

Minutes of the  
First Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Third Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne  
September 8, 2003  
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

### Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 14 and 21, 2003
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
  - b. Purdue University – E. Blakemore
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 03-1) – R. Hess
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 03-1) – E. Blakemore
  - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 03-2) – D. Oberstar
7. New business
8. Committee reports “for information only”  
Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 03-2) – D. Oberstar
9. The general good and welfare of the University
10. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: R. Hess

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Njock Libii (absent)

Secretary: J. Petersen

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, R. Bean, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, S. Blythe, J. Brennan, G. Bullion, C. Chauhan, M. Codispoti, C. Erickson, L. Fox, R. Friedman, P. Goodmann, J. Grant, T. Grove, S. Hannah, L. Hess, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, J. Knight, Z. Liang, L. Lin, D. Marshall, L. Meyer, M. Montesino, G. Mourad, A. Mustafa, M. Myers, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Perez, J. Purse-Wiedenhoeft, D. Ross, H. Samavati, J. Tankel, J. Toole, L. Vartanian, G. Volland, M. Wartell, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

W. Branson, C. Carlson, S. Choi, D. Erbach, D. Goodman, A. Karim, L. Kuznar, M. Lipman, E. Neal, G. Schmelzle

Attachments:

[“Proposed amendment to SD 88-13 \(Procedures for Promotion and Tenure\)”](#) (SD 03-1)

[“Procedures for Promotion and Tenure”](#) (SD 88-13, as amended)

[“Revision to Senate Document 98-22 \(The Plan for the Assessment of Student Academic Achievement\)”](#) (SD 03-2)

[“The Plan for the Assessment of Student Academic Achievement”](#) (SD 98-22, as amended)

Medical Education Representative: R. Sweazey

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, B. Hancock, J. Jones, K. O'Connell, S. Sarratore,  
J. Wellington

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin, K. Stockman

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Hess called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 14 and 21, 2003: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:  
J. Grant moved to approve the agenda as distributed.  
The agenda was approved as distributed.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
  - a. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: Indiana University has a new president, Adam Herbert. The Indiana University website is full of information about him.

I would like to make a couple of observations from the most recent US News & World Report ranking. IPFW again is in the fourth tier. What is most notable to me is the peer assessments: on the 5-point scale we are at 3.0. That is 1/10 of a point up from where we were last year, and it is the highest of any peer assessment score in the fourth tier. So people must think we are doing a pretty good job. At the same time we, as a branch campus of Indiana University, have the highest student-to-faculty ratio of any Indiana University campus listed in the fourth tier -- that is, more students per faculty than any other Indiana University campus.

b. Purdue University:

E. Blakemore: I would like to welcome everyone back for the year, and encourage Purdue faculty to speak to me if they have any concerns about campus issues.

I would also like to let the faculty know about an issue that was of concern last year. Last April, (former) Senator Linda Hite, of the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision, wrote a memo to Bob Sedlmeyer, last year's presiding officer, regarding the issue of voting rights for continuing lecturers. She asked him to forward the memo to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, which I chaired last year. I received a copy of the memo late last April, after our last meeting of the year.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has not met yet this year, and has not elected a chair. Its first meeting is next Monday afternoon, September 15. One of the items on the agenda next Monday is (former) Senator Linda Hite's memo regarding voting rights for continuing lecturers. She has asked the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Senate to readdress the issue of voting rights for continuing lecturers. She has several grounds listed in that memo, and I am sure she would be willing to share that memo with anyone who would like to see it. These are some of the issues she raises:

- Until last year's revision of the Constitution, all full-time members of the faculty whose duties were at least half time teaching and scholarly work were considered voting faculty. Prior to last year, continuing lecturers were considered individuals with the rank of lecturer and did have voting rights.
- Last year some people expressed concern about replacing tenured faculty with continuing lecturers, but since there is now a cap of 15% of the total campus FTE (actually it is now 10%) on these positions, this should be less of a concern to people than it was last year when that limit had not yet been established.

- Many departments and schools do give continuing lecturers voting privileges.
- Last year's ballot was confusing, and people did not know whether a "yes" or a "no" vote actually granted voting privileges to continuing lecturers.

Because I think this is an issue of concern to many people on campus and, in fact last year because I was chair of Faculty Affairs, several people spoke to me about it, I would like to encourage those of you who would like to express your view on this issue to contact me or other members of the Faculty Affairs Committee before we meet next Monday. Other members of the Faculty Affairs Committee you can contact are the following: Margit Codispoti, Nash Younis, David Oberstar, Lowell Beineke, or Heda Samavati.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 03-1) – R. Hess:

I would like to start by thanking Bob Sedlmeyer for the faculty and for the university for his service as presiding officer last year and seeing to the business of us all. My cohorts, who will be keeping order, include a holdover from the past: David Turnipseed has agreed to be acting parliamentarian for this year, and I appreciate his willingness to do that. Josué Libii is Sergeant-at-Arms. I will give him the appropriate "club" to use as he sees fit. I would also announce that the associate vice chancellor of Academic Affairs, Steve Sarratore, may have speaking privileges.

My official report is contained in Senate Reference No. 03-1, which is the document that accounts for what you accomplished last year.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 03-1) – E. Blakemore:

E. Blakemore moved to approve SD 03-1 (Proposed amendment to SD 88-13 [Procedures for Promotion and Tenure]). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 03-1 passed on a voice vote.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SD 03-2) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 03-2 (Revision to Senate Document 98-22 [The Plan for the Assessment of Student Academic Achievement]). Seconded.

Motion to approve SD 03-2 passed on a voice vote.

7. New business:

R. Hess asked Senators to introduce themselves and their departmental affiliation.

8. Committee reports “for information only” – (SR No. 03-2):

SR No. 03-2 (Guidelines for Grade Appeals) was presented for information only.

9. The general good and welfare of the University:

P. Iadicola: I would like to ask the administration that, when they contract the services that could be done by students or faculty of this university, they consider investing in the faculty and the students. There was a recent survey that came out on the parking situation. I received mine by mail. I understand that some actually got a telephone survey. I am not sure where it came from, but I know that there have been other things in the past - surveys, etc. - and it would be good to have these as opportunities for faculty to be able to train students in doing this type of research. I am sure there are other types of projects for which the university will hire consultants, and other types of research or marketing, etc. that could be done by students as well as faculty. So, I would just ask the administration that in the future to perhaps develop some kind of vehicle where they send out solicitations for proposals or requests for projects they are hoping to do.

M. Wartell: There is no disagreement on that issue. We will continue to do that. That parking survey came as much of a surprise to us as it did to you. I still do not know who commissioned it.

M. Nusbaumer: I received a telephone call, and I specifically asked on whose behalf they were calling, and the people doing the survey did not seem to know, either.

J. Grant: I wonder if Chancellor Wartell could update us about what happened to the parking lot next to the river. I know we received a memo on it, but my understanding was that that issue was supposed to come back to Senate after further consultation from the University Resources Policy Committee. I do not remember it ever coming back last March. We received the memo at the end of the semester, and now it is paved. I was just wondering what happened.

M. Wartell: I cannot give you detailed information on that. Walt Branson would be glad to, and he will do that next time. My understanding is that the University Resources Policy Committee was consulted about it. This is a temporary paving job, it can be undone. We have decommissioned parking lots in the past. There was no intent to make it a permanent situation, but there was just no other way to easily accommodate the parking problems that we have on campus. You know probably better than I do how difficult parking was, at least for the first couple of weeks.

J. Brennan: I would like to speak to this issue because I was chair of the University Resources Policy Committee last year. I dropped the ball as chair of that committee, for which I apologize to all my colleagues, especially to those on the committee: I had some health issues that made it hard for me to get my work done. We did discuss this issue many times in the University Resources Policy Committee. The committee was pretty much split, and it was going to come to the Senate again. We considered a compromise proposal to ask for a commitment from the administration that that parking lot would be removed when new parking facilities were built. Because of what happened with the running of the committee– I should have resigned as chair– we never did vote on that. While I cannot say this for sure, I think the University Resources

Policy Committee was going to be split on any parking lot recommendation and would not have sent a solid recommendation to the Senate one way or the other. I also had the impression that things were likely to end pretty much that way in the Senate as well.

R. Hess: Traditionally in this body we have as part of the first meeting a discussion of what I am fond of calling the “west unpaved parking lot,” which is now temporarily paved. There was a period of time when the late Mike Downs would introduce a resolution, or at least raise the question, “When are we going to do away with that awful sight out there and beautify it in some way?” Now, I do not think he had a parking garage in mind when he was talking about beautification.

S. Hannah: I would like to report on the results of the faculty salary increment distribution which was determined last spring for this year’s salary.

As for the previous year, the policy was established as an average rate of 2% with a pool equivalent to 1% for awards and equity/special merit. On a campus-wide basis, this pool (the 1% pool) was split among faculty, administrative, clerical staff and service staff based on salary totals in those categories. Faculty got a percentage of that according to our percentage of the total salary budget. For faculty, the 2% raise funds were allocated by chairs and deans based on their own unit’s criteria and procedures. Deans then recommended to me candidates for special merit in priority order and for equity considerations in priority order. Equity award factors included the percent difference from CUPA for the appropriate discipline and rank, years in rank, and level of performance. Merit award criteria followed departmental and school merit criteria. Special merit awards and equity awards were made by me after recommendations from the deans and then on to the chancellor. Faculty were notified of the awards at the time they received their annual compensation letters.

As last year, there were no particular targets for the number or level of awards. My only limit was how much money I had to give away. In both last year and this year, roughly 30% of the faculty received an award. This year 112 faculty versus 114 last year received an award. Seventy-five received merit awards, twenty-eight received equity awards, and nine received both. A total of \$167,518 was distributed to faculty, about half in special merit and about half in equity awards, roughly the same ratio as last year. Anticipating the question about whether or not we will continue to do this, I think the answer again as last year, and the chancellor can confirm this, is that all things being equal, hopefully “yes” if those are enough qualifications. Contingencies like enrollment, state budgets, and national salary trends all make a difference in our own progress. Our long-term goal, however, of improving faculty compensation as indicated by the procedures followed last year and this year, remains the same. If you have any particular questions, I will try to answer them either now or you can contact me with a specific question about your own situation.

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to respond to the comments Elaine Blakemore made with regards to the request by Professor Hite. Just last year, the Senate passed document SD 02-5. It went to the entire voting faculty, and the entire voting faculty voted, and the decision about voting rights in the university and the Senate were clearly spelled out in that document. To revisit that issue so soon I would, at a minimum, expect that document or that request to be supported by evidence of substantially different conditions for us to again go through that same process.

M. Myers: At approximately 9:00 this morning, Governor O’Bannon collapsed in Chicago and is in Northwestern Hospital in critical condition. I would hope the Senate would keep the governor and his family in thought and prayer.

M. Wartell: First, in convocation we talked about the increases in enrollments and headcounts. Those slipped off a little by the end of the week so that our finals were a 1.5% increase in credit hours and a .4% increase in headcount. After years of 8% increases and 6% increases, that sounds like very little. But it is an increase, so that is very important. It is a whole lot easier to handle in terms of covering classes. We shoot for about a 2% increase every year. The 8% came as a massive surprise a couple of years ago. Be that as it may, we have followed approximately ten-year enrollment cycles. It is my hope that we are not heading toward another dip in our enrollment. We are going to work hard to keep that from happening. I think every indication is that folks in Fort Wayne and the region are choosing IPFW much more often than they did before, and not looking at it as a backup school. We got a large number of valedictorians and salutatorians this year. I hope that we are going to see an increase in SAT scores. We have cut off the bottom 10% of the classes that apply. Little by little, while not hurting our overall enrollments, we are raising the standards at IPFW because the community college system is working its way into Indiana higher education.

With respect to building that is going on, the student housing is ahead of schedule. The bridge is completed. We will dedicate the bridge at the same time we have the I-P Foundation meeting, and that is on the 16<sup>th</sup> of September. The dedication will be at 1:00 p.m. You are all welcome. Since it is a bridge to our future, we are going to have the preschoolers from our daycare center bring us across. It ought to be a nice photo opportunity. The bridge itself has worked out very well, and we have an application in for the second bridge. Many of you have seen that picture. I hope it comes to pass, but such things are always uncertain. Northeast Indiana Innovation Center's intent is to break ground in spring for their building, which will be over on the State Developmental Center's land. In regard to the music building, the recommendation for the architect will go to the Purdue Board of Trustees at this next meeting, so that is proceeding. As you heard at convocation, we are well on our way toward the private funds that need to be raised. In fact, we are almost there. So that project will proceed very nicely. We still have one more hurdle to get over, and that is the State Budget Committee prioritization of projects. They are concerned about spreading out capital projects so that it does not affect the state budget as much.

Finally, with regard to the Medical Education building, I really do not have a report on that because we do not know how far along Indiana University is in their planning process. We are now sharing space with the State Developmental Center. A couple of programs will move over there. Bill Utesch's counseling program in education will have its headquarters there along with music therapy and, when we get it up and running, art therapy. We have just purchased another building. You may have seen the Oh's Tae Kwon Do Martial Arts Institute building right behind the Speedway. It is a brand-new building, a very nice building. Susan Hannah has been over there to see it. It was abandoned by Oh's Tae Kwon Do. That will be a place for a possible design center for our engineering program, and we also hope that the Community Research Institute will occupy the other half of it. It will be a very nice area for public interaction, especially for the Community Research Institute.

T. Grove: I was playing with my two-year-old son at the bridge. There is really not a whole lot of sidewalk that connects that side of the bridge with the campus.

M. Wartell: There are plans for extending the crosswalks and the sidewalks. The bridge will not be open until the student housing is open. We cannot just have people headed for a construction site.

M. Nusbaumer: Could you be a little more explicit in terms of the relationship between IPFW and the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center?

M. Wartell: There are several aspects of the relationship. The first point I will make is that the original Northeast Indiana Innovation Center was a collaboration between the city, the Chamber of Commerce, some private donors, and IPFW. IPFW was the receiver of the land from the state. That land, which is the front lawn of the State Developmental Center, was deeded to the I-P Foundation. The I-P Foundation will, in turn, lease back that land to the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center in order for them to build on it. The city has recently applied to make that area a certified technology park, so that the tax benefits will accrue to the non profit innovation center. That is our legal interaction with them. IPFW, except through the Foundation, has no legal tie with them. However, we have several partnerships. We provide interns for them. The business school has a relationship through the Center for Entrepreneurial Excellence; and the engineering school, as individual businesses build up, will have a relationship with them. Beyond that, we have no financial relationship with them, except that this year the legislature provided \$500,000 in the first year of the biennium and \$1 million in the second year of the biennium for research. That \$1.5 million will support the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center and, after that, the continuing \$1 million a year will be used to support research on this campus.

M. Nusbaumer: Not necessarily related to the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center?

M. Wartell: Not necessarily related to the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center. In fact, it will probably **not** be related to the Northeast Indiana Innovation Center.

R. Hess: Some of the great historic photographs at IPFW are photographs that show students, staff, faculty, and administration with armloads of books going from what is now the computer center, mathematics, chemistry, etc. (that wing where the library **was**) to the new library. There are some wonderful photographs of people perspiring and carrying those books. If you have a two-year-old child, and you want to be a part of this photo opportunity, get close to the front! Or the rest of you, grab a preschooler's hand, and you will find yourselves in photographic history. Just to remind you that is 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 16. We will cross not "the bridge to nowhere" but "the bridge to the 21<sup>st</sup> century."

Kudos to the athletic program on its recent soccer showcase. We cannot buy publicity like that, for the present or for the future. If you see folks in the athletic department, congratulate them. They deserve it. Similarly, kudos to Arnie Ball for coaching our entry into the world games in volleyball – it is a phenomenal accomplishment. We ought to celebrate that in a variety of ways. The Purdue faculty senators will be asked to conduct an election this month for the Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs. You will receive information about that shortly. Jennifer Bosk, the Director of Alumni Relations, has asked that you be made aware of the 5<sup>th</sup> annual IPFW Alumni and Faculty Mastodon Roast. It will be from 5-7 p.m. in the tent by the alumni brick walk on Coliseum Boulevard on October 14. We will not be roasting mastodons, but there will be food – it's free.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen  
Secretary of the Faculty