seconded.

Motion to amend SD 02-18 failed by a show of hands. (For: 13; Against: 20)

P. Hamburger moved to amend SD 02-18 as follows: (changes in bold):

- 2.2 The administrator or committee chair ... to the next level. When the vote is not unanimous, **a written statements** stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may ....

The chair ruled the motion out of order.

Motion to approve SD 02-18 passed on a voice vote.

7. New business

- a. M. Nusbaumer moved to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee with making recommendations to the Fort Wayne Senate by the November, 2003 meeting regarding the participation of tenure-track faculty in the promotion and tenure process.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

- b. M. Nusbaumer moved to approve SD 02-19 (Resolution to Office of Academic Affairs Regarding Continuing Lecturers). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 02-19 passed on a voice vote.

8. Committee reports “for information only”:

- a. Executive Committee (SR No. 02-29) – M. Nusbaumer:

M. Nusbaumer presented SR No. 02-29 (Senate Membership, 2003-2004) for information only.

- b. Faculty Affairs Committee (SR No. 02-30) – E. Blakemore:

E. Blakemore presented SR No. 02-30 (OAA Document Regarding Continuing Lecturers) for information only.

- c. Executive Committee (SR No. 02-31) – M. Nusbaumer:

M. Nusbaumer presented SR No. 02-31 (End-of-the-Year Committee Reports) for information only.

- d. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (SR No. 02-32) – G. Bullion:

G. Bullion presented SR No. 02-32 (IPFW Budgetary Affairs Report on the Status of Division I Budgetary Matters) for information only.

- e. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 02-33) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar presented SR No. 02-33 (Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering Technology) for information only.

- f. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 02-34) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar presented SR No. 02-34 (Proposal for Minor in Film and Media Studies) for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

S. Hannah: Last week we had handouts here regarding an OAA draft document: “Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating Teaching.” Since that time you have received online a copy of this draft document which was developed by a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee. It has been reviewed in many settings as trying to develop a set of rubrics for defining, documenting, and evaluating teaching -- particularly teaching excellence -- to assist faculty who are preparing dossiers for promotion and tenure based on teaching excellence and for those who are reviewing folks. This is the product of many hours and lots of people over the last year or so. The goal from the beginning was to attach it to the famous “Brown Document,” an OAA memorandum which provides guidelines for putting together promotion and tenure dossiers. This document (Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating Teaching) would be attached to the Brown Document as another set of guidelines. If you are looking at teaching as your area of emphasis, it might be something you would want to add. I hope you will read it with care. I already have gotten several responses. If you want hard copies, there are hard copies here. I do encourage you to read it carefully – it has been read by lots of groups, but it is amazing how obvious things get missed, and it is meant to be something that would be useful. If you see something that is missing or something that is not clear, and you would like to make a suggestion, please do. By the end of the semester I intend to pull all those things together and declare this the draft of the moment, and officially attach it to that OAA memorandum. It is to be a dynamic piece responding to faculties’ interests and concerns and ideas as we go forward, so I just call your attention to it and will thank you for your comments.

P. Hamburger: I appreciate this information, but I see this document as more than just guidelines. It looks to me like these are more policies, and if the vice chancellor is stating that this should be a document that is included in the Senate documents, then I believe this is an issue where the Faculty Affairs Committee should look into it, make a recommendation to the Senate, and the Senate should approve it. That would show that IPFW faculty recommended and supported this document. My concern is that every year promotion and tenure committees come back with more and more recommendations, and the cases get out of control – they just keep getting bigger and bigger. I strongly believe that this is an issue that the faculty Senate should look at how to document because this is a policy issue, it is not a recommendation by the vice chancellor or anybody else. It should be brought to the Senate and looked at carefully and a recommendation made.

M. Nusbaumer: I would echo Peter’s comment. I think this document is indirectly establishing criteria. I am also very troubled that you plan to attach this to the Brown Document. There are no attachments on research and/or service. I intend to raise this matter in the fall.

S. Hannah: The policy is that those criteria are set by departments. We will talk about it later.

M. Nusbaumer: The AAUP data for the current year has been distributed. I am sure it does not surprise anyone. We are basically the most under-paid faculty.

I also want to express concern about free speech issues on campus, especially given our history with the Theater Department. There have been various documents posted on bulletin boards sponsored by appropriate campus organizations as well as postings on faculty doors that have been ripped off. I find that to be a threat to free speech and that has no place in the university.

This is Peter Hamburger's last Senate meeting as Purdue Speaker and Bob Sedlmeyer's last Senate meeting as Presiding Officer. I have enjoyed working with both of them, and I appreciate their efforts and contributions to the faculty.

M. Wartell: The Indiana Senate has passed its version of the budget. Now we are in what I can best call the "quiet phase" of negotiation where the conference committee is beginning to work on making the House and Senate versions similar so that they can pass a budget. In the House version, we were allocated 75% of our enrollment change monies: first year, 50% and the second year, 25%. In the Senate version they took away a total of 5% of that, allocating 40% of the budget in the first year and 30% in the second year. I still maintain we should be getting 100% of our enrollment change money -- there is no telling what will happen in the conference committee. In terms of repair and rehabilitation, the House recommended 25% of that budget be given to us, the Senate is recommending 32%. It is still not enough to maintain what we believe is important to us. We will try to keep our facilities up the best we can. That is very hard to do unless we get 100% of our repair and rehabilitation money. The House included the music building, but the Senate did not. In fact, they included very few capital projects. That will all be brokered out in the conference committee. It is really very hard to predict what will happen. There are small percentages allocated for inflationary increases. That is not something that is going to have a great effect on us because, in general, our major increases will come from strategic plan dollars, the increase in the number of students (that is, enrollment change money), and changes in tuition and student fees overall. So we will have to see how that comes out.

I have one piece of very good news: The contractor who will build the student housing will be on site May 8 with picks and shovels, rakes and hoes – everything necessary to begin the construction. An interesting aspect of the proposed timeline is that the contractors will be finished with two buildings in December. Remember, there are a total of eight buildings, seven of which are residential buildings. I hope that you think the bridge is as stunning as I think it is. I think it really is an unbelievable architectural feature for the campus. I am really pleased with it.

P. Hamburger: Someone raised the question, as this is a wonderful bridge, are we going to advertise IPFW somehow? It is really high, and there are big possibilities.

M. Wartell: We are thinking about it. Let's wait until the bridge is up.

L. Kuznar: When do we expect to have students in the student housing?

M. Wartell: The buildings will be occupied August 2004. The Office of Admissions is finding that not only are the students asking about when the student housing will be available, but parents are asking as well. That is a very good sign.

In spite of our usual funding woes, our legislators try to help us. It is very difficult in light of the current state of the economy. In general, the campus is really doing very well. With funding the way it is, it is hard to make major dents in our problems.

I hope you have a good summer.

R. Sedlmeyer: The chair has one item. We had a lengthy discussion of the School of Education's revised promotion and tenure procedures. Part of that discussion wandered into the area of criteria. Upon reviewing Senate Document 88-13, and discussing the matter with those who have a much longer institutional memory than the chair, it becomes clear that the Senate approves school procedures only. Senate does not approve school criteria. So I am asking Jacqui to send to all senators for next year, the web site where you can look at all the documents which are associated with promotion and tenure that have been approved by this body. Also, I am asking her to send paper copies of all campus-level promotion and tenure documents to all voting faculty.

#### Campus Promotion and Tenure Documents

SD 88-13	Procedures for Promotion and Tenure
SD 88-25	Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
A Commentary on SD 88-25	
SD 94-3	Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
SD 91-20	Extension of the Probationary Period for Justifiable Cause

10. Meeting adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen  
Secretary of the Faculty