

Minutes of the
First Regular Meeting of the Seventh Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
September 14 and 21, 1987
Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 13 and 20, 1987
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - S. Hollander
 - b. Purdue University - D. McCants
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Nominations and Elections Committee (SD 87-1) - F. Codispoti
 - b. Nominations and Elections Committee (SR No. 87-1) - F. Codispoti
 - c. Nominations and Elections Committee (SR No. 87-2) - F. Codispoti
7. New business
 - a. Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SD 87-2) - D. McCants
 - b. Senate Document SD 87-3 - M. Downs
 - c. Senate Document SD 87-4 - M. Downs
 - d. Student Affairs Committee (SD 87-5) - A. Friedel
 - e. Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SD 87-6) - D. McCants
 - f. Senate Document SD 87-7 - W. Worthley
 - g. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (SD 87-8) - M. Downs
8. Committee reports "for information only"
 - Steering Committee for Implementation of the Smoking Policies (SR No. 87-3, Report from the Steering Committee for Implementation of the Smoking Policies dated 17 July 1987 and Minority Report from Jack Dahl dated 17 July 1987) - M. Downs
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Memorial resolution: Carl W. Steeg
11. Adjournment

Attachments:

- ["Election of replacement member of the Nominations and Elections Committee"](#) (SD 87-1)
"Results of the election of the Ad-hoc Committee To Review IPFW's Relationships to Indiana University and Purdue University" (SR. No. 87-4)
"Results of the election of the International Studies Program Advisory Subcommittee" (SR. No. 87-5)
["Proposed Medical Security Program"](#) (SD 87-2)
["Chancellor's Smoking Policy"](#) (SD 87-3)
["Tobacco Smoke Policy"](#) (SD 87-4)

["Election of replacement member of the Student Affairs Committee"](#) (SD 87-5)
["Election of replacement members of the Faculty Grievance Board"](#) (SD 87-6)
["Resolution of Appreciation: Edward A. Nicholson"](#) (SD 87-7)
["Election of replacement member of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee"](#) (SD 87-8)
"Fort Wayne and the Concept of the Urban University" (SR No. 87-6)
"Memorial Resolution: Carl W. Steeg" (SR No. 87-7)

Session I
(September 14)

Senate Members Present:

M. Adair, K. Bordens, J. Carnaghi, J. Clausen, F. Codispoti, R. Detraz, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, E. Foley, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, L. Graham, S. Harroff, J. Haw, M. Hayden, J. Hersberger, S. Hockemeyer, S. Hollander, A. Karna, K. Keller, F. Kirchhoff, M. Laudeman, B. Lingaraj, S. Manheimer, D. McCants, E. Messal, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, J. Outland, K. Perry, J. Porter, A. Pugh, J. Rivers, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, S. Sarratore, D. Schmidt, R. Sedlmeyer, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Squadrito, J. Sunderman, D. Swinehart, W. Unsell, S. Usman, K. Wakley, T. Wallace, J. Wilson, W. Worthley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

H. Garcia, P. Iadicola, E. Nicholson, J. Owen, J. Silver, D. Wartzok

Representative from Medical Education: Bruce Johns

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, T. Guthrie, K. Johnson, J. Lantz, D. McGee, G. Parsons, K. Stevenson, R. Svoboda

Visitors Present:

D. Benson, R. Brown, J. Clinton, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, P. Downs, E. Franklin, P. Groves, M. Hile, K. Maly, A. Montgomery, M. Plozay, R. Steiner, D. Worthley

Acta

1. Call to order: T. Wallace called the meeting to order at noon.
2. Approval of the minutes of Aril 13 and 20, 1987: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

M. Downs moved acceptance of the agenda. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. S. Hollander:

After five months without speakers' reports, there's about 12 minutes' worth of news to report. I'll start with the good news:

1. Enrollment increases--even very small ones--are always good news. IPFW'S up-tick this year echoes a stronger national trend. I noticed in yesterday's *New York Times* a long piece saying, "All the demographics had pointed to smaller entering classes this year, [but] institutions, ranging from large state universities to small liberal arts colleges, were deluged first with record numbers of applications and then with a higher number of acceptances than most had expected." Whatever the causes, it's good to see IPFW somewhat in step with the nation. And I'm hopeful that increased orientation efforts begun this summer will result in more of our new students' remaining with us in future years.
2. In August, Indiana University approved two new degree programs for IPFW a master's degree in education with a counseling major, and a bachelor of science degree in criminal justice.
3. Over the summer, a task force of Fort Wayne Future took a serious look at higher education. Task-force members with IPFW connections included Bill Frederick, Vivian Lansky, Mike Downs, Arnie Ball, Ernie Williams, Suzon Motz, and me; but the group is broad-based and broadly supported. We discussed IPFW with state legislators, with IU Vice President Dan Orescanin (himself a former regional-campus chancellor), with Commissioner for Higher Education Clyde Ingle, with IU Trustee Ed Kettler and Purdue Trustee Bob Jesse, with PU President Steven Beering, and with others. This examination will bear fruit: The *Journal-Gazette* reports that a Coopers and Lybrand consultant will be retained to take an in-depth look at both the financing and the management of the university. In this study, Fort Wayne Future is joined by the Chamber of Commerce and is funded by the Foellinger Foundation. The study will not be a narrowly defined accounting project: The consultant has examined state universities and university systems, and her findings and recommendations should enormously facilitate the study to be begun with the election at today's Senate meeting of a committee to study inter-university relationships. I would hope that anyone asked to supply information for either the faculty Senate study or the Coopers and Lybrand study would give full cooperation.

4. Speaking of the Foellinger Foundation, the chancellor announced this morning a major legacy to the university from Fort Wayne's leading source of philanthropy. This morning's announcement climaxes efforts by a series of IPFW chancellors during nearly a decade to secure support for one of the campus's strongest programs. Today's announcement points out once more the value of consistent direction, persistent leadership, and long-range goals.
5. Speaking of long-range goals, and last among the good-news items: The Task Force on Strategic Planning and Management did not meet during the summer.

Summarizing the bad news of five months is not easy. I think I have time for only a few problems.

1. The Task Force on Strategic Planning and Management is meeting again, for three hours every Wednesday.
2. There was heavy last-minute hiring this summer. In my own department, a full-time faculty member was hired over the telephone without having been interviewed; I'm not sure he had even applied for the job. On some Sundays, side-by-side display ads in the local paper virtually pled for breathing humans who could teach courses added at the last minute in various departments. I know that all this emergency hiring enabled us to be responsive to the enrollment increase; I hope that we are retaining pedagogical quality under these extreme pressures.
3. Visiting with the Fort Wayne Future task force on June 10, President Beering announced that he had already ordered up a study of the value of West Lafayette's contribution to its Fort Wayne campus. In return for the few hundreds of thousands of dollars we pay annually for "central services," President Beering said, his study showed that West Lafayette provides \$4 million worth of return. When he declined to accept my suggestion that his study be furnished to our Senate committee, I filed for a copy under the state's wonderful law guaranteeing access to public records. And I got a wonderful response: There was, it seems, no written study. President Beering's \$4 million figure, I was told, "must have come from verbal discussions. . . ."

And so it goes. . . .

4. Occasionally, some hard data do get printed. Official figures from the IPFW Office of Institutional Research show some distressing trends. Figures for this fall are not yet available, but during the 8-year period from fall 1978 until last fall, the number of student credit hours grew by 8.2% and the number of full-time, nonadministrative faculty by 8.1%.

During the same period, the number of administrators grew by 59.2%, and the number of associate faculty and TA's by 61.9%. I am awaiting this year's data.

5. I am prepared to cite a litany of problems affecting communication between the chancellor and this body, its speakers, faculty committees, and individual faculty members. I will do so at the chancellor's insistence. Failing that, I will offer only one example: This morning there was a news conference concerning the department of theatre. The appropriate dean or division chair was not told that there would be a news conference. He was not invited. Communication between the chancellor and the faculty is worse by far than at any other time in my nearly 20 years at this institution. Its rapid improvement should become a high priority in the chancellor's office.
6. After repeated attempts, I secured a draft copy of a ten-year plan for IPFW soon to be submitted to the Commission for Higher Education. That plan names 21 new degree programs for our next six years, and a number of new research areas and centers. I don't know who may have written it, but it is a bizarre document, worth your reading. It says that all departments in the fine and performing arts are IU departments--which may be news to our theatre faculty. It says, "Beginning July 1, 1987, a trial reorganization begins in Fort Wayne." (That sentence has, incidentally, been rewritten by the Fort Wayne administration; it now reads, "Fort Wayne is divided into divisions rather than schools as a result of a trial reorganization beginning July 1, 1987.") I have been promised a copy of the final draft.

I would like to end with two short announcements:

1. Indiana University President Thomas Ehrlich will meet with the faculty at 9:00 a.m. on September 21; you should all have received an invitation, and I urge your attendance. Press reports of his meetings with the faculties at other campuses suggest that he listens well, and the two occasions he has established for me to talk to him about IPFW strongly reinforce this view.
2. The Indiana-Purdue Foundation at Fort Wayne meets tomorrow at 8:00 a.m. in Walb. The faculty used to receive notices of this annual meeting, but now its existence is hidden in the "et cetera" section of the "Briefings" calendar. The Foundation's business is important to the university, and its annual public meeting, though duller than meetings of the faculty, merit attention. The coffee and danish have always been free.

T. Wallace: Ladies and gentlemen, I will respond to the gross misrepresentations in writing at the appropriate time. It would take me too long to do that now. Let

me just take one: The document he referred to was produced by Purdue University for the Commission in which we were asked to produce programs that we might be embarking upon between now and about the year 2000. We simply submitted what we had in the file; but I will respond to the factual part of what has just been presented because it is completely misrepresented.

b. David McCants:

I wish to express appreciation to Chancellor Wallace for his initiative in establishing lines of communication with me as speaker of the faculty. Last year he proposed that he and I and the IU speaker meet regularly. I believe we met twice that year. This year we have already met twice, because we had two meetings during the summer months. One benefit of his initiative is that our conversations are more wide-ranging than they would be if initiated by the speaker. Another benefit is that the registration of faculty concerns by the speaker with the chancellor can be done on established occasions instead of in an appointment requested by the speaker to communicate faculty dissatisfaction.

In the two meetings with Chancellor Wallace this summer I registered faculty sentiments regarding the following:

1. I shared the very positive reactions of faculty participants in the summer freshman-orientation/ registration program. I conveyed faculty enthusiasm for being invited to participate in that program and for the efforts our administration made to encourage--and "require" may not be too strong a word--participation by newly admitted students.
2. I shared with Chancellor Wallace faculty dissatisfaction with the very late notice of salaries for the new academic year. This year I think we may not actually have gotten notice until the new fiscal year had already started. Chancellor Wallace volunteered to arrange for earlier notice in the future.
3. I appealed for timely notice to faculty and staff of decisions of interest to the entire campus community--for example, the appointment of directors for the divisions in the new academic organization. Some director appointments which were effective July 1 have as of today still not been announced to the campus, I believe.
4. I shared with Chancellor Wallace faculty concern about some of the newspaper publicity, especially editorials, about IPFW. The concern of some faculty is that some of the press coverage exaggerates our defects, deficiencies, and limitations. I appealed for an effort by our spokespersons to influence the presentation of IPFW as a good university

which aspires to be a better university, instead of a poor university which is having a hard time attaining the status of good.

I wish to commend all--whoever they are--for getting the Multipurpose Building renamed the Athletic Center. Obfuscation seems particularly reprehensible in a university. Even if you cannot share that sentiment with me, perhaps you will still agree that the redesignation does allow that change, at least in this instance, is progress.

Purdue University has announced that the Trustees, this week, will consider a new medical-security program for faculty and staff. The new carrier will be Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Representatives from the business office answered questions about the proposal for a selected group of faculty and staff at a meeting last week and the week before. The Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs has prepared a resolution on this subject for presentation under new business at today's Senate meeting.

T. Wallace: I'd like to offer a clarification on the salary-increment notification. We decided that we thought it would be possible for department chairs to notify faculty of their recommended salary increments. In the past, until Purdue University trustees had met and approved the budget, notification of salaries was not made. We will attempt to have the department chairs indicate to the faculty what the salary-increment recommendation is. That obviously will be unofficial. Only upon official approval by the trustees will formal letters come out.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

T. Wallace: I'd like to welcome the new senators and hope they have a good year working with us on the important agenda of the universities.

I have asked the Agenda Committee to meet a little more frequently and in a little more informal nature. We had our first informal meeting which dealt with some of the problems of the university. A number of interesting points were raised. . . . We will be asking for a study of how we use part-time faculty. I have drafted a statement that I will take to the next Agenda Committee meeting . . . and will ask that it be assigned to the appropriate committee.

This morning I met with the Faculty Affairs Committee to discuss the work that they will do on planning faculty professional service and what constitutes legitimate reduction of teaching load for things other than research and administration. I will transmit a draft document to them.

Those two very important items will be working their way through the Senate committees. I think that that's important because if we are going to embark upon new degrees and higher concentration on services for undergraduates, it is going to require that faculty get release time for such things as participating in orientation. I think that we

will have to look at the whole question of how we can give release time for what kinds of things and to monitor that release time.

I would like to spend a little bit of time in my report dealing with the smoking policy. As you know we had two documents to work from: one was the Senate's resolution, SD 86-17, and the implementation committee's report which we had over the summer. We attempted to get a program operational by the fall. I would like to walk you through that program so that you might perhaps understand it a little better.

First of all, the areas that we have allocated for smoking represent about 2% of the square footage of the campus. We are 98%, by square footage, smoke-free. We have made, I think, a very good beginning. I have indicated that the policy should be reviewed in April, and I am sure there are a number of groups that would appropriately want to examine various parts of the policy. I see this as a question like the Bork appointment to the Supreme Court. We have to sift through ideology, politics, and substance, and try to focus on the quality of air. I think what we tried to do is to see how we can arrange to have the best quality of air within the university, balancing off where we minimize the effect on those of us who don't smoke of being in an environment that has some smoke, and particularly recognize that one-third of the student population smokes, and try to put this all together into a working agreement, which I think requires understanding and cooperation from all of us.

The Senate resolution made the statement that we should "Provide an atmosphere in which all individuals can conduct necessary day-to-day functions . . . without being subject to sidestream smoke." Obviously, one of the things in that requires us not to be able to eliminate sidestream smoke down to one part per trillion, but to see how close to zero we can get within a reasonable policy. Number 1 also went on to say that "This improvement in the campus environment requires prohibiting smoking in all offices, restrooms, meeting rooms, hallways, classrooms, and laboratories; designating smoking areas with independent ventilation flow in selected buildings (pending engineering studies); and requiring enforcement of relevant regulations by Police and Safety, with cooperation and support by all employees and students. . . ." There is one part of that statement that I believe turned out to be incorrect--although I think that it was a reasonable assumption--that is, that the objective being achieved required that there not be smoking in all offices. We deviated from that, I think, in order to, best accomplish the objective of minimizing the sidestream smoke and maximizing the quality of air. If we use the 10% of the faculty and staff who smoke, we're talking about 0.6% of the square footage of the institution. We also said that it would be best to have the 10% of the faculty and staff smoking in their offices, hopefully with the door shut, than to be congregated in controlled areas. Therefore, as I'll review for you a little bit later, two of the faculty lounges that were all-smoking or partly smoking were designated as nonsmoking. Now faculty who want to go into those lounges and not be bothered by smoke will be able to do that. So we deviated from the statement, but I think in the interest of meeting the objective.

We feel Police and Safety should be able to give a ticket on the first violation, depending on circumstances, as they do with any violation. We have informed Police and Safety that if they have someone, for example, who refuses to move or refuses to comply with the policy, rather than going through a four-local-ticket sequence, they get a state ticket right away. In checking with the legality of officers giving tickets out before you get to a state ticket, there are some problems with that. I really don't think we should wait that long. If we have somebody who says, "I'm going to thumb my nose at your policy," as far as I am concerned, they get a ticket. I think the intent of the statement was to have the Police and Safety patrolling the buildings on smoke patrol. We felt that that was not possible. We are saying that everyone has a role in that. There are already people who have mentioned to people that they are in violation of the smoking policy and, from what I am hearing, people are apologizing and moving to a smoking area.

Part 2 of the faculty resolution calls for removing ashtrays, discontinuing the sale of tobacco, and putting up signs. We have done that. We have taken someone's suggestion about having receptacles outside the building. Those people can put their cigarettes out before entering the building. I would say that we probably have spent over \$10,000 in materials to implement the policy.

I feel that before we run off and spend money on independent ventilation, we ought to know whether there is a need for independent ventilation. In looking at this, I was impressed with the argument that if you don't know what the problem is, you don't know what cubic foot per minute or hour of the measured capacity you need to ventilate these areas. So I think the posture there is that when the need arises, we will investigate the cost and attempt to do that. Or we may indeed simply move the smoking areas. I believe down through number 2 we have met the spirit and intent of the Senate policy.

In number 3, they talk about positive-assistance programs. Those have been established. There are a number of programs: one is run by an HMO, one is part of the wellness program, and I understand there is a four-week program beginning the 23rd of this month.

I would then like to move from that document by saying that I do feel that we have implemented a policy which is in agreement with the Senate resolution. I think that we need to look at it, see how it works, and review it in April. I met with the implementation committee, and they made some suggestions that we will be implementing, like getting communication out to people that if they smoke, they should close their doors. We are also getting a list of devices that can be purchased by individuals for their offices which suck up the smoke. We will distribute that information, and those faculty who want to be in a position of not annoying their neighbors can purchase those as they so desire.

On the implementation committee report I would like to go to the recommendations on designated smoking areas.

Liberal Arts Building: The steering committee recommended that there not be any smoking in that lounge. They asked us to consider room 133, which is used as a storage room. We decided that rather than use a storage room, we would use one-third of the student lounge near the doorway because we felt that the doorway and the ventilation system could take care of the smoke. Obviously, one of the questions we need to ask is, "How many people are actually smoking in this area?" If there are 200 people an hour smoking in that area, it is not going to be good enough. On the other hand, if we have two people an hour smoking in the area, then maybe it will be fine.

Fine Arts Complex: We did as recommended by the committee.

Helmke Library: We did as recommended by the committee.

Kettler Hall: We deviated. The committee recommended that the vending lounge on the ground floor be a smoking area and that at least one end of that area be enclosed so as to contain smoke as much as possible. We are using one-third of that lounge. There is heavy smoking going on in there. However, I think in walking to the bookstore through the hallway that whether it's offensive or not depends on your tolerance level. As I have walked around campus, it seems to me that may be the most difficult area. We felt that with one-third of the students smoking, there needed to be areas on the ground floor, first floor, and second floor. We now have small areas in the north corridors of Kettler Hall. I would like to point out that if we take the first floor and look at the total first-floor circular region, the area being used is about 15 feet long, which represents 9.4% of the square footage. As part of my physical-fitness program I hold my breath for six seconds as I go through that area. . . . Again, our theory is that if we spread a small amount of smoking in a number of areas, that the ventilation system can handle it better than congregating all the students down in the vending lounge. I'll also say that the committee recommended in Kettler Hall that the faculty lounge be one-half nonsmoking. We have that all nonsmoking. They also recommended that we investigate on the second floor of Kettler an area which is now assigned to computer technology teaching assistants. We did not do that. . . .

Life Sciences Resources: We did as recommended.

Athletic Center: We decided, although they recommended no smoking in that building, that the small vending lounge near the classrooms be a smoking area. Again, with one-third of the student population being smoking, we felt we would try that vending lounge next to the classrooms in the athletic facility.

Neff Hall: We went along with part of the recommendation. However, the faculty lounge was designated as smoking. We said it should be nonsmoking. We figure that if the faculty can be in their offices smoking, that that lounge should be nonsmoking.

Walb Union: We did as recommended.

That, ladies and gentlemen, represents the implementation policy and some of the rationale for why we did what we did. I still contend that you would be unable to find a university in Indiana that has a better policy than that. I am sure I'll keep saying that, and somebody will show up with one. We will be reviewing the policy in April. I ask people to give it a chance. I think it would be irresponsible to spend money on ventilation before we know what we need. So far, I have been very pleased with the amount of cooperation that I've seen. As a matter of fact, in most of these public smoking areas I am finding more nonsmokers just sitting there than I am finding smokers.

M. Downs: Chancellor, two things: I very much appreciate the long report on the smoking policy. I don't want to take up time now, but I have two resolutions which I will offer for consideration to the faculty under new business and which address aspects of what we have been talking about here. The other could, perhaps, come under good and welfare, or perhaps could come here. This is a suggestion. We had a large and very successful picnic here on campus for new students. Invitations were sent out. I think it's the sort of thing we ought to do. There is one aspect that I think could be improved in the future. Twice during the last seven years I have been in charge of fund-raising efforts here on campus. I always felt free to approach clerical and service staff to participate in these fund-raising efforts, and they have always responded, I think, very well. I notice that the invitation which was sent out did not include clerical and service staff. I think every effort should be made to include them as part of the campus family and to allow them to enjoy the same kind of atmosphere and ambiance that the picnic created. I would like to suggest that in the future they be included in the invitations.

T. Wallace: That is a good point. It has been raised. We have all-university functions in which everybody comes and the intent, which may not have been the right intent, was to have a faculty-student affair. But you may be right; we'll review that before we have another one.

M. Downs: In many instances the first, and many times the most enduring, contact students have on this campus is with the clerical staff, and to the extent that we can include them in and make them a part of this process, I think we will be taking a step in the right direction.

W. Frederick: In your report of the presiding officer, I'd like to refer to Senate Document SD 86-23, which is in the minutes of the April meeting. The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure passed a resolution, and the Senate subsequently passed a resolution, dealing with the academic reorganization. In part 2 of that resolution, there was some concern expressed at that meeting about director appointments. Since then, in your memo of June 4, you announce your intention to appoint Dr. George Bullion as director of the new Division of Business, Economics and Supervision, and Michael Miller as associate director, without having followed the request of this body to have representative search-and-screen committees. Is that your intent and will there be search-and-screen committees for the other divisions?

T. Wallace: We have handled this matter, I think it is fair to say, within that organization as they wanted to handle it. We did have some discussions on how the three departments would function, and somebody here can correct me, but I think that what we did is, rather than the administration mandating anything, they worked it out. Our long-range approach is different in the various divisions, and I would rather come back at another time and lay that out for you. I can do that at the next meeting. . . . There will be some changes in the near future that will impact on the whole situation.

A. Finco: What does it mean to say that they worked it out? I don't know what that means when you've got a colossus like business getting mixed up with two smaller groups.

T. Wallace: All I know is they transmitted documents to me where they had worked out how that unit was going to operate.

A. Finco: I guess the question was on the selection of administrators rather than . . . how they are going to function as a group. The selection of the director, if you will, was not done by the selection process which is usually used.

T. Wallace: That is correct. I'd like to wait until the next meeting because this relates to the whole reorganization which will be a major topic at our next meeting. It is a valid question, and I am only ducking it because I want to wait and do it next time around.

D. McCants: You have given us a lengthy report on the disposition of the document on smoking. Will you also be presenting to us next month the disposition of other documents approved by this body in the last year or so about which we have not had any report?

T. Wallace: Yes, I will.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Nominations and Elections Committee (SD 87-1) - F. Codispoti:

F. Codispoti moved to approve SD 87-1 (Election of replacement member of the Nominations and Elections Committee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

b. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 87-1) - F. Codispoti:

The Nominations and Elections Committee conducted the election of the Ad-hoc Committee to Review IPFW's Relationships to Indiana University and Purdue University. (See Senate Reference No. 87-4 [attached].)

c. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No. 87-2) - F.
Codispoti:

The Nominations and Elections Committee conducted the election of the International Studies Program Advisory Subcommittee. (See Senate Reference No. 87-5 [attached].)

7. New business:

a. Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Document SD 87-2 - D. McCants:

D. McCants moved to approve SD 87-2 (Proposed Medical Security Program).
Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

b. Senate Document SD 87-3 - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 87-3 (Chancellor's Smoking Policy).
Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

c. Senate Document SD 87-4 - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 87-4 (Tobacco Smoke Policy). Seconded.

The meeting recessed at 1:15 p.m.

Session II
(September 21)

Senate Members Present:

M. Adair, K. Bordens, J. Carnaghi, F. Codispoti, A. Dirkes, M. Downs, A. Finco, P. Flynn, E. Foley, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, L. Graham, S. Harroff, J. Haw, M. Hayden, J. Hersberger, S. Hollander, P. Iadicola, A. Karna, K. Keller, M. Laudeman, B. Lingaraj, S. Manheimer, D. McCants, E. Messal, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, J. Outland, J. Owen, J. Porter, A. Pugh, J. Rivers, M. Rosenfeld, D. Ross, R. Sedlmeyer, J. Silver, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Squadrito, J. Sunderman, D. Swinehart, W. Unsell, S. Usman, K. Wakley, J. Wilson, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

J. Clausen, R. Detraz, H. Garcia, S. Hockemeyer, F. Kirchhoff, E. Nicholson, K. Perry, S. Sarratore, D. Schmidt, T. Wallace, D. Wartzok, W. Worthley

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Representative from Medical Education: Bruce Johns

Faculty Members Present: G. Bullion, V. Coufoudakis, R. Hess, D. Mauritzen

Visitors Present:

D. Benson, J. Clinton, M. Dinnerstein, P. Groves, R. Hess, C. Hildebrand, M. Hile, K. Maly, A. Montgomery, R. Steiner

Acta

S. Hollander called the meeting to order at noon.

7. New business:

c. Senate Document SD 87-4 - M. Downs:

A motion was on the floor to approve SD 87-4 (Tobacco Smoke Policy).

M. Downs moved to postpone consideration of SD 87-4 until a time the chancellor is present and to make the resolution at that time a special order of business. Seconded.

K. Squadrito moved to amend the resolution to require that the resolution not be discussed again until M. Downs provides empirical data to support his resolution. Seconded.

Motion to amend failed on a voice vote.

Motion to postpone to a definite time passed on a voice vote.

d. Student Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 87-5) - A. Friedel:

A. Friedel moved to approve SD 87-5 (Election of replacement member of the Student Affairs Committee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

e. Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SD 87-6) - D. McCants:

D. McCants moved to approve SD 87-6 (Election of replacement members of the Faculty Grievance Board). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

f. Senate Document 87-7 - Warren W. Worthley:

P. Zonakis moved to approve SD 87-7 (Resolution of Appreciation: Edward A. Nicholson. Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

g. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (SD 87- 8) - M. Downs:

M. Downs moved to approve SD 87-8 (Election of replacement member of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

8. Committee reports "for information only":

Steering Committee for Implementation of the Smoking Policies (SR No. 87-3, Report from the Steering Committee for Implementation of the Smoking Policies dated 17 July 1987 and Minority Report from Jack Dahl dated 17 July 1987"Y - M. Downs:

M. Downs presented SR No. 87-3 for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

W. Frederick: With the body's indulgence, I would like attached to the minutes of this meeting that go out to all faculty a report called "Fort Wayne and the Concept of the Urban University" (see SR No. 87-6) presented by Leadership Fort Wayne. Since there are so many groups studying IPFW currently, I think this is an interesting report. It is a brief history of the political machinations that brought about IPFW and includes some discussion of the management agreement and a synopsis of a survey of industry and business leaders of Fort Wayne and their opinions about IPFW. There are several interesting conclusions in this report.

S. Hollander: Without objection, it will be distributed. Other items under general good and welfare?

F. Codispoti: I would like to take this opportunity to announce the results of the elections held here last week. The following faculty members were elected to the International Studies Program Advisory Subcommittee: Jeanette Clausen, Virginia Craig, Arthur Friedel, Richard Hess, Zoher Shipchandler. And the following Senators were elected to serve on the Ad-hoc Committee To Review IPFW's Relationships to Indiana University and Purdue University: Marian Adair, Jeanette Clausen, Arthur Friedel, Steven Hollander, Frederick Kirchhoff, David McCants, and David Onwood.

S. Hollander: The chair has a few general good-and-welfare comments: Helen Gibbons, coordinator of academic ceremonies, will be representing this faculty at the inaugural ceremonies for President Ehrlich. President Beering, appearing at the Indiana-Purdue Foundation meeting, said that the academic plan "has been finished for all practical purposes." The fiscal/management agreement will be reviewed this fall. Other news from the foundation meeting: during this past year \$62,507.35 has been transferred from the library endowment to the Helmke Library for the acquisition of library materials. I'd like to thank President Ehrlich for coming to visit the faculty this morning. Those of you who were there I think found it a very unusual, in all the best senses of the word, session.

J. Haw: About a month ago all faculty received from the chancellor's office a copy of the IPFW faculty constitution. From this document, I have heard for at least the first time that the Purdue University Board of Trustees had rejected sections of our Constitution on January 23, 1981. In checking with the secretary of the faculty, I find that copies of the Constitution going out to new senators still contain these rejected sections as if they were in effect. My question, to anybody who may be able to shed light on the matter is, is it in fact true that the Senate was not told for six and a half years that it was operating under a Constitution, part of which had been rejected, and, if so, why?

W. Frederick: At the time it came up when it went before the Purdue University Board of Trustees, we had pointed out the variances between what we had approved as faculty and what went before the trustees. With many calls to West Lafayette, we asked, "What should we do? Should we go ahead and put forth an amendment to the Constitution which would require approval by two-thirds of this body and two-thirds of the voting faculty?"

I was advised at that time that the best thing to do would be to let some future archivist find it. I think it is appropriate that an historian is bringing it up. I was nervous about doing that. I think now that it was a bad decision. We should have kept at it, because I think even now it makes more sense that those clauses be part of the Constitution with the reorganization and because we have Indiana and Purdue departments within a single school. What the administration--Hansen, Haas--was concerned about was that IU faculty, heaven forbid, would vote on Purdue academic matters.

J. Haw: I presume that as the Rules Committee considers constitutional amendments and reapportionment, it will consider the measure of whether these rejected sections or an amended version thereof should be reinserted?

J. Silver: I for one would like to be reminded what we did last spring on this matter.

S. Hollander: There were one or two documents which had the effect of having this body amend the Constitution so that it would agree with the version passed by the trustees of the Purdue University Board of Trustees. That document was recommitted to committee by this body last year.

M. Downs: It is the first Senate meeting of the year, and as has been the case for the past several years, I must again call everybody's attention to the long-term existence of the temporary parking lot. Last fall when I raised this question and argued that it was unnecessary and inadvisable, the chancellor said that during the year there would be a study and that the result of that study would be either to eliminate the parking lot in the interest of river-bank aesthetics, or to pave it--thus ending its continuing existence as a temporary parking lot. He said he hoped that he would be able to come back to us in the fall with a decision one way or the other. I wait with anticipation for that. I have not changed my opinion. I am sure Vice Chancellor Carnaghi hasn't changed his opinion of the parking lot either. I don't think either of us wants the temporary parking lot--I don't want one at all; I think he wants a permanent one. Sooner or later someone is going to have to decide one way or the other, and I hope soon so that I don't have to bring this up every first meeting of the faculty in the fall. Thank you.

D. Swinehart: I have a brief statement in regard to the election results. I hesitate to speak up as a first-term senator, one with what appears to be a vested interest as an unsuccessful candidate. However, the importance of the subject compels me to make a statement of my position. The recent election of the Ad-hoc Committee To Review the Relationships of IPFW to Indiana University and Purdue University has produced a result so biased that it reflects upon the credibility of any findings or recommendations that this committee produces. The election resulted in six faculty members from one school being elected, while none were from Business and Management Sciences, Engineering and Technology, Education, Health Sciences, Fine and Performing Arts, or SPEA. I believe that these disenfranchised groups represent substantially more than half the student majors at IPFW, and account for the vast majority of community and professional interfaces in the Fort Wayne area. Their point of view and inputs are critical to any matters related to the relationship of the parent university. If the committee goes forward as constituted, my faculty will find it difficult to support any findings or recommendations that result. We also encourage other disenfranchised groups and schools to regard any findings or recommendations with a great deal of skepticism.

D. Onwood: I must confess that I am disappointed that a committee which has yet to meet, which is going to have a difficult task, and which is charged with meeting with members of the university, all members of the faculty, even outside the university, should be labeled biased without ever having had a chance to meet. Please let us elect a chair and demonstrate our bias in making an act before you label us. The task is going to be difficult. Please give us your support. Please.

K. Squadrito: I didn't hear him saying what you heard him saying. I didn't hear him saying that you, David Onwood, are biased. Is that correct?

D. Swinehart: I would retract any sense of that in my statement. It was to the representation by areas rather than the individuals. I voted for nearly everybody who was elected.

K. Squadrito: Some people can perceive it as such because there is only one concentration of faculty members. I don't think he was saying that any of you people are biased.

A. Finco: It does seem to me the statement criticizes the work of the committee before it's even done. It says to withhold your support.

K. Squadrito: Yes and no. I see his point of view and I see yours, too. I think he's bringing something up that people might worry about. I am not worried about your objectivity. I have known these people a long time, but what we might not worry about is faculty and decisions made at this university is how other people might perceive something. I think what he is saying is that maybe there should be some kind of rule or regulation that would say you can only have one member or two from each department. Limit it to that kind of thing. In which case, people who might misperceive something would not be able to misperceive it. Can we vote on that today or discuss that at some future time?

S. Hollander: We cannot vote on it.

10. Memorial resolution: Carl W. Steeg:

D. McCants introduced D. Mauritzen, who presented a resolution in memory of Carl W. Steeg, Professor of Engineering, who died this past summer.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Blauvelt, Secretary