

Minutes of the
First Regular Meeting of the Ninth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
September 18, 1989
Noon, Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 10, 17, and 24, 1989
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Haw
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University - M. Downs
 - b. Purdue University - K. Stevenson
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 89-1) - J. Haw
 - b. Agenda Committee (Senate Documents SDs 89-2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, and -8) - J. Haw
 - c. Ad Hoc Committee To Review the Relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University (Senate Document SD 89-9) - F. Kirchhoff
7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 89-1)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, M. Auburn, A. Bassett, J. Bell, F. Borelli, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, B. Bulmahn, J. Carnaghi, D. Cox, V. Craig, M. Downs, J. Eichenauer, E. Foley, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, J. Haw, R. Hawley, S. Hollander, K. Keller, F. Kirchhoff, J. Lantz, B. Lingaraj, A. Mahmoud, J. Manzer, E. Messal, J. Meyers, R. Miers, D. Monteith, R. Novak, D. Oberstar, D. Onwood, J. Owen, M. Richeson, S. Sarratore, D. Schmidt, A. Shupe, E. Snyder, K. Squadrito, K. Stevenson, J. Sunderman, D. Swinehart, J. Switzer, G. Szymanski, G. Ulmschneider, W. Unsell, K. Wakley

Senate Members Absent:

H. Garcia, D. Hockensmith, A. Pugh, S. Skekloff, S. Usman

Attachments:

["Approval of replacement members of the Rules Committee, the Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs, the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, the Professional Development Subcommittee, the Academic Appeals Subcommittee, and the Educational Policy Committee"](#)
(SD 89-1)

"Promotion and Tenure Documents: School of Engineering and Technology (SD 89-2); Library (SD 89-4); Division of Health Sciences (SD 89-5); School of Fine and Performing Arts (SD 89-7); and School of Education (SD 89-8)

"Endorsement of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee To Review the Relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University" (SD 89-9)

Note: Consideration of Senate Documents SD 89-3 and SD 89-6 was postponed until the next Senate meeting and, therefore, these documents are not attached to these minutes.

Presiding Officer: M. Mansfield

Parliamentarian: R. Pippert

Sergeant-at-Arms: R. Barrett

Faculty Members Present:

L. Balthaser, G. Bell, V. Coufoudakis, E. Cowen, L. Graham, L. Griffin, J. Smulkstys, M. Souers, R. Svoboda, P. Zonakis

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, N. Newell, D. Painter, V. von Frank, J. Walker

Acta

1. Call to order: M. Mansfield called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 10, 17, and 24, 1989: The minutes were approved as written.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Haw moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Indiana University:

M. Downs: I have two items of business. One of them will be taken care of by Ken Stevenson and has to do with the meetings that several of us on this campus had with a subcommittee of the Purdue University Board of Trustees.

I have to report to Indiana University employees that, after 15 months, the revised health insurance program at Indiana University was approved by the Indiana University Faculty Council at its last meeting. The council has solicited opinions, suggestions, complaints--even compliments, if such are to be made--from Indiana University employees on this campus. They may be given either to me or Steve Hollander, or they can be sent directly to the department of insurance or the University Faculty Council in Bloomington. This brings to a close, we hope, 15

months of study and negotiation and argument and dispute. However, the president of the university informs me that we will continue to look at health insurance programs in the future, and we can expect that it will be one of the constant items in our diet every year from now on.

b. Purdue University:

K. Stevenson: My first remark is with regard to Purdue University health insurance plans. Purdue University faculty received a memo a week or so ago warning you that there would be a description of the new health plan being proposed in a combined issue of *Purdue Today* and *Sericle*. I hope you had a chance to read that over. If you had questions, there was a special seminar here last Friday. I would like to encourage those of you who haven't yet, to submit to me your survey forms and questionnaires, and let me know how you feel about the new program. We're trying to collate those feelings and send them on to President Beering.

The second item that I have is in regard to the attempt last year to create a Purdue University system-wide faculty governance structure. M. Mansfield was our campus representative on that ad hoc committee that developed a proposal that went before the Purdue University Senate last spring. At their last meeting, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, the proposal to create the Purdue University Faculty Council, which would have given representation to all Purdue campuses based on the size of the faculty of each, did not pass. Therefore, we will not be asked to ratify such a structure in the immediate future. However, the Purdue University Board of Trustees appointed a subcommittee to investigate the need for some kind of representation by the various campuses. Three members of that subcommittee--Trustees Ringoen, Anderson, and Stewart--met here on August 29, individually, with several of us: David Onwood, who is chair of the Rules Committee; Maynard Mansfield, Presiding Officer of the Senate; and Mike Downs, Speaker of the IU faculty, and me. We are not at liberty to reveal the specifics of the discussions, but I can say that they were open and frank. I think we did a reasonably good job of educating them about the problems a campus such as ours has in communicating our unique needs to them. I think that we can be optimistic that there will be some positive steps taken by them to allow us to have a greater voice in our own affairs.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

M. Mansfield: I have no formal report, but I would like to remind you that, among the many events associated with the 25th Anniversary that compete for your attention, there is one tomorrow which is of special interest, I should hope, to the Senate, since the Senate is hosting it. It is the fall luncheon/convocation at which President Beering and President Ehrlich will be present. The luncheon is at noon; the convocation will convene sometime around 12:45 p.m. You needn't attend the luncheon in order to come to the convocation; I presume that works the other way as well--that you may attend the luncheon, but not stay

for the convocation. The presidents will be talking about "IPFW: The First 25 Years and the Next." I would encourage you to attend that if it is at all possible.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Agenda Committee (SD 89-1) - J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to approve SD 89-1 (Election of replacement members of the Rules Committee and the Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs).
Seconded.

J. Haw moved to amend SD 89-1 by striking the second "Whereas" in the document as printed and insert the following: Whereas there is one vacancy on each of the following committees: the Rules Committee, the Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs, the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee, the Professional Development Subcommittee, the Academic Appeals Subcommittee, and the Educational Policy Committee; and Whereas, the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee has appointed Roberta Tierney as a replacement member for the remainder of the 1989-90 academic year; and Whereas the Professional Development Subcommittee has appointed AnnMarie LeBlanc as a replacement member for the remainder of the 1989-90 academic year; and Whereas, the Academic Appeals Subcommittee has appointed Elaine Blakemore as a replacement member for the remainder of the 1989-90 academic year; and Whereas the Educational Policy Committee has appointed Barbara Bulmahn as a replacement member of the 1989-90 academic year. Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 89-1, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

b. Agenda Committee (Senate Documents SDs 89-2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, and -8) - J. Haw:

J. Haw moved to approve SDs 89-2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, and -8. Seconded.

S. Hollander moved to divide the question along the lines of the documents themselves. Seconded.

Without objection, the question was divided.

H. Broberg distributed editorial corrections to SD 89-2 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures: School of Engineering and Technology).

Motion to approve SD 89-2, as corrected, passed by a voice vote.

D. Onwood moved to postpone consideration of SD 89-3 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures: Labor Studies) until the next Senate meeting. Seconded.

Motion to postpone consideration of SD 89-3 passed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander introduced an editorial correction to SD 89-4 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures: Library): Under the "Procedures" section, line 3, the word "candidate" should read "candidate(s)."

Motion to approve-SD 89-4, as corrected, passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 89-5 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures: Division of Health Sciences), passed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander introduced two corrections-to SD 89-6 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures: Division of Public and Environmental Affairs): paragraph 3, line 2, the word should be "tenure" track and paragraph 5, line 3, the word should be "is" not "are."

D. Onwood moved to postpone consideration of SD 89-6 until the next meeting of the Senate. Seconded.

Motion to postpone consideration of SD 89-6 passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 89-7 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures: School of Fine and Performing Arts) passed on a voice vote.

Motion to approve SD 89-8 (Amendments to SD 88-35: Promotion and Tenure Procedures - School of Education) passed on a voice vote.

c. Ad hoc Committee To Review the Relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University (SD 89-9) – F. Kirchhoff:

F. Kirchhoff moved to approve SD 89-9 (Endorsement of report of the Ad Hoc Committee To Review the Relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University). Seconded.

D. Onwood moved to amend SD 89-9 by deleting the information in parentheses, on page 7, the next to the last paragraph.

F. Kirchhoff moved a substitute motion which would delete, on page 7, the next to the last paragraph, beginning with the word "however" and going to the end of the paragraph, and then to merge that paragraph with the next. Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice.

Motion to approve SD 89-9. as amended, passed on a voice vote with no dissenting votes and with three abstentions.

7. Question time:

Q: During the past year, the Senate's efforts have focused on drafting policies governing the promotion and tenure processes at Fort Wayne. Section VI of the Constitution of the Faculty gives the Faculty "the power to recommend policies concerning ... the conduct, welfare, privileges, tenure, appointment, retention, and promotion of the Faculty" [emphasis added].

Have Fort Wayne administrators verified that the policy statements so far approved by the Fort Wayne Senate are acceptable to those university authorities to whom they serve as recommendations? Is the administration prepared to affirm that, should the Faculty choose to do so, the new policies can be put into effect during the current academic year?

A: J. Lantz: Yes and Yes.

Q: In her remarks to the Faculty at the August 29 introduction of new IFFW staff, the Chancellor alluded to the campus 5-year master plan and said that "action plans" for the implementation of the 5-year plan would be written this year.

Some Faculty believe that a major problem with the 5-year plan was the absence of adequate Faculty consultation and the fact that the plan was never submitted to the Senate or other Faculty body for review. Will the "action plans" to be developed this year also be administrative creations not to be taken seriously by the Faculty, or will good sense prevail?

A: J. Lantz: The "action plans" will have very broad faculty input. Dr. Auburn has written a first draft which he will be presenting, as to how this plan is to be organized. The plan is to have discussion at department, school, and university levels. Dr. Borelli is working with his staff. He will provide for input from university faculty. Dr. Dahl will be coordinating the planning. He will also provide for discussion from many segments of the university. It is our hope that, in fact, as these plans are being organized that anyone and everyone will have an opportunity for input. If they do not have the input it is because they will not have taken the opportunity to do so.

Q: S. Hollander: Claims were made about the Wallace master plan that there were similar opportunities for input. I would still hope that elected faculty-governance bodies would be significantly involved in creating and approving the master plan. That is not a follow-up question; it is a follow-up comment.

A: J. Lantz: I would hope that most of you know me well enough to know that I don't have any secrets or anything about my life or what I do in my professional work that demands any secrecy, so I would hope that that was then and this is now.

8. New business: There was no new business.
9. Committee reports "for information only": there were no committee reports.
10. General good-and welfare of the University:

M. Downs: First, in keeping with a long-standing tradition, I would like to observe that the temporary parking lot is now eligible for sabbatical. I only urge that it be granted one, and the usual requirement that something receiving a sabbatical return to the campus the following year be waived. I am aware that increased enrollments have increased the number of people and automobiles coming to this campus, but I am sustained by the report that was developed by the committee to recommend future development on this campus, that it is the wrong parking lot in the wrong place. I think we should have adequate space for parking on this campus, but the temporary parking lot ought to be resituated at a point which is more in keeping with the aesthetics of the campus. I also observe that it is a temporary parking lot, because there was strong faculty opposition to it. So, I encourage the administration to consider its movement to some other more aesthetically pleasing place in the near future. It is -a request I have made °before, and I don't anticipate that it is going to be any more successfully received this time; however, it should be made.

The second point I want to make is in the way of an observation about Chancellor Wallace's five-year plan. At the time it was completed, he asked a number of us if it could be published and disseminated broadly because of an emergency--because another plan or another set of proposals was already being considered by the public in this regard. It was the Coopers & Lybrand report which was prepared for Fort Wayne Future, Inc. He said, "Of course, before anything was done to implement the plan, it would be brought to the faculty for consideration." This was a promise that he did not make in writing. And it was probably wrong for those of us that were asked to give our permission without having received it in writing. I am of the opinion that the five-year-master plan that was published was seriously flawed as a plan in many ways. (I think, however, that it was well-written; it was an attractive publication.) There are elements in the plan that we ought to implement. But I think it is a mistake to implement those as if they were part of a well-considered, well-thought-out, fully supported plan developed by this campus. It would be far better if we went back and developed a plan that met those criteria before we begin to implement very much of what was contained in that plan.

The third point that I want to make today concerns an appeal that was heard by the Purdue University Faculty Grievance Board last year. The grievance committee made a recommendation to the president of Purdue University. Their recommendations had two parts. One supported the action of the university and found no fault with the action in regard to this case. The second part of the report said there were basic flaws in the way that the case had been handled, that the case had been unfairly handled, and it proposed a procedure which urged the president to remedy the unfairness. The president of Purdue University accepted the first part which supported the university--that's not unexpected—and rejected the second part of the report. That's his prerogative. Nobody, I think, wishes to deny the president of the university the right to reject the findings of grievance committees.

I will observe that after having talked to a number of people who have been on this campus for a long time, it is the first time that the president of Purdue University has rejected the findings of the grievance panel on this campus. Nevertheless, that is within his power. The point that I want to raise, however, is that the Purdue procedure, as I read it, requires that the president meet with the grievance panel face-to-face and explain his reasons for rejecting the findings. In this instance, the president, despite a specific appeal from the grievance committee that he meet with them, said that there would be no need to do so. I say this, not as a Purdue faculty member, but as one who was personally acquainted with the case and was one of the representatives of the aggrieved faculty member, and I feel that something very important has been missed here and lost. I hope that no one on this campus advised the president that it was a step which he ought to take in regard to this particular case.

J. Lantz: I would like to go back to the comment Speaker Stevenson made about the Purdue University Trustees' meeting on this campus. He characterized it as open, and he felt as if they had been listened to.... I was complimented by all three trustees about the interviews--the people that they had talked with--on this campus. I want you to know that they were well regarded here and that you were well regarded by them.

The second item I have is that we have record enrollments and record credit hours, and I think that must demonstrate record dedication by the faculty, administrators, clerical, and service staff. So I want to give you a record-breaking thanks.

We are right in the middle of our 25th anniversary. I hope you attended our birthday party on campus. It came off as a nice affair. We had over 500 people at our endowment dinner. More than 130 of those tickets were purchased by IPFW faculty and staff. The party was, in my opinion, a beautiful tribute to IPFW, and I am very proud of the committees and staff and PIT for the evening. The IPFW scholarship endowment will realize about \$40,000 from that dinner.

This afternoon our Silver Salute will be at the Performing Arts Center. There is a reception which will be hosted by INB National Bank at 4:30, with the program at 5:00. I hope you will be there and you will encourage your colleagues to attend that program downtown.

Tomorrow morning the IP Foundation will be meeting on our campus at 11:00 a.m. in Walb 224-6-8. Please feel free to come.

Last Monday, at the free period, I was invited to speak to the International Students Organization. Several of their members expressed serious concerns that the free period has been set aside on this campus for faculty and student interaction and that the governance across the university seems to be using all of the free periods.

S. Hollander: The cost of popcorn in Kettler Hall rose over the summer from 40 to 50 cents. I hope that the 25% increase is somehow connected with the 25th anniversary and that next year we'll see some kind of rollback.

S. Sarratore: Since Arts and Sciences has neglected to present us with a document today, I am assuming that we are reverting back to the promotion and tenure policies that were in place prior to the reorganization?

M. Mansfield: That is the chair's understanding.

M. Auburn: That is my understanding.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty