

Minutes of the  
First Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Eighth Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne  
September 8, 2008  
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 14, 2008
3. Acceptance of the agenda – B. Abbott
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Purdue University – N. Younis
  - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 08-1) – S. Davis
6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 08-2) – J. Summers
7. Committee reports requiring action
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment\*

\*The meeting will adjourn or recess by 1:15 p.m.

Presiding Officer: S. Davis  
Parliamentarian: A. Downs  
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen  
Secretary: J. Petersen

---

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, N. Adilov, A. Argast, S. Ashur, S. Beckman, S. Blythe, J. Burg, J. Dalby, S. Dhawale, P. Dragnev, B. Dupen, R. Elaver, C. Erickson, E. Foley, R. Friedman, J. Garrison, J. Grant, T. Grove, I. Hack, P. Iadicola, J. Jackson, M. Lipman, G. McClellan, K. McDonald, W. McKinney, L. Meyer, D. Moore, G. Moss, K. Moustafa, D. Mueller, M. Nusbaumer, T. Parker, K. Pollock, T. Prickett, D. Redett, M. Ridgeway, L. Roberts, J. Summers, R. Sutter, J. Tankel, C. Thompson, A. Ushenko, G. Volland, M. Walsh, G. Wang, M. Wartell, M. Wolf, N. Younis

Senate Members Absent:

W. Branson, D. Liu, J. Lutz, G. Mourad, W. Utesch

Faculty Members Present: O. Chang, B. Kanpol, J. Khamalah, K. O’Connell

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, M. Franke, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin, K. Soderland (*Journal Gazette*)

## Acta

1. Call to order: S. Davis called the meeting to order at 12:11. S. Davis asked that the senators and visitors in the room introduce themselves.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 14, 2008: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

B. Abbott moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University:

N. Younis: Good afternoon, Colleagues!

I would like to welcome the new senators and thank all the senators for being willing to serve on the Senate. Thank you all for taking on all of the responsibilities to ensure the Senate functions smoothly. I look forward to working with Speaker Nusbaumer, Presiding Officer Davis, and the Fort Wayne senators.

By now we should have the results of the faculty survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute for IPFW. Soon the results will be available to the faculty. As in any assessment report, it is important that we close the loop. Therefore, I would like to see an analysis of this report done by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Speaking of the Faculty Affairs Committee, we have two vacancies to fill by senators who are neither from the College of Arts and Sciences nor from the College of Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science. I would like to call upon the senators from the eligible colleges to serve on this committee if the nominations will be opened.

I am honored to be the Purdue Faculty Speaker. I would like to hear from the faculty regarding their interests and concerns. It is worth mentioning that the two speakers and the presiding officer meet monthly during the academic year with the chancellor and the vice chancellor for academic affairs. We meet to discuss issues that affect the operations of IPFW. Issues encompass academics, athletics, planning, development, faculty, students, and the Fort Wayne community.

I hope that you will have a great semester. Thank you.

- b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to echo Speaker Younis's comments. Welcome to both the new and returning senators.

1) For those few of us who remain Indiana University-benefitted faculty, there has been a change in the family leave policy. Unfortunately I only stumbled upon this by accident rather than by design. If you have any questions, please let me know. It went into effect in July.

2) As most faculty are aware, we now have the ability to issue plus/minus grades for our students. Having polled my classes this semester, however, most students are unaware of that fact. I would encourage all faculty to be very explicit on their syllabi so that students can be aware of what kind of grading system and structure all faculty are using.

3) The Faculty Affairs Committee is one of the most important committees on this campus of the Senate. The Bylaws require that four units/schools be represented. We only have two. Of those not represented, two of them have both Indiana and Purdue University faculty. Four of them are Indiana University-only units. I very much encourage senators from any of those units not represented to please come forward and represent your school. The Senate has, over the years, been concerned about representation and the ability to person committees. I would suggest that if we do not have people stepping forward to person these committees, we need to, as a body, seriously consider the way in which we person these committees. It is a lot to ask of the Faculty Affairs Committee when we try to operate shorthanded.

S. Davis: What are the units that are available?

M. Nusbaumer: The units/schools not represented are the College of Visual and Performing Arts, Doermer School of Business and Management Sciences, School of Education, College of Health and Human Services, Helmke Library, and the Division of Public and Environmental Affairs.

4) The issue of energy conservation should be important to all of us, and I think IPFW needs to take a leadership position for the northeast Indiana region. I have spoken to both the chancellor and the student body president who share my concerns in that regard. It is important for all Faculty Senate committees to give some thought to ways in which we can conserve energy as an institution in the way in which IPFW operates. I think this is also a significant issue with regards to the ability for people to access an IPFW education. I would like for anyone who has any ideas that you think are worth considering to aid us in that regard and send your ideas to the appropriate committee. If in doubt as to what committee that is, send them to me and I will be happy to forward them to the senate committee. I would appreciate any efforts in that regard.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 08-1) – S. Davis:

S. Davis: Thank you to Kay Folks and Jacqui Petersen for arranging for the logistics of the refreshments today, and thank you to Chancellor Wartell who bought the pastries, coffee, and water for our meeting today.

S. Davis referred to Senate Document SR No. 08-1 (Report on Senate Documents).

S. Davis: Andy Downs has a word to say about parliamentary procedures.

A. Downs: Jacqui Petersen e-mailed all the senators the guide for parliamentary procedures. One side is *Robert's Rules of Order*, and on the back side are the basic theories of *Robert's Rules* as well as the hierarchy in which motions may be made. Keep in mind that the purpose of *Robert's Rules of Order* is to help keep order and help make sure the majority and minority positions can be represented in a nice, friendly manner. One of the easiest ways to do that is, whenever you have a question, make sure you direct it at the chair instead of at an individual. These will be on the chairs as you come in. Please do not take the laminated ones with you. These are for those of you who forget to bring your personal copy with you. We will collect them at the end of each meeting.

S. Davis: The Executive Committee sent out an e-mail last year to look at the Senate committees. We received responses from most of you. We are going to review them. It is not a question necessarily of whether the committee should exist but if the structures of the various committees are working out. For example, with some of the moves on campus, there are a couple of committees which sort of went into limbo. We are going to look at that in the Executive Committee. The four committees we have heard nothing from so far are the following: Subcommittee on Athletics, Calendar Subcommittee, Continuing Education Subcommittee, and the Honors Program Council. Once your committees meet, please let us know of any suggestions you may have about your committee structures. One of the problems we are having is that a lot of committees are missing people for sabbatical, lack of interest, etc. I know it is extra work, but I encourage you to view it and have your colleagues get on these committees and provide the service that I know we are all capable of providing.

I sent an e-mail out to the senators on the Higher Education Commission report. It is titled: "Reaching Higher: Strategic Directives for Higher Education in Indiana." The introduction is aspirational in nature. I have asked the chancellor, during his talk during the general good and welfare section, if he would speak to the impact, if any, this is going to have on IPFW in the short term and the long term. This is available from me if you want to take a look at it, and it is also available online where it is very easy to access.

I support what Senator Nusbaumer said about the greening of campus, and I think it is a very important topic. I am reading what other schools in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* newsletter are doing, even as far as scheduling classes. I would not mind if the Educational Policy Committee would look at it and think about, for example, getting to more Monday/Wednesday classes before 3:00. If you get people coming in two times a week rather than three times a week, this can be helpful as far as energy conservation. We need to think a little bit out of the box, and I know there are labs, but maybe labs can be in the

evening. A lot of things need to be looked at there. We can be a leader in the community and make sure that our footprint is clean.

With regard to textbook costs, I do not know what committee should look at this, but we found that, in our department, a lot of items are being put under courses at the Bookstore that the faculty member has not asked to have put under courses. In other words, there is a spot on the sheet where you have required and recommended books. I put no other books as recommended down on one course, yet there was a solutions manual that was on the shelf in which I assigned homework, and I realized that there were also student study guides for \$60-\$70 a set. Everyone should look and make sure you have on the shelves what you want. It should not be the publisher or the bookstore manager deciding what goes there, it should be the faculty member who decides what goes on the shelf. I think we need to be aware of that because if a student sees the \$60 book, even though it is not going to help him, he may perceive that it is going to help him.

I knew I was in trouble when I walked up to my favorite Diet Coke machine, which is the one where you can watch it come down, and there was a place to swipe a credit card on it. While my raise was 2 percent last, the price of my Diet Coke went up 25 percent. When you have a monopoly, this is what happens.

6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolution (Senate Reference No. 08-2) – J. Summers:

J. Summers read the memorial resolution for Virginia Robertson Craig. A moment of silence was observed.

7. Committee reports requiring action: There were no committee reports.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports “for information only”: There were no committee reports.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

R. Friedman: With regard to the plus/minus grading, one thing that came up at the administrative council meeting in Arts and Sciences is the effect that it may have on prerequisites and degree requirements. If it says a C or better, for example, for a prerequisite, how might that be affected if we allow for C- grades or for a GPA requirement of 2.0 in classes for a degree? How may that be affected also by the change to the plus/minus system? That is something we decided to ask departments to think about.

J. Tankel: Just to follow up on that, there will be an Educational Policy Committee meeting tomorrow, and that will be on the agenda.

P. Iadicola: I am looking forward to hearing the chancellor talk about increasing enrollments, and I have been here 29 years and can now confidently say we have 12,000

students. I am also looking forward to hearing him speak about the building projects, bridges, and expansion of campus housing.

For the general good and welfare of the university, I have a concern regarding the actions of the former vice chancellor for academic affairs. With approval of the chancellor and the passive acquiescence of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, an action was taken that actually served to hinder and block the rights of the faculty to evaluate, discuss, and debate a proposal regarding the integrity of one of the programs it was offering.

On two occasions, the former vice chancellor for academic affairs invited herself to a faculty meeting. The first time it was in order to pre-empt the consideration and discussion of a proposal regarding the integrity of a graduate program offered by my department. We were told that she was going to make a decision regarding the program and that there would not be any further discussion regarding the integrity of the program because that term was deemed to be offensive. On a side note, I was ironically invited to participate on the North Central Committee to consider the mission and integrity of the programs at IPFW this past year. At the second meeting, a proposal was then presented that was, as we were told, approved by the chancellor to essentially disenfranchise the senior faculty of my department in considering the question of integrity of our program.

This is a problem for my department, and my department has experienced, let's just say, a large degree of administrative micro-mismanaging. That is not the issue that I bring to you today. The issue has to do with the role of faculty and the right and responsibility of faculty to have oversight authority over the programs that they offer as a department. The very question of the integrity of the curriculum of this university is dependent upon the faculty of departments playing an active role in raising those questions and debating them. In the months to come, I will present a proposal to this body to investigate this action. Another consideration will be to consider passing either a modification of legislation that already exists or new legislation that will safeguard faculty's rights to consider and debate these issues without the interference of the central administration.

For the good and welfare of the university, I will raise this issue more specifically in the future and hopefully we can reach a decision that is for the good and welfare of my department as well as this university.

J. Summers: I am not sure which committee this goes to, but in the past I have had several students within the past year who are athletes. They have come to my class in the past year multiple times with injuries. Prior to our entry into conference, my students showed up occasionally, once or twice a semester, injured. I have had students coming to class every day wrapped in tape and ice, injured – every single day, more than one student. They talk to me about a lack of medical supervision, and when it does show up, it is perfunctory. Worse, there is a lack of any sort of feedback from the students on the coaches. I, as a faculty member, am evaluated by my students, chair, dean, vice chancellor, and chancellor, and they are all evaluated by us. We can say the people above us are doing things right or wrong. Our student athletes have no such voice. There is some sort of supervision, I would hope, of the coaching staff by the administration, but there is no means of feedback for the

people who are actually below them to say, in an anonymous fashion, what is happening. I have had multiple complaints from my students who have said, "Don't tell anybody I've said anything, don't use my name" because they are afraid of repercussions. They are **student** athletes, they are not professionals, and they are not paid. They are students first, and yet they are not being treated, in this area of the university, in ways which everyone else in the university is, and I find it to be completely unfair. I hope it will be dealt with by the appropriate committee.

C. Erickson: Perhaps the chancellor will be talking a little about this, but in the last convocation you mentioned that you had plans for some retail business at the corner where the Child Care Center is now. You did not say anything about the Child Care Center or any kind of future development there, so I would just like an update on what is happening with the Child Care Center.

M. Wartell: I am looking forward to the debate about the individual problems in the Sociology Department on the Senate floor.

**Enrollment.** You all know that we are up around record enrollments; actually 12,338 students is our official enrollment count. A significant part of the increase comes from the dual-credit programs in which many of your departments are participating at the high schools. That, I believe, will be very important to us in the future in terms of those high school students choosing to come to IPFW. I know that Mark Franke has been talking about how we connect those students better with IPFW. We also have a number of new students in our increase. It is really about half and half between the dual-credit courses and the regular students. Minority enrollments are at an all-time high, and full-time students are also at an all-time high. We have done very well in that regard.

**Building Projects.** The medical building should be finished in January or February.

You will see a hiatus in bridge building. They will quit when it gets cold and then start up again when it gets warm. They hope to finish in either June or July.

The hotel has had some problems in opening. Apparently the windows they ordered for the first floor have not come in yet. Everything above the first floor is completely furnished. All of the rooms are completely finished. They believe they will be able to open without food or drink September 23, and then there will be some kind of opening celebration in October.

We are in the planning stages of another 450 beds for student housing.

We hope to go out for bids for the Student Services Building in November. That may be put off just a little bit depending on the architect's ability to finish the engineering drawings.

**Child Care Center.** We have some very interesting possibilities. There is a nearby child care facility built specifically for child care. I don't know if you understand the requirements for licensed childcare, but you have to have a micro bathroom in every classroom in a licensed child care facility. This was built specifically for that. It looks like



we can have access to that, and that could become a temporary home, or it could become a permanent home for our child care center. It will be a vastly improved facility over what we have now, and we should be able to cover infants on up. We are working on full-time child care as well. The difference between full-time and part-time child care is in how much folks will have to pay because the licensure requirements are different. We try to make child care affordable for our students, and we hope to get to full-time child care. By nearby, I mean a few blocks – the church facility right on Hobson. They actually have two child care facilities in the church, one of which they are not using at all.

**Reaching Higher report from the Commission on Higher Education.** From a university point of view, having transfer capability and commonality from Ivy Tech is a good thing. The Indiana Commission on Higher Education and the state have made it their purpose to support the Ivy Tech Community College to a great extent. There is a belief that cheaper is better; at least that is the way I view the report. We are working with Ivy Tech. We have several programs to facilitate Ivy Tech students coming to IPFW, most notably the Crossroads Program. Mark Franke said to me just this morning that we need to make that happen in a more facile way. The best example of how it is not happening in a very facile way is that Ivy Tech has approximately 8,000 students and last year, with associate degrees, 25 of them transferred to IPFW. That is not a very big number. In total, approximately 180 students who were attending Ivy Tech transferred to IPFW. That transfer function is brand new. It has not happened very easily. We do not get very many of them. If Ivy Tech is to become a true community college, then that number needs to grow massively. We cannot affect the Ivy Tech part of it, we can only affect, I believe, what we take. We are working on it. That is one part of the Reaching Higher report.

The Reaching Higher report also talks about accountability. We are involved with a voluntary system for accountability. We will continue to be involved with that. We are now being funded, not only on the basis of enrollment growth, but also on the basis of our success in terms of graduating students and the number of degrees that we actually produce. In that regard, we are doing acceptably, but we need to be doing better. We need to have a higher graduation rate, and we are working at that. Little by little, that is happening. You know about all of the programs that George McClellan has been involved in, and that Bill McKinney is getting involved in now to develop a culture of graduation. We are working on those things.

Affordability is another issue that was brought up in the Reaching Higher documentation. Our financial aid has increased at a greater rate than our tuition has increased over the last several years. The Auer scholarship gift will help that as well, so that little by little we are outpacing the increase in our fees. That does not get to all of the students as well as we would like it to. We are, by the way, the only campus that has only one fee for students. We do not have any hidden fees, such as lab fees, facilities fees, etc. I believe that is much better for students, and we are continuing on that path.

**Coca-Cola Contract.** We have resisted for three years now the increase in the Coca-Cola machines' products from \$1 to \$1.25. When the new contract finally came up, we could not resist it any longer. It was part of the negotiation. We are still less expensive than many

places. We looked at the credit card function as a convenience. They tried to get us to raise the price for the last three or four years, and we had not done it, but we finally had to do it.

M. Nusbaumer: Going back to the Indiana Commission report, one of the things that is very noticeable is a lack of suggested direction for any of the regional campus, including ours. They focused on the major research institutions. It seems we were fundamentally ignored in terms of strategic direction. Is that going to be coming?

M. Wartell: You can look at that in two ways. One, we are being ignored. I do not happen to look at it that way. Another way to look at it is that it is giving us the ability to do a great deal of what we want to do. We are not being forced into any mold. I think that is fortunate since we are very different from the other regional campuses. We are not that different from Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, except for the fact that there is a medical school on their campus. By the way, by 2009 we should see all four years of medical school here. Little by little, that part of our campus will grow, and that will be an important addition to the campus. The focus of the Reaching Higher report is the research universities and the community colleges. I do not know how to interpret that.

P. Iadicola: In the tuition report, I thought I read something about change in calculating the enrollment and credit hour leaning towards a completion of courses and not just counting students of enrollment in classes. Has there been any discussion in central administration of the budgetary impact on our campus?

M. Wartell: We just discussed it this morning. We know what the calculations will indicate. I believe that, if we start calculating our enrollment based on class completions rather than class beginnings, we will see that the major research universities retain people better than we do. We do not retain people very well, but I do not think it is going to be a whole lot worse, relatively, than the position we are in now. I believe that Ivy Tech will see a significant drop in their numbers because I think their attrition rate is much greater than ours.

P. Iadicola: Would that mean a potential reduction?

M. Wartell: It could mean that, but remember that if you look at it as a finite pie, if we do not lose much, if the major universities do not change much, and Ivy Tech drops down, that could be good for us. I do not think we have all the data yet, and we will have to see how that comes out.

R. Sutter: Is there any way of interjecting into conversation discussion about admission requirements for students? My impression is that flagship campuses have different admission requirements for their students.

M. Wartell: They have the same minimums basically, but they set a higher standard because they can afford to be more selective.

R. Sutter: Is there any way of interjecting that into conversation?

M. Wartell: What position are you advocating? Do you want us to raise our admission standards or do you want folks to understand that they are different?

R. Sutter: As it relates to funding student completion of credit hours. I think that is a factor.

M. Wartell: I think there is a way to interject that, and I think we can discuss it.

G. Moss: I have a question on the statistic that there were 8,000 students at Ivy Tech and 25 transferred to IPFW (with associate degrees), and I do not want to take away at all from the fact that there is a body of students out there that we can tap into. Ivy Tech is a two-year college, and they offer many two-year programs, so when those students graduate, they have completed what they need for the profession. I was wondering whether there are any numbers that show what proportion of that 8,000 are actually associate degrees or in preparation to complete a four-year degree. That would give us a better idea of the number of students to tap into.

M. Wartell: Jack Dahl is working on the subtraction part of that. It is very hard to determine students' intentions towards four-year degrees. What we are trying to look at is subtracting off those folks who are in vocational sorts of tracks. It is not easy to do. It is a difficult number to get, but we are working on it.

P. Iadicola: With regard to Senator Sutter's comment, admissions at the university should be taken into account as it relates to that formula.

M. Wartell: One thing that I am hearing more and more on the Purdue side, which I think is an important thing to hear, is that when you look at the land-grant mission, the land-grant mission is about access. Since West Lafayette is becoming more and more selective, we end up being the access point. That is an important mission. I think we fulfill it very well. There is a move to cause us not to offer associate degrees anymore. It is also part of what led up to Reaching Higher – the white paper that went with it. We offer a set of associate degrees that are very high quality, and I think unmatched. Dental is a wonderful example of that. Should we give those up? I would argue that, if we are doing the right job, we should not. That comes back to this interesting question about how Ivy Tech is judged in terms of the vocational versus the educational part of their mission. When our graduation rate is calculated, we do not calculate our success (and we have incredible success) in all of those dental degrees, in the two-year nursing degrees, or in some of the other associate degrees that we offer. There are a whole lot of things to be discussed, and you would like to have them out on the table, but they are not as obviously on the table in the Reaching Higher report as we would like them to be.

G. Moss: Another example is the transition to teaching students. They come here for an 18-hour program, and their courses are graduate level. They all count as dropouts because they are not officially in a full graduate program. If by chance they then apply to be in our graduate program, they complete it. They are here to get certified.

M. Wartell: I understand that. Traditionally, in our graduation rate, we never talk about graduate students. In fact, we do not talk about our part-time students, of which we still have significant numbers.

K. Moustafa: I do have a concern about the way that our graduation rates are measured. Look at Purdue and Indiana Universities and the way their students go straight through versus our students. I have classes of 40 where I have asked how many of them work. Two people did not raise their hands. It is interesting that they are trying to make us measure up to Indiana and Purdue Universities when our student body is totally different. There are articles in the paper about how bad our graduation rate is, but they do not take into account that our constituency is much different, and our mission is different, than Indiana and Purdue University's. I think it looks bad to the community, and I was wondering what we could do to help make that awareness known. Our business community does seem to recognize this, but it is the community at large that I am worried about, because who is representing our students in the legislature when they come up with the idea of measuring baseline graduation rates?

M. Wartell: It is an interesting question. We talk about it regularly, and we talk about it to our legislators and the Commission on Higher Education. Education is a slow process.

K. Moustafa: Maybe that is something that we, who have constituencies helping design our programs from outside, might mention so that it does reach a wider audience.

M. Wartell: Have a good semester!

11. The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Jacqueline J. Petersen  
Secretary of the Faculty