

**Minutes of the
Eighth Regular Meeting of the Sixteenth
Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort
Wayne**

April 14 and 21, 1997

3:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of March 17, 1997
3. Acceptance of the agenda - S. Hollander
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - J. Hersberger
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 96-27) - W. Frederick
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-28) - M. Masters
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-14) - B. Bulmahn
 - c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-15) - B. Bulmahn
7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 96-29)
8. New business
 - a. Peter Iadicola (Senate Document SD 96-16)
 - b. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 96-17 [formerly Senate Reference No. 96-30])
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-30) - M. H. Thunte
 - b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 96-31) - M. Nusbaumer
 - c. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-32) - S. Hollander
 - d. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-33) - S. Hollander
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-34) - B. Bulmahn
 - f. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 96-35) - R. Barrett
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick

Parliamentarian: M. Sherr

Sergeant-at-Arms: N. Younis

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

C. Aikman, S. Argast, V. Badii, R. Barrett, R. Berger, F. Borelli, W. Branson, B. Bulmahn, C. Champion, C. Chauhan, J. Clausen, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, L. DeFonso, M. Downs, F. English, O. Freiburger, J. Grant, P. Hamburger, T. Hamilton, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, L. Hess, R. Hess, S. Hollander, P. Iadicola, J. Knight, T. Laverghetta, D. Legg, M. Masters, L. Motz, G. Mourad, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, D. Ross, H. Samavati, D. Schmidt, M. Scudder, J. Silver, P. Terry, M. H. Thuyente, M. Wartell, J. Wilson

Attachments:

["Senate Election Results"](#) (SR No. 96-36)

["Guidelines for Weekend College"](#) (SD 96-14)

["Recommendations on academic advising"](#) (SD 96-15)

["Amendment of SD 93-9"](#) (SD 96-16)

["Report of Review of SD 93-9: Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards"](#) (SD 96-17 [formerly SR No. 96-30])

["Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards"](#) (SD 93-9, as amended)

Senate Members Absent:

D. Edwards, R. Emery, S. Frey-Ridgway, C. Humphrey, B. Kingsbury, M. Lane, K. O'Connell, P. Stubblebine, C. Thompson, L. Wright-Bower

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, W. Ludwin, D. McCants, D. Thuyente

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell

Session I

(April 14)

Acta

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of March 17, 1997: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

S. Hollander moved to accept the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Indiana University:

M. Downs: Professor Hollander and I attended, as representatives of this campus, the last meeting of the Indiana University University Faculty Council for this year. There were several items of business that were dealt with, two of which I think may ultimately have some impact on Indiana University faculty at this campus.

One was a list of minimum standards for the operation of faculty boards of review. It was approved. It does not apply to any pending cases, but it will apply and govern the treatment of cases which arise in the future that involve Indiana University faculty boards of review.

The other item of business which could have an effect on Indiana University faculty at this campus is a Family Leave Policy. It does not become effective immediately; it becomes effective after the Board of Trustees has had a chance to look at it and approve it. It will tend to make more firm the provisions that exist for permitting faculty to take leaves for illness or for family problems.

b. Purdue University:

J. Hersberger: The Presiding Officer and I were asked to meet with Carolyn Jones, Assistant Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs at West Lafayette, for discussion about new Purdue University grievance procedures, not thinking that we should get to do that just by ourselves. We grabbed together a group of fair-minded and contentious Purdue faculty who are familiar with the process to meet about that. Bill Frederick, David Fairchild, Steve Hollander, Carol Sternberger, Jeff Wilson, and I will be participating in this event tomorrow here on campus.

Also, in light of those things, the CIA, which as you know hasn't had much to do the last couple of years, does get to have an election each year for the Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board where we replace six members out of twelve. In alphabetical order the lucky winners this year are: Elliott Blumenthal, Chand Chauhan, David Fairchild, Don Schmidt, Roberta Tierney, and Jeff Wilson. So, if you see any of them, congratulate them on their election to the Faculty Grievance Board.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 96-27) - W. Frederick:

W. Frederick: I refer you to Senate Reference No. 96-27. In there you will see reference to SD 96-2 Changes to the Purdue University Faculty Grievance Procedures. We had earlier this year amended the grievance procedures. We had changed some dates and timing and that is, at this point, inoperative because West Lafayette wants to change the entire grievance procedure. We will let you know more of the outcome of that

after tomorrow's meeting with Carolyn Jones.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-28) - M. Masters:

Mark Masters conducted the election of Senate Committees and Subcommittees. (See Senate Reference No. 96-36 for results)

b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-14) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-14 (Guidelines for Weekend College). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

c. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 96-15) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn moved to approve SD 96-15 (Recommendations on academic advising). Second.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

7. Question time:

Q: Late last year, the Edutech consultants submitted their report about computing at IPFW. In the four months that have passed, what steps have been completed to address the problems they identified? What steps are underway and planned, and is there a schedule in place for addressing the remaining problems?

A: W. Branson: The Edutech Report recommended the establishment of three committees: an overall policy committee for information technology, an advisory committee for administrative reasons, and an advisory committee for academic issues. The main purpose of all of these committees is to help communicate and provide input into campus priorities and policies. At this point the initial membership and the charter for those committees have been created and, in fact, the overall policy committee is going to meet this Friday to begin its mission to provide input.

In terms of other input, one of the things I have done is to ask the director of C&DP to meet with the deans to get some of their individualized input on what C&DP could be doing for the various schools. We have also begun to do more formal agreements where, when we do a major installation or a significant installation--like the engineering and technology lab or the set of computers over in the Medical Education School--, we really need to sit down with the user and talk about what their expectations are of C&DP and what level of

service we can provide to them once the installation is in. We have also involved all of the vice chancellors more consistently in prioritizing projects that need to get done and when we have to make those kinds of decisions. There has been considerable involvement by the vice chancellors. An example of that is the prioritization of the installation of all of the faculty computers that we funded during the year.

For the future I am really relying on the committees to provide us with a high level of input to address some of the technology and computing issues that we face. Unfortunately, the issues are very complex and they are not at all simple, and neither are the answers. I think with their input we can make the best decisions for the use of university resources.

8. New business:

P. Iadicola introduced and move to approve SD 96-16 (Amendment of SD 93-9 Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards). Seconded.

S. Argast moved to table SD 96-16.

Motion to table passed on a voice vote.

S. Argast moved to consider Senate Reference No. 96-30 (Report of Review of SD 93-9: Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards [Option 1/Option 2 Policy]) under "new business." Seconded.

Motion passed on a show of hands.

The Presiding Officer announced that SR No. 96-30 would become SD 96-17.

S. Hollander moved to amend SD 96-17 under "Recommendations," item 2, by inserting in the first sentence the words "the 1997-1998 Faculty Affairs Committee" after the words "The Senate charge." Seconded.

Motion passed on a show of hands (28/4).

M. Downs moved to amend SD 96-17 under "Recommendations," item 2, by adding the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: The Faculty Affairs Committee should report to the Senate at its December meeting with recommendations or a progress report. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

R. Barrett moved to amend SD 96-17, under "Recommendations," item 2, by deleting the words "or a progress report." Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

T. Hamilton moved to amend SD 96-17, under "Recommendations," item 2, by adding the following phrase: The Senate charge a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Fort Wayne Senate.

Motion died for lack of a second.

The meeting recessed at 4:15 p.m. until Monday, April 21.

Session II

(April 21)

Senate Members Present:

C. Aikman, S. Argast, V. Badii, R. Berger, F. Borelli, W. Branson,
B. Bulmahn, J. Clausen, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, L. DeFonso,
M. Downs, F. English, O. Freiburger, S. Frey-Ridgway, P. Hamburger,
T. Hamilton, J. Haw, J. Hersberger, L. Hess, R. Hess, S. Hollander,
P. Iadicola, B. Kingsbury, J. Knight, M. Lane, T. Laverghetta, D. Legg,
M. Masters, L. Motz, G. Mourad, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, K.
O'Connell, D. Ross, H. Samavati, D. Schmidt, M. Scudder, J. Silver,
P. Stubblebine, C. Thompson, M. H. Thuyente, J. Wilson

Senate Members Absent:

R. Barrett, C. Champion, C. Chauhan, D. Edwards, R. Emery, J. Grant,
C. Humphrey, P. Terry, M. Wartell, L. Wright-Bower

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, J. DiIorio, P. Lane, D. McCants, B. Steffy, D. Thuyente

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, N. Newell, A. Stein

Acta

The meeting was reconvened at 3:03 p.m.

8. New Business: (continued)

SD 96-17 Report of Review of SD 93-9: Faculty Roles, Workloads,
and Rewards (Option 1/Option 2 Policy) was on the floor from the previous
session.

M. Downs moved to amend SD 96-17, under "Recommendations," item 1,
by adding in the first sentence the following phrase: [The present
policy] (SD 93-9), as amended in the document accompanying this report,
continue [until replaced by a new faculty workload policy...]. Seconded.

J. Wilson asked if the motion was in order.

W. Frederick ruled that it was.

J. Wilson asked that editorial revisions be made to SD 96-17
taking out references to Option 1/Option 2 Faculty. The editorial
revisions were accepted.

R. Hess appealed the decision of the chair.

The decision of the chair was upheld on a show of hands.

M. Lane moved to amend SD 93-9, attached to SD 96-17, by substituting the word "year's" with the word "semester's." Seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

The motion to amend passed on a show of hands.

Motion to approve SD 96-17, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

9. Committee reports "for information only"

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-30) - M. H. Thuyente:

Senate Reference No. 96-30 is now Senate Document SD 96-17 and was considered under "new business."

b. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 96-31) - M. Nusbaumer:

Arts M. Nusbaumer presented SR No. 96-31 (Proposal for an Associate of Degree) for information only.

c. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-32) - S. Hollander:

Senate S. Hollander presented SR No. 96-32 (End-of-the-Year Reports of Committees and Subcommittees) for information only.

d. Agenda Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-33) - S. Hollander:

S. Hollander presented SR No. 96-33 (Senators for 1997-1998) for information only.

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 96-34) - B. Bulmahn:

B. Bulmahn presented SR No. 96-34 (Transmittal of the report of the Distance Education Subcommittee) for information only.

f. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 96-35) - R. Barrett:

D. Thuyente presented SR No. 96-35 (Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee

Recommendations for the 1997-1998 Budgetary Year). He made one editorial change by deleting in bullet 6 the words in parentheses: (by as much as \$10,000 per year for full professors at IUPUI).

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: I have two items I would like to call to the attention of the body. One is the Library Fund Drive. We have received responses from a considerable number of faculty, but we haven't received responses from an even more considerable number of the faculty. We are going to send out reminders. We are going to send out duplicate pledge sheets so that faculty have a chance to respond and, ultimately, and I utter this threat with great seriousness, we may even call you and ask you to consider giving to the library, which is much in need. I can tell you that from the faculty who have thus far made commitments, we have pledges that total more than \$40,000. If we can get the same kind of response from the faculty who have yet to respond, we will probably raise something in excess of the goal we have set for ourselves. I would like to encourage everybody to consider this good cause and respond generously. As a sideline to this, it is my pleasure to announce that President Beering has made a contribution to this drive and, if people who have not yet responded respond at the level that he did, the faculty part of the drive will be very successful. President Beering has very little occasion to use our library to support his research or even for pleasure. If he can be generous, I expect, I think reasonably, that faculty here who use this library can do likewise. I hope that you will.

The second item has to do with the answer which the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs gave to the question I asked about the Edutech report on C&DP. I found his report less than forthcoming in regard to many of the Edutech recommendations. The Vice Chancellor dealt primarily with only one recommendation, the formation of the committees, which is only now taking place. Many of the recommendations from the outside consultants involved a timeline. The committees were to be established in January. Questionnaires measuring the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of faculty with the operation were to be distributed this spring. Many of us are aware as well that Edutech also made informal recommendations regarding C&DP which were thought essential for its improvement. I would like to ask the Vice Chancellor if there is any more that he can tell us about the Edutech report than he mentioned during question time.

W. Branson: I would be happy to address that issue. That is a very good question from Senator Downs. I got feedback from other individuals that maybe my response wasn't detailed enough and I didn't address enough points. I would like to go through the Edutech report and address their recommendations and some of the things we have been doing, and then talk about some things beyond Edutech that we have also been doing to try to address both information technology on this campus as well as C&DP.

Edutech's first recommendation was to establish a high-level Information Technology Policy Committee. After reviewing the report,

we came up with the charge of the committee. That committee has met. It did take longer than we wanted it to. With the various groups that needed to be consulted, we felt like it was more important to do that rather than to rush into this. That particular committee is made up of the vice chancellors plus representatives from various areas across campus. It really is intended to be a policy-level committee. They will also function to help more specifically with C&DP's priorities, but also look at information technology priorities over the entire campus.

They also recommended that we have administrative and academic computing advisory committees. Those are more working committees and report up through the main committee. Again, they selected individuals to sit on those committees who represent various constituencies across campus. We hope that those committees will function to communicate back to their constituencies what is being done, discussed, and being looked at in terms of information technology at IPFW. The administrative committee has met. We have already planned the second meeting of that administrative committee and the academic committee will probably be meeting sometime during the week after next.

The third recommendation was to change the name of C&DP. That hasn't been a priority with me, frankly, because I don't want people to say we changed the name and nothing else happened. We need to look at that. We need to come up with a name that is descriptive of what that department's functions will be in the future.

The fourth recommendation was to set up service-level agreements. We haven't done that to the degree of formality that they're suggesting. What we have done with several major installations is to establish expectation between C&DP and the users in terms of what is supposed to happen. Who is responsible for what? If there are problems, how do they get handled? A couple of examples are a major installation we did in Medical Education and an open lab we just opened in Engineering and Technology. We also did that, somewhat, with the web server establishment since the Webmaster resides outside of C&DP. It has been suggested that one of the things we need to do with these service agreements is to establish a monitoring system so that we can keep records and make sure that we are obtaining the expected level of service. I think that is very important.

The fifth recommendation was to establish formal feedback. We have been developing a survey, but we would like to have the input of the Information Technology Policy Committee. We will present that survey to them at their next meeting. I think that is very important because we really do need to hear the feedback and get that from our users.

The sixth recommendation was to concentrate on faculty outreach. Within the resources we have we have been trying to beef up Bill Baden's role. We have also gotten Mary Schoeler involved much more in faculty outreach and user outreach activities. That area is one we need to continue to focus on and see if we can't do more to continue this outreach and increase those outreach efforts.

Add staff and adjust salaries was another recommendation. They also recommended that we create dual reporting roles for some of the staff. With what we can do within the budget, we are trying to add additional

staff and address some salary issues where we are losing great numbers of people because of market pressures. Just as important, and I talked about this last time, is where in the faculty computer installations we spent a great deal of time working with other information technology staff across the campus. We actually used them to do installations and do some of the support necessary for those computers to be installed. This benefits both C&DP and the technology staff who have an opportunity to learn the network, learn C&DP standards and, when they are working with their systems, it will help them to understand how their systems interrelate better. In addition, it is a great benefit for the folks in C&DP because they learn what those other information technology staff are doing and some of their specific needs.

We also worked real closely with Transitional Studies when we upgraded their computer lab. In essence, we did some very extensive cross-training with the information technology staff in Transitional Studies and C&DP folks because we wanted their servers to look like C&DP servers so that, if they had problems, we could help them; and, frankly, if we had problems they would be available to help us also. That was a very successful venture.

Their ninth recommendation was to create a strategic plan for information technology. I think that plan needs to start from C&DP. I am viewing that more as a campus-wide plan and that really will be one of the charges of the policy committee to come up with a detailed plan.

Create a detailed implementation plan for SIS. When Edutech came Peggy Lane had just started as project leader for SIS. We were just in the throws of making that transition. My reading of Peggy's report is that things are going very well and that we are moving along on implementation plans. We also involved Bill Frederick and Bill Ludwin on that implementation committee to make sure that we were getting academic input into the process. My understanding is that their next thrust will be to focus on history, and that will open the door for a lot of other improvements to that system.

Their final recommendation was to increase funding levels for information technology at IPFW. We have attempted to address that in one way in a legislative request this year. If the legislature looks favorable and does fund some of the quality improvement money that was requested for technology, that would be available as prioritized across campus.

Beyond the Edutech report we have done two or three things in C&DP that I think are significant. We have increased the training offerings due to some user input. I hope that is being well-received. There are some areas that we still need to offer some additional training in and we are identifying those and bringing out ways to offer that. We have also increased the help-desk hours to match more closely the office times of some of the offices on campus. And we are trying to use some of the computer operators to work at the help desk to replace some of the student help that is out there right now. The goal there is to increase the level of expertise at the help desk. All we can do is see if that is working or not.

Finally, up in C&DP we have really been working hard to increase customer interaction. I talked a little bit about Bill Baden and Mary

Schoeler. We have them as well as Ron Cigna spending more time with the customers trying to assess and to understand expectations of the customers.

Beyond C&DP there are a couple of things I have been doing in Financial Affairs that impact this indirectly--actually, more directly than indirectly. We are currently in the middle of a very massive customer-service training program for all of Financial Affairs folks. C&DP is certainly included in that. We also started a quality improvement/process improvement project where we are going to recognize formally and reward, I hope, in at least some small way, individuals for their efforts in improving quality or making quality improvements to the projects.

I am not trying to paint a rosy picture and say we are doing everything and all is well. I think there are a lot of issues that we still need to be addressing very aggressively. We are trying to do that. I guess the picture I am trying to paint is that there are a lot of individuals, and now a lot of committees, working very diligently to address some of the issues. As much as I can I guarantee that improvements are coming. We will continue to do everything we can to address information technology issues across campus.

S. Hollander: It is a long-standing tradition in this body at its last meeting of the year to express appreciation of Barbara Blauvelt, secretary of the faculty. I know I couldn't have done my job as chair of the Agenda Committee this year without her. I suspect that most, if not all of the people in this room, have called her repeatedly with stupid questions and have gotten intelligent answers. I ask that we show our appreciation to Ms. Blauvelt.

W. Frederick: I would also like to extend my thanks to the Parliamentarian, Mitch Sherr, and to the Sergeant-at-Arms, Nash Younis.

11. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt, Secretary