

Minutes of the  
First Regular Meeting of the Twenty-First Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne

September 10, 2001

12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 16, 2001
3. Acceptance of the agenda – P. Hamburger
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Indiana University - B. Fife
  - b. Purdue University – P. Hamburger
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 01-1) - L. Wright-Bower
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 01-1) – D. Oberstar
7. Question Time (SR No. 01-2)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
  - Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 01-3) – M. Codispoti
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: L. Wright-Bower

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Njock Libii

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

H. Abu-Mulaweh, J. Bausser, M. Bookout, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, C. Carlson, C. Champion, M. Codispoti, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, S. Davis, L. DeFonso, W. DeMott, C. Erickson, B. Fife, L. Fox, R. Friedman, J. Grant, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, L. Hite, S. Isiorho, R. Kashyap, M. Kimble, J. Knight, J. Lutz, D. Marshall, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, B. Parke, J. Purse-Wiedenhoft, D. Ross, R. Sedlmeyer, K. Squadrito, J. Tankel, D. Townsend, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

B. Abbott, E. Blakemore, W. Branson, J. Brennan, G. Campbell-Whatley, C. Chauhan,  
E. Neal, A. Pugh

Vacancies: 1 BMS, 1 VART, 1 ENGL

Attachment:

["Promotion and Tenure Procedures document for the Division of Organizational Leadership and Supervision"](#) (SD 01-1)

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, J. Banks, J. Clausen, G. Hickey, J. Hrehov, J. Jones, T. Guthrie, D. Legg,  
D. McCants, R. Wiener

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, M. Gruss, P. McLaughlin, M. Mellinger, J. Messier

#### Acta

1. Call to order: L. Wright-Bower called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 16, 2001: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

P. Hamburger moved to amend the agenda by adding SD 01-1 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures document for the Division of Organizational Leadership and Supervision) under "committee reports requiring action." Seconded.

The motion to amend passed on a voice vote

The agenda was approved, as amended.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Indiana University:

B. Fife: I would like to welcome everyone back for another academic year at IPFW. This promises to be a challenging year on many substantive fronts, and I hope that we can collaborate to effectuate progressive and positive changes in the campus community.

Last year it seemed that the Division I issue dominated our focus for much of the year. Thus far this calendar year, it has been *Corpus Christi*. We can all be proud of the manner in which censorship was rebuffed and academic freedom and free speech prevailed. Simply put, we did the right thing in spite of a great deal of resistance.

There is one specific issue that I would like to call attention to since I have the floor. The issue, in my opinion, is one of the most serious faculty issues on this campus and it requires immediate action. Faculty salaries at IPFW are not what they should be, and I doubt that any reasonable person would suggest otherwise and be able to defend the premise with concrete data. Every biennium results in a fairly predictable scenario—incremental change in higher-education spending in Indiana. Thus, if we are really going to prioritize the issue of faculty salaries at IPFW, we need more of a plan than relying exclusively on the Indiana legislature. This, in and of itself, will not remedy the problems associated with low salaries. This is not to suggest, however, that I am being critical of the administration for its effort in lobbying the Indiana legislature. It is my general perception that there is a sustained, ongoing effort to make legislators, especially those from northeast Indiana, aware of the funding shortcomings at IPFW. Indeed, such efforts should continue and they are very important to the long-term growth of this campus.

In any organization human resources must be a top priority. One concrete measure of putting people first is compensation. Like it or not, compensation levels have a profound effect on one's life and the choices that can and cannot be made. Compensation levels also have a significant impact on retirement as well.

This past summer, President Myles Brand reported to the public that much of the tuition increase at IUB would go to enhance faculty salaries, which in his estimation were below par at comparable institutions. Such a proactive approach to salary compression is commendable and undoubtedly a very positive initial step to addressing a very real human issue. The positive impact on faculty morale of such an endeavor is undoubtedly immeasurable.

In response to a misinformed letter to the editor in *The News Sentinel* earlier this summer, Professor Hannah wrote an account which delineated some of the excellent work conducted by faculty at IPFW. She reported that “By any measure, IPFW is an important intellectual resource for Fort Wayne and northeast Indiana.” Her premise was that IPFW's academic record is beyond reproach. I quite agree with her conclusion.

I sincerely hope that during this academic year and beyond, faculty salaries are at the forefront of the policy agenda. The time to address this onerous problem in a comprehensive manner is past due. By investing in people now, we can help to ensure the long-term viability and prosperity of this very fine academic institution.

b. Purdue University:

P. Hamburger: President Jischke will be on campus on October 2. He wants to meet with faculty leaders between 2:00 and 3:00 p.m. There will be a reception for faculty. Information regarding this reception will be distributed by the Chancellor's office.

There will be changes in the health premiums and benefits and that will be provided to the Board of Trustees on September 21. When we have all the details, I will report again.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 01-1) - L. Wright-Bower:

L. Wright-Bower asked Senators to introduce themselves and their departmental affiliation. She also introduced the officers of the Senate.

L. Wright-Bower: S. Hartman has graciously agreed to procure a gavel for our meetings. As you meet in your committees, please make sure you notify Barb Blauvelt who the chairs are. That should be taken care of soon. Please also send copies of your minutes to Barb so that they can be put up on the web. I also remind you that the calendar is a little different for this month. Should we need to have a second meeting, it will be on Monday, September 24. Next Monday, September 17, in the Williams Theatre, there will be a celebration of life ceremony for Les Motz who passed away last spring.

6. Committee reports requiring action – Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 01-1) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 01-1 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures document for the Division of Organizational Leadership and Supervision). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 01-1 passed on a voice vote.

7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 01-2):

**Please explain the process and criteria for giving the Chancellor's Award as a salary increment to faculty on the IPFW campus. What are the criteria for consideration? What is the process of application? How are faculty notified of the relevant dates/deadlines for the application process**

S. Hannah: I can answer the questions best by describing the overall faculty salary increment process at IPFW, with specific reference to the process as it unfolded this past spring. As you know, Purdue University requires that all salary increases be based on merit, considering equity in appropriate cases. The entire increment process at IPFW is based on this premise.

The process begins when the next year's budget is finalized and a percentage salary increase number is fixed. Since this was a biennial budget year, we did not know exactly what that number was until fairly late in the process, sometime in early March. At that point, the projected University budget included a three percent (3%) salary increase for 2001-02. Academic Affairs thus received an allocation equal to 3% of our salary base as did the other university divisions. In the three years I have been at IPFW, the allocation has varied from three to four percent.

As in the past, the VCAA held a quarter percent (.25%) and distributed the remaining 2.75 percent (2.75%) to each school or other academic unit for allocation.

In turn, each dean held back another quarter percent (.25%), distributing 2.5 percent (2.5%) to each department.

Departments then followed their own policies and practices in recommending how their allocated amount should be distributed among the faculty. By and large, departments use their promotion and tenure criteria and the annual productivity report for making these determinations. Department chairs then submit a list of the salary increment recommendations for each faculty member in their department to their dean.

Chairs also submitted recommendations for special merit or equity awards to be made from the deans' .25% merit fund. Deans reviewed the department recommendations and allocated their .25% in response to chair requests.

At this point (this year the due date was March 15), deans forward the departmental and school recommendations, together with a rank ordered list of recommendations for additional merit or equity awards to be funded from the VCAA's .25% merit pool.

At the VCAA level, I review these lists with each dean and make the VCAA merit/equity awards, generally in increments of \$500. Every year I have run out of money before I run out of names.

For the past two years, the deans have also been asked to submit recommendations for exceptional merit or equity awards to be made from a special fund allocated by the Chancellor in order to increase the funding available for salary increments. The specific criteria for these exceptional merit/equity awards are determined by each dean. In general terms, however, the deans were asked to recommend the "top 10 percent" of their faculty, plus any significant equity cases.

I then consulted with each dean on their list of the "top 10 percent" and forwarded a list of 40 names (a very generous 10% in a faculty of 320!) to the Chancellor.

The Chancellor funded the recommended list exactly as I presented it to him. He agreed to fund the full list of 40, without asking me to develop any further ranking. I did make a few amount adjustments to come within his budget, but the list of names was unchanged. Note that the actual award amount was not determined until late in the review process given the uncertainties in the state budget process.

Each faculty member should have received a salary letter in early July, stating exactly what their 2001-02 salary would be and identifying the sources of any increments.

The process has followed essentially these same steps for the past several years—certainly the three years I've been here. The addition of the exceptional merit/equity award funded by the Chancellor the last two years was a welcome opportunity to recognize outstanding accomplishment and address equity issues beyond our ability to handle within the usual increment allocation. There is absolutely no guarantee that we will have such an opportunity again.

If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

8. New business:

M. Nusbaumer moved to approve the following resolution: The Fort Wayne Senate supports the university's defense of the principles of academic freedom in the production of the play *Corpus Christi*. Seconded.

Motion to approve passed on a voice vote.

9. Committee reports "for information only" – (Senate Reference No. 01-3):

SR No. 01-3 (Proposal for a *Bachelor of Science in Human Services* from the School of Health Sciences) was presented for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

D. Ross: The Student Affairs Committee has two vacancies. If anyone here is willing to serve, please contact me.

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to note, again, that the temporary parking lot down by the river remains in existence.

S. Hannah: Deborah Conklin has been appointed the Executive Director of Continuing Studies effective immediately. She was the unanimous choice of a hardworking search committee and I thank everyone who participated in that process. I congratulate Deborah and pledge her my support.

I would also like to remind you that there is a lecture by Alan Sandstrom, outstanding researcher, on Thursday at 3:30.

M. Wartell: Tomorrow night Rulon Gardner is speaking as part of the Omnibus Lecture Series.

L. Wright-Bower: If there are no other short announcements, we'll move on to discussion of the Strategic Plan.

P. Hamburger: This is a draft of the Strategic Plan for discussion only. Our final plan will be approved by the Purdue University Board of Trustees on November 4.

L. Wright-Bower: There are two other hearings scheduled also: One is Wednesday, September 12, at noon, and the other is Thursday, September 20, from 3:00-4:15 p.m. in Kettler 146.

B. Fife: I have a number of questions, but I think the most substantive involves the money. I would like to know how the \$3 million figure was derived for providing competitive salary levels and salary equity. Will the \$74.8 million for capital projects make it more difficult to enhance salaries given the fact that when we engage in capital fund

projects we enhance our debt and increase our physical plant expenditures? I would like to know specifically how the \$3 million figure was derived and to what extent—let's say that was given across the board—it would enhance faculty salaries on this campus?

J. Dahl: That number is a rounded result from a prior comparison of CUPA data to IPFW data. We will be undertaking a more current review of salary data this fall. I do believe it would be an adequate amount to address potentially all of the discrepancies between IPFW salaries and national averages.

If I could go on to respond to the second part of the question. The capital budgeting process and the annual appropriation or operating budget process are entirely separate. With a few exceptions in the last biennial budget, which are related to specific cases and justifications for them, the state in the first part provides authorization, in the second part provides fee replacement monies, and in the third part provides plant expansion funds for operation of the facilities. So you can see there is an aura of interplay between operations and capital-related expenditures. There is no direct link.

B. Fife: Specifically, let's say we allocated the \$3 million figure which is still in the planning process. How much, if you factor in social security and retirement, would that enhance faculty salaries if that were allocated across the board? What percent would the increase be?

S. Hannah: If we took the average by rank and compared it to the average CUPA data by rank--and that is where the number came from--I would have to go back and do a lot more division. It was just a ballpark number. If you don't like this number and want it bigger, we can put it down if you have some kind of rationale for it. And if you have a suggestion for the rationale, since you're on the strategic planning committee anyway, you have plenty of opportunity to submit that.

B. Fife: I certainly understand the source of the information. Again, I would like to know and I think it would be an important part of the campus dialogue. We should know how much that will enhance the status quo now, and then we can see whether the \$3 million figure is one that people will feel comfortable with or not.

J. Grant: If we set aside the money that they allocated to buildings, there are only two other categories in which there is funding that is not coming from the state. Everything else is going to rely on an increase in funding and, given that state funding is already inadequate, it casts some kind of question over the strategic plan. And that's not to say that the plan itself is not worthy. . . .

S. Hannah: I don't read it that way at all. You're way ahead, I think, of the Strategic Planning Committee. If you will notice, there is a column here that says grants and other sources. We haven't done a very good job of going through there and pulling out what would be funded through a capital campaign, through gifts, through grants. We have been taking some direction from Dr. Rab Mukerjea, who works with Purdue's strategic planning process, who has a lot of suggestions, and shall I say criticisms, about the way we put this together.

He suggested another way to present it. . . . This was just a list and I think you're giving it more credit than it deserves. Suggestions about the amounts are very good. Other folks have suggested things that aren't on here that should be. And we need to give some very, very hard thought as to where that money will come from. Do we propose a capital campaign? Do we look for grant money for a lot of the technology support? Do we look for donors for endowed chair positions? We have not gotten there yet.

L. Wright-Bower: Part of strategic planning is setting the bar. Where do you want the bar to be? How much money do we want? Where do we want to go? And then, after the plan is approved, we start dealing with the operational issues and the action plans and the nitty gritty. So it is not that it hasn't been addressed very well. It is not time to deal with that step quite yet.

M. Wartell: But I think that Senator Grant brings up a really important issue. That is that fundamentally, unless I am missing something really big, there are only three sources for recurring monies. One is state allocation--and that might not be that permanent in light of state budgets these days and our financial picture--and the second is tuition. We have the option of raising or lowering tuition. Lowering doesn't happen very often. And the third is endowment. This institution has a larger endowment than many institutions of its kind: we're something near \$22 million, I believe. We started out, when I came here, with an endowment between \$3-4 million dollars. So we are growing that endowment. On the other hand, those are very difficult funds to come by. State funds may become very difficult. Tuition funds we have a little bit of control over, but in hard economic times it is going to be very hard to justify raising tuition very much. So there is going to be a great deal of prioritization that needs to be done with the strategic plan. Senator Fife's point is right: catching up with national averages in terms of faculty salaries is not going to be a trivial undertaking. We pushed as much as we could this year with so-called "Chancellor's merit funds" and we will continue to try to do that. But as Vice Chancellor Hannah pointed out, that may not be a trivial undertaking either. I don't mean to paint a bleak picture, but the picture isn't perfect right now. Strategic planning helps us make some of those decisions. You have an opportunity to be an integral part of that now. I look around and I see a number of members of the strategic planning committee: Senators DeFonso, Hamburger, Fife, Oberstar, Hite, and Wright-Bower. So, this is a process. What we are trying to do, I think, is to inform everybody as best we can. As Senator Fife pointed out, salaries are a very important part of that. It is an issue of self worth.

M. Nusbaumer: On the last page of this document it talks about the establishment of a standing committee. I very much would like to see the Senate elect those people and participate as fully as possible. I am suggesting that the Senate support the Senate's election of representatives to that committee and participate as fully as it possibly can.

K. Squadrito: Do you know if any of the money the state makes on the powerball goes to education at all?

M. Wartell: We have certainly gotten some of it. It has come through Build Indiana Funds. Some of our representatives have been very generous with funds they've allocated to



us--Representatives Goeglein, GiaQuinta, Moses and there is a fourth one, I believe. That is the money the legislators have been allocating to help us. There was just a meeting of the state budget committee in which a small amount of that funding was allocated for this year, but the rest of it was put on hold because of the bleakness of the income outlook for the state.

K. Squadrito: Since our state gambles and all this gambling is going on, would it be illegal for IPFW to take a couple bucks out of general funds and buy a couple of powerball tickets?

K. Wartell: That's really faith-based funding.

S. Davis: On page 19, items 3 and 4, are these in priority order? Would the upgrades for classrooms in Kettler be part of this Kettler Hall item? Every year I come in here, there are fewer seats for us to sit in. What does some of these include?

M. Wartell: With respect to buildings, especially when they will be partly privately funded, the priority will depend on when we can garner the private funds. The music building is a good example of that. If someone turns around and hands us \$6 or \$7 million within the next couple of months, that music building will become an incredible priority. The remodeling of Kettler is totally on state funds. Remember that two building projects that we put in for the last biennium were Helmke Library and Kettler Hall. You see those as very high priority, but those aren't supported by private funds at all.

S. Davis: A lot of schools sell the naming of their rooms.

M. Wartell: We do that as well. But some rooms in some buildings are easier to sell than others.

D. Townsend: I like the straightforward, clear-cut wording under goal 2, no. 5: recognize and reward outstanding achievement in research. But when I looked for equivalent wording under teaching, I didn't see it there.

L. Wright-Bower: That recommendation was made by the CELT group also.

L. Wright-Bower: Any other statements concerning the general good and welfare?

M. Wartell: I want to return to this summer's controversy for just a second. I want to remind everybody that this campus has an incredibly diverse range of activities. The campus supports them on a viewpoint-neutral or content-neutral basis. We don't advocate; we don't denigrate. We simply are supportive of them. We have campus ministries on campus; we have Catholic masses; we have prayer groups; we have an invocation and a benediction at Commencement. And we have *Corpus Christi*. And we have a pagan group on campus, I believe. All of those things exist. The slippery slope that Professor Nusbaumer mentioned--I'm not so sure it was spiraling--but the slippery slope is that if we choose one or another of those to support, or we let anybody else to choose one of those to support, where do we stop? The next thing is a book, a concept in one of your classes, or a number of your

classes. We're a university. So, folks, I really appreciate the support that you've given the administration with your resolution. And we respect the single dissent as well. But we are a university and we will continue to try to act like one and we will continue to take the high road because it--I don't want to say never because that's an awfully strong word--but it never pays to attack anyone personally. And there were a lot of personal attacks that went on in this. We were guilty of none of them. At least I believe we were guilty of none of them. Thank you and I hope that you are as proud of this university as I am because I think everybody acted very well in this situation.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Barbara L. Blauvelt

Secretary of the Faculty