

Minutes of the
First Regular Meeting of the Third Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
September 12 and 19, 1983
Noon, KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 11 and 18, 1983
3. Acceptance of the agenda
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - J. Lantz
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 83-1) - J. Stauffer
7. New business
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - a. Agenda Committee - E. Coufoudakis
 - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 83-2) - J. Haw
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Memorial resolutions
11. Adjournment

Session I (September 12)

Senate Members Present:

R. Barrett, D. Bialik, K. Bordens, D. Bowers, J. Brennan, W. Bruening, J. Bundschuh, D. Cannon, J. Carnaghi, F. Codispoti, E. Coufoudakis, M. Crill, M. Downs, R. Emery, N. Fincher, L. Fox, W. Frederick, J. Giusti, E. Goebel, J. Haw, J. Heine, L. Hess, S. Hollander, W. Kolb, J. Lantz, G. Leddick, E. Leonard, J. Lichti, M. Lipman, D. McAleece, G. McCullough, M. Miller, J. Moore, E. Nicholson, M. Nusbaumer, J. Owen, R. Pippert, M. Richeson, S. Rickert, J. Rodriguez, W. Schlacks, J. Smulkstys, J. Stauffer, D. Switzer, J. Sunderman, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

S. Beering, T. Guthrie, E. Haglund, J. Ryan, C. Steeg, J. Ulmer, J. Violette, R. Wall

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Attachments:

"Campus Parking (for information only)," University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 83-4)

"Memorial Resolution for DeWayne A. Stonebarger" (Senate Reference No. 83-5)

"Memorial Resolution for William F. Erbeding" (Senate Reference No. 83-6)

Faculty Members Present:

A. Dirkes, K. Balthaser, L. Balthaser (assoc. fac.)

Visitors Present:

J. Chapman, T. Harris, D. Katter, M. Roeger, M. Shady, D. Worthley

Acta

1. Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 11 and 18, 1983: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

E. Coufoudakis moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. M. Downs had no report.

b. J. Lantz reported the following:

(1) A conflict-of-interest statement is being prepared and employees of Purdue University who have financial interests in outside companies which do business with the university will be asked to complete a conflict-of-interest statement.

(2) The Board of Trustees approved the merger of the Communications Department and the Theatre Department at IPFW. They also approved the amendments to the regional campus autonomy document and have renamed Alfred W. Kettler a director of the Indiana-Purdue Foundation.

(3) Vice President Ford has not recommended the proposed reciprocal fee remission at this time. A copy of his letter is available in J. Lantz's office.

(4) A request from a colleague has been received to discuss, at the Inter-campus Faculty Council, the coordination of conference travel. The query will be brought up at the first meeting of the council.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Giusti welcomed back returning Senators and introduced the newly elected Senators and the representatives from Medical Education and the School of Dentistry. He also

introduced M. Mansfield as the new parliamentarian and thanked D. Onwood for his service last year. J. Lantz was welcomed as the new Purdue University Speaker and A. Finco was thanked for his contributions to the Senate last year. B. Blauvelt was welcomed as the Secretary of the Faculty again this year.

J. Giusti announced that enrollments are up this year. Official figures will be announced by Indiana University. The figures should show that IPFW was one of the few campuses experiencing a significant growth in enrollments--and in parking problems. "There are plans," J. Giusti said, "to expand parking Lot 10--much to [his] dismay." He said that J. Carnaghi had informed him that West Lafayette engineers and architects have been on campus, have studied the parking problem very closely, and this is their recommendation. Also under consideration is the possibility of moving the flagpole a few yards to the south to allow three lanes to go around the Kettler Hall circle, eliminating the parking meters. The parking meters would be moved to the first row of Lot 10.

J. Giusti commented on several items pending from last year's Senate:

- a. SD 82-11 (Tuition Fee Courtesy): The Senate petitioned the presidents of both universities to ask their respective fringe benefits committees to develop a reciprocal fee-courtesy program with eventual reciprocity among all state institutions of higher education. The document is still on S. Beering's desk, and a response is still awaited
- b. SD 82-14 (FWSD-76-20, Promotion & Tenure Policies, Criteria and Procedures): SD 82-14, approved by the Senate last spring, is under consideration by West Lafayette. Several Purdue faculty are concerned about the liability produced by the document. S. Beering has been made aware of their concern.
- c. SD 82-2 (Academic Appeals Policy): Letters from both presidents have been received approving IPFW's Academic Appeals Policy. Because the document stipulated approval by the boards of trustees, the document will have to be approved by the Senate before implementation.
- d. SD 82-1 (Athletic Conference Membership) and SD 82-5 (Great Lakes Valley Conference Membership): Application for membership in the Great Lakes Valley Conference has been filed.

The Fall Semester Faculty Convocation will be held on September 20 at 3:00 p.m. in Neff 101. S. Beering will be the guest speaker.

There is some confusion about an article that appeared in the last Intercom. The article reported that the IPFW Foundation holds 92 acres. IPFW has a 420-acre campus. The campus acreage is divided up among the IPFW Foundation, the City of Fort Wayne, the County Commissioners and Purdue University.

J. Giusti asked for questions and comments:

F. Codispoti asked if a study was being done to understand the increase in enrollments this semester so as to intelligently plan for future semesters.

J. Giusti asked E. Nicholson to respond to F. Codispoti's question, but mentioned that they were expecting just over 10,000 students this semester, not 10,476. He said he felt several things may have contributed to the increase, including "much better counseling."

E. Nicholson added that he has asked F. Kenworthy "to do this very thing that you [F. Codispoti] have asked for, i.e., see if we can't identify the reasons for the uptick in enrollment and see if we are going to have a permanent trend-up. I doubt if it is a permanent trend. I suspect part of it might be a permanent increase in enrollment. All other signs indicate a leveling-off of enrollment. Enrollment statistics that I saw just this morning indicate that we have more students at the freshman level than anticipated. We have fewer transfers off our campus and perhaps a few more transfers onto this campus. But I may come back and change that analysis after we look at some of the other data. . . ."

M. Downs asked at what point and to what degree appropriate faculty committees were involved in the decision to enlarge Lot 10. J. Carnaghi indicated the parking problem had developed the last two days of registration week. He said that during the first week of classes there were 300 cars parked illegally--on the grass, on sidewalks, under trees, etc.--and now there are approximately 200 cars parked illegally, with 60 empty stalls in the far north parking lot. He said he had received petitions with a thousand names on them from students asking for more parking. He said, "There are parking problems and we have to deal with them."

In addition to having more students, J. Carnaghi said students are staying on campus longer (use of the gymnasium is up 33% and FTE credit hours per student are up). He added: "The first group we went to was the engineering group at West Lafayette who deal with these kinds of things. We asked for advice on what we can do immediately to solve the problem as well as help us begin working on a long-term plan. The immediate solution has come in; the long-term plan is being worked on. Second, we went to the cabinet and explained to them what the proposition was, and last Tuesday afternoon was the first meeting of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), which I took the proposal to. "

In response to a question by E. Leonard, J. Carnaghi said there were 70-plus bicycles and 60-plus motorcycles parked that morning. Additional racks and pads had been added the past summer.

J. Smulkstys indicated that he felt the parking problem may be "basically an enforcement problem" if there are vacancies in the far north parking lot.

J. Carnaghi said he had announced that tickets would not be given except for cars parked illegally in handicapped areas, fire zones, loading zones, meters, and A parking lots until there is more parking available.

J. Smulkstys added: "I don't have the solution to the problem, but I think most of us appreciate very much the Chancellor's work in the beautification of the campus. . . . If we build an additional parking lot by the river, it will really create a very negative impression and will destroy that view of the river. Second, if we add a third lane . . . I think we will increase the traffic flow through the campus . . . by nonmembers of the university community. . . . If this plan is to facilitate the traffic flow for people who are not on campus, I am opposed to that [plan]. . . ."

J. Carnaghi responded: "I think there are two distinct problems. First, parking. I think what we are proposing does best accommodate the students. The lot that gets filled first is Lot 10. It is heavily used by students, it is centrally located, and it serves its purpose for all. The second issue, the three lanes in front of Kettler Hall, is under study, and I am sure that URPC will spend much of this year looking at that. . . . But I have to also admit that when people are coming through, many of them are our people as well as townspeople cutting through getting to work."

J. Owen asked if across-the-river parking was a dead issue.

J. Carnaghi said as many as 12 cars have parked across the river, and that there are spaces for 80 cars. He added that they were not insensitive to destroying green grass, but the proposal is the best for "doing something quickly and putting students where they want to park." He said there are plans to build parking lots near the gymnasium in the future, but that there is a water-table problem there.

In response to a question by E. Coufoudakis, J. Carnaghi said the proposed extension of Lot 10 would be about 300 feet.

D. Cannon commented that he had never had trouble getting into Lot 1 at any time of the day. J. Carnaghi said he had been there about five times and the lot was filled except for one or two stalls.

W. Frederick asked for someone from the URPC to comment on that committee's involvement in this proposal.

J. Sunderman said the same information had been presented to the URPC as had just been presented to the Senate. He said they talked about small-car parking lots and parking buildings in addition to the extension of Lot 10.

J. Giusti thanked the body for their interest and apparent pride in IPFW, and for their suggestions and possible solutions to the problem. He explained that the proposed extension of Lot 10 would "virtually wipe out the remaining space that you see [to Coliseum Boulevard]." He said he has asked J. Ulmer to undertake a study on organized carpooling.

6. Committee reports requiring action: Nominations and Elections Committee Senate Reference No. 83-1- J. Stauffer:

Election results of the Accelerated High School Studies Advisory Subcommittee re as follows:

Arts and Letters
Sylvia Neely, 1983-84

Science and Humanities
Rudy Svoboda, 1983-86

Professional Studies
Ann Dirkes, 1983-85

Engineering, Technology, & Nursing
Elaine Cowen, 1983-86

7. New business:

M. Lipman moved the following resolution:

WHEREAS

There exists a current and extreme shortage of parking spaces at the University, which necessitates a quick solution, and

WHEREAS

It is the purview of the faculty, via the University Resources Policy Committee, to make recommendations to the Chancellor concern-ing the optimal utilization of all physical facilities of the University, including parking, and

WHEREAS

The faculty, via the University Resources Policy Committee, was not properly consulted prior to the administration's decision to build a new parking lot adjacent to Lot 10,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

The faculty recommends to the Chancellor that the current parking problem be relieved by the rapid construction of a temporary parking lot in the immediate vicinity of the Multipurpose Building and the new athletic fields,

AND THAT

The faculty recommend to the Chancellor that the University Resources Policy Committee be properly consulted prior to the planning of any additional permanent parking facilities on campus.

Seconded.

W. Frederick moved the previous question. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

M. Lipman's motion passed on a voice vote.

The meeting recessed at 1:30 p.m.

Session II (September 19)

Senate Members Present:

D. Bialik, K. Bordens, D. Bowers, J. Brennan, W. Bruening, J. Bundschuh, D. Cannon, J. Carnaghi, F. Codispoti, E. Coufoudakis, M. Crill, M. Downs, R. Emery, N. Fincher, L. Fox, W. Frederick, E. Goebel, T. Guthrie, E. Haglund, J. Haw, J. Heine, L. Hess, S. Hollander, W. Kolb, J. Lantz, G. Leddick, E. Leonard, J. Lichti, M. Lipman, D. McAleece, G. McCullough, J. Moore, E. Nicholson, M. Nusbaumer, J. Owen, R. Pippert, M. Richeson, S. Rickert, J. Rodriguez, W. Schlacks, J. Stauffer, D. Switzer, J. Sunderman, J. Ulmer, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

R. Barrett, S. Beering, J. Giusti, M. Miller, J. Ryan, J. Smulkstys, C. Steeg, J. Violette, R. Wall

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present:

K. Balthaser, L. Balthaser (assoc. faculty), W. Fredrick

Visitors Present:

J. Chapman, J. Clinton, T. Harris, S. Payne, A. Quinn, D. Worthley

Acta

E. Nicholson called the meeting to order at noon.

7. New business:

J. Stauffer announced the results of the election of the Accelerated High School Studies Advisory Subcommittee. (See item 6 above)

8. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Agenda Committee - E. Coufoudakis:

E. Coufoudakis announced that K. Balthaser had been granted speaking privileges in discussing the report on Continuing Education from the Educational Policy Committee.

b. Educational Policy Committee - J. Haw:

The Senate received the report from the Educational Policy Committee on Continuing Education.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

Discussion on the parking problem continued:

J. Sunderman said he felt the Senate may have acted hastily at the last Senate meeting in passing a judgment concerning the parking problem. He also said he felt "it may be possible that the motion that was presented and passed might have incorrectly implied that the University Resources Policy Committee was not being properly consulted in one way or another." He added that the URPC did meet, at the request of the Presiding Officer, after last week's Senate meeting. The results of the meeting are in the information memo distributed at the door. (See Senate Reference No. 83-4)

M. Downs asked M. Lipman to "refresh [the Senate's] memories as to his recollection of these events and his reason for making the motion at that meeting."

M. Lipman responded that "the purpose of the whereas states that the URPC was not properly consulted. Specifically, the problem was that a memorandum was circulated to the university at the same time, or immediately after, the committee was consulted, and it appeared that the administration had in fact made its decision prior to any recommendation from that committee. The committee was in fact consulted. . . . The purpose of the quite lengthy debate was to rate the merits of this resolution, and I certainly think the body spoke when the resolution was passed. The Presiding Officer then requested the committee to consider the question again, and I do not know whether or not that was proper since the Senate had already settled the issue. M. Lipman went on to explain his votes in the committee.

R. Barrett asked if it would be in order to make a motion to reconsider the Lipman resolution.

E. Nicholson ruled that the motion would not be in order.

S. Hollander asked if URPC discussed how much more it would cost to build a lot elsewhere than on a river bank, and how much additional time it would take.

J. Sunderman indicated figures concerning cost and length of time were provided to the committee.

J. Carnaghi added that costs were available to expand Lot 10, but that the estimated cost to expand Lot 1 was taken from figures when they expanded between Lots 1 and 2 the year before. He said no figures were available for the Chancellor's proposal because of the lack of specific information on the plan.

R. Pippert made the following observation: "It seems strange to me to have a recommendation coming from a committee to some individual or agency outside the Senate when the committee is a creature of the Senate and the Senate has acted on this. It seems that any recommendation contrary to the action of the Senate would be directed back to the Senate I don't understand how a creature of this body can essentially ignore an action taken by this body and make a different recommendation somewhere else. . . . And I guess in my mind the only weight that this would carry is that there is a group of people who disagree with what the Senate did."

R. Barrett appealed the decision of the chair not to entertain a motion concerning the Lipman resolution. Seconded.

E. Nicholson indicated his ruling was based on the Bylaws of the Senate which state that "No formal business may be conducted, nor action taken on any motion or resolution, before acceptance of the agenda or after the close of new business."

M. Downs said that he felt the Chancellor had received advice from all of the relevant sources--the Senate, the engineers from West Lafayette, URPC, and the students--and that "he should make a choice. And in making that choice he should read clearly what the intent of each of the bodies giving advice is." It is "clearly the intent of the Senate, as opposed to the intent of other bodies, that the parking lot be a temporary parking lot placed north of the Multipurpose Building; and that should be clear in the same way that it is clear the URPC . . . has suggested something different, and other people with a variety of insights . . . have suggested something else. I think we have gotten to the point where we don't really need to suggest it much longer, but allow the Chancellor to make his decision."

W. Frederick said he hoped "when other issues arise, academic issues, that we [the Senate] spend as much time in this body debating academic issues as we have parking lots. . . ." He added he "found it extremely annoying for an organ of this body to meet again contrary to the will of the body and pass a contradictory resolution. I would hope that that wouldn't happen again."

M. Downs responded: "I think that it's irregular, but I think that, in defense of the committee, this was a request which came from the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I am not persuaded that it was an entirely appropriate request at this point, because it raises questions as to what he hoped to accomplish by having the meeting. Perhaps a compromise. . . It does raise some questions as to the proper role of a Presiding Officer in relation to the committees of this body."

J. Sunderman said he felt the committee had acted properly. "We did meet partially at the request of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, but I can assure you that we would have met anyhow. . . . We certainly would have met again to make sure we were consulted. . . . I might also mention that a memo from a member of the Senate was sent to the Chancellor this week that stated, or implied, that our committee was not to report to the Chancellor, that we were a body of the Senate . . . that was supposed to report to the Senate. This was well-known to all of us on the committee. . . . The reason I brought this memo to the Senate was to provide information only. . . . I did send a memo from our committee to

the Chancellor summarizing the deliberations. . . . I would like to read from Senate Document 81-10, the Bylaws of the Senate, which state: 'that committees and subcommittees shall also report to the Senate at the Senate's request, . . . as requested by the Agenda Committee, . . . or on their own initiative. . . .' This is the reason that we reported to the Senate today. 'And may give information concerning their activities to the Chancellor, to any Faculty unit, or to any Fort Wayne campus committee, subcommittee, or council.' I think we would have been derelict in our duty if we had not provided information from our committee to the Chancellor."

J. Rodriguez asked if anyone could report to the Senate on the implementation of the resolution of the Senate regarding this matter.

J. Carnaghi indicated that he had received a memo from the Chancellor asking that construction work not be started. . . . He said he felt the Senate meeting today and the Chancellor's meetings with university officials the next day would be crucial to the Chancellor's decision. S. Hollander asked if the committee had discussed the impact of the new parking lot on traffic-flow problems.

J. Sunderman indicated that the problem would be held within the parking lots as much as possible.

M. Downs asked if the additional pressure on traffic would make it even more necessary to construct a 3-lane road in front of Kettler, and J. Carnaghi indicated he did not know.

V. Coufoudakis said he felt additional data needed to be gathered on both costs of construction and on the impact on traffic flow before undertaking construction of any kind.

J. Carnaghi said it was hard to judge what problems would arise with the traffic until the traffic was there. He said the two official proposals, to expand Lot 10 and to expand Lot 1, do have dollars associated with them, but that the Chancellor's proposal did not.

E. Nicholson said that, at the request of the deans and division chairs, a study on how classes are scheduled is being done. He said there are times when rooms are not 85% or 92% utilized, but 40% or 60% utilized.

W. Bruening asked if some A parking spots could temporarily be made into B parking spots.

J. Carnaghi said there are 300-plus A stalls and there are 500-plus A permits outstanding. He said the A stalls are filled as well as the B stalls at peak times.

M. Downs suggested that J. Carnaghi authorize ticketing illegally parked cars again, after appropriate notice, to see if the problem would disappear. He said he feels "many times people work out their own solutions to problems once they realize what's going to happen." He said he felt a variety of changes in class scheduling could be made to avoid the parking problem in the future.

10. Memorial resolutions:

M. Downs moved the attached memorial resolution for DeWayne A. Stonebarger.
Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

J. Lantz moved the attached memorial resolution for William F. Erbelding. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt
Secretary