

Minutes of the  
First Regular Meeting of the Twenty-Second Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne

September 9, 2002

12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of April 8, 2002
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Grant
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Purdue University – P. Hamburger
  - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer (SR No. 02-1) – R. Sedlmeyer
6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolutions
  - a. Franklin A. Bryan (Senate Reference No. 02-2)
  - b. Gerald G. Szymanski (Senate Reference No. 02-3)
7. Committee reports requiring action
8. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 02-4)
9. New business
10. Committee reports "for information only"
  - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 02-5) – D. Oberstar
  - b. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-6) – D. Oberstar
  - c. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-7) – P. Hamburger
  - d. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 02-8) – J. Grant
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: R. Sedlmeyer

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: D. Marshall

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, P. Agness, R. Barrett, L. Beineke, E. Blakemore, W. Branson, J. Brennan, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, C. Chauhan, S. Choi, M. Codispoti, C. Erickson, L. Fox, J. Grant, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, L. Hite, J. Hrehov, P. Iadicola, S. Isiorho, M. Kimble, J. Knight, L. Lin, M. Lipman, D. Marshall, A. Mustafa,

M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, A. Perez, D. Ross, H. Samavati, G. Schmelzle, K. Squadrito,  
J. Tankel, G. W. Ulmschneider, W. Unsell, L. Vartanian, N. Younis, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

M. Bookout, C. Carlson, R. Friedman, A. Karim, L. Kuznar, B. Parke, E. Neal,

J. Purse-Wiedenhoef

Representative from Medical Education: R. Sweazey

Faculty Members Present: J. Clausen, R. Darabi, P. Gray, S. Sarratore, J. Wellington

Visitors Present: J. Dahl, M. Gruss, P. McLaughlin, A. Weissner

Acta

1. Call to order: R. Sedlmeyer called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 8, 2002: 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. Purdue University:

P. Hamburger: I have in my hand a copy of the "Results of the Faculty Survey Conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute for Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne." I believe that the Vice Chancellor's office has a copy and, if you are interested, they will give you one. I hope the Faculty Affairs Committee and the administration will do an independent analysis of this report. I will point out some of the data that surprised me. I am not going in the order of importance, but by the way it is presented here. The first set of questions is related to IPFW and compares IPFW with other public colleges and universities. The first surprise was rank: at IPFW there are 16.9% full professors and nationwide there is 33.8%. Of course, because of this, we are higher in every other category. We have a higher percentage of lecturers and instructors compared to others. We have 12.2% versus 10.6%. It is not significant, but we should think about that.

Most of the questions in this are not really significantly different from the other institutions. One of them that surprised me was: "During the past two years have you worked with undergraduates on a research project?" IPFW had 54.4% and nationwide 60.4%. I think this should be improved.

To report something good, the question is "Do you agree strongly or somewhat that there is a lot of campus racial conflict here?" We report only 3.6% versus 7.4%. I think that is

very good. The next is probably not so good. The question asks, in the opinion of this faculty, whether students are strongly committed to community service. We believe that only 11% are; nationwide it is 21%.

The biggest dissatisfaction of the faculty is with salary and fringe benefits. This is a little bit misleading. I doubt that fringe benefits are the problem. I believe the salaries are the problem. The dissatisfaction is basically 39.5% versus 45.6%. So, that is something the administration should do something about.

Another dissatisfaction, which is different from the nation, is the quality of students. Only 33.7% believe that we have good quality students versus 38.1% nationwide.

The second set of questions is about IPFW. The question was how faculty relate to teaching versus research. Particularly, how it is different with regard to gender. For me this is really striking. How many in teaching: overall 26% (males 19.7 – females 34.9). Leaning towards teaching: 39.9% overall (males 36.9 and females 44.2%); leaning towards research: 29.8% overall (36.9 males and 19.8 females); heavily in research: 4.3 overall (6.6 for males; 1.2 for females). On the other hand, when it comes to recognition for teaching: males are recognized 47.1% and females only 30.6%. Females are more interested, but still the recognition is 47% as opposed to 30%. I don't know if we can do anything about that.

The overall job satisfaction is 77.2%. It could be better. It is very interesting. There is one category that is interesting beyond that. Only a minority of the faculty were satisfied or very satisfied with the following: user support for labs; human resources process for providing candidates for clerical, service and technical positions; employee assistance programs; process for obtaining IPFW summer grants; and financial support for research at IPFW. The ranges were between 20-43%. This is way below half of the faculty. We should look into it. I really feel that the Faculty Affairs Committee and the administration should analyze this report and come back and report their findings.

I am going to give a similar report to the Board of Trustees this Friday.

Finally, for nostalgia, I don't have the humor nor the charisma nor the language skills [of Mike Downs], but I do want to mention that we still have the temporary parking lot by the river.

Thank you very much.

b. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: This is my first meeting as Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty. I would like to thank all of my supporters. My ability to do this job is, in part, dependent upon hearing the concerns and interests of faculty. If you wish to contact me, please call the main office in sociology and leave a message.

I have not seen a copy of the report that Senator Hamburger is talking about. I had serious methodological concerns about the survey. I did not return this survey because there was no guarantee of anonymity. I would have thought that this would have been a problem for any human subjects committee. I'll hold my response until I see the report.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer (Senate Reference No. 02-1) – R. Sedlmeyer:

R. Sedlmeyer made reference to SR No. 02-1 which lists the Senate documents brought before the Senate last year.

R. Sedlmeyer gave a PowerPoint presentation which was inspired by his attendance at the Faculty Convocation. He made reference to the new IPFW billboards. For example:

**One University/Two Great Names.** He suggested that they add 300+ faculty who are: creative, caring, collaborating, contributing, committed faculty with a footnote making reference, also, to the efforts of the large number of administrators and staff members.

**Strategic Plan.** He said the strategic plan sets out a bold vision for this university which will be known for its academic excellence, value and accessibility; for its exceptional learning environment for diverse learners; for faculty, student, and staff accomplishments; and for contributions to the region.

**175 Degrees of Excellence.** He encourage everyone in every class to make excellence a habit. He suggested that everyone approach everything they do with a desire to excel.

**A Sign of Intelligent Life.** "We need to inflame their intellect," Sedlmeyer said. "We like to recruit and retain our students. There is no reason why each of us can't inflame their intellect and challenge them intellectually to become the best that they can be. To unsettle their minds to widen their horizons, inflame their intellect, and teach them to think straight."

**Get Set for Life.** He continued: "They're only with us for four years, or maybe a little longer if they're part-time. They don't come here just to get a degree. They come here to get a life. We are part of that and we set the foundation for that. We help guide and direct them on that future path. The more solid the foundation we give them, the more likely they will be set for life. I think there is another message in here and that is us being a major contributor to the region. That is getting involved in the life of the community through Continuing Studies and the other programs that we sponsor, e.g., the K-12 program and the programs for the adults in our community."

R. Sedlmeyer: Lastly, I want to talk a little about my vision for this Senate. I took a subset of values from the Strategic Plan. I would like us to exhibit those values as we go forward with our part in shared governance. We have an important job to do with respect to shared governance. We share a responsibility to develop policy and set policy with our administration. We have a very important role to play—especially with those policies that affect the academic life of this campus. We need to take that responsibility seriously, but also remember that we don't always have the last say. We are in this together with those who are sitting here on my right. It behooves us to work collaboratively to see that vision for excellence come about. We're all pretty smart people. I am probably one of the least intellectually-endowed people in this room, but when we get together in our committees, let us take our responsibility to share our intellect in addressing whatever issues come before us.

We must exhibit personal integrity. I believe it is important. When we say yes, we mean yes; when we say no, we mean no. We should not say anything different in the Senate than what we said in committee or vice versa. Do not say one thing in committee and then go somewhere and say something else. To me honesty and integrity are probably the most important values you can bring to this body.

We need to have free and open inquiry. We should always feel free to share whatever our position is on an issue and to share that with as much vigor as we feel necessary. We should

allow all sides that free and open inquiry. The same should be true in committee. Those who are responsible for chairing committees should ensure that that openness is there. At all times we should treat each other with respect. We all have gifts and talents that we bring to this body. Let's treat each other kind.

We have a lot of people in this body and on the faculty that do a lot of good things. I think we should try, as much as possible, especially under good and welfare, to recognize all the good that is being done at this university and we should honor that.

. . . . I get a lot of guidance from my religious background and I hope, therefore, to bring humility to this office. I know I am no better; I'm no smarter; I'm no more talented than anyone else. If we all come here with a little bit of humility, it will ensure the Senate exhibits all those other values. I would appreciate your cooperation as we go forward seeking excellence for our university.

One other thing: if you haven't visited the Senate website (<http://www.ipfw.edu/senate>), it is fabulous. You get the minutes, members, the Constitution, everything that goes on in this body. I highly recommend you visit that site.

6. Special business of the day – Memorial Resolutions:

- a. Franklin A. Bryan (SR No. 02-2)
- b. Gerald G. Szymanski (SR No. 02-3)

Memorial resolutions were read for Drs. Bryan and Szymanski. P. Hamburger asked that a moment of silence be observed for them and for the victims of September 11, 2001.

7. Committee reports requiring action:

There were no committee reports requiring action.

8. Question time (Senate Reference No. 02-4):

**In a letter to the faculty dated June 21, 2002, you described the process you used for 2002-2003 salary increments. Given that this represents a significant change in past practice, would you provide the following information:**

- 1. What percent of total faculty increment money was withheld for special equity awards?**
- 2. What percent of total faculty increment money was withheld for merit awards?**
- 3. What was the total number of faculty receiving special equity awards?**
- 4. What was the total number of faculty receiving merit awards?**
- 5. Does the administration plan to continue the current process and general allocation structure?**

S. Hannah: Let me state at the beginning that my comments here refer only to the faculty salary increment process. While a similar procedure was followed for staff and clerical/technical employees, I am speaking here only about the process for faculty positions, including chairs, below the level of dean. I did meet with Senator Nusbaumer to clarify his questions. My responses are as follows.

Questions 1 and 2 refer to the increment decision-making process above the department/school level. Chancellor Wartell's memo of April 16<sup>th</sup> and my letter of June 21<sup>st</sup> explained that we made a concerted attempt this year at the university level to deal with equity/market issues in addition to merit. Purdue University-West Lafayette and Indiana University-Bloomington made similar efforts. Thus the Chancellor committed a "significant" salary allocation above the 2% allocated to departments to address equity/special merit for faculty and staff. This was not a "withholding of funds" as referenced in the question, but instead was a pool of additional funds designated for this purpose.

Senator Nusbaumer asked me what was the source of these funds. Since we put the state allocation monies (which were flat), the equity monies, and anticipated new enrollment income all in one pot, it is hard to say exactly what income source funded which expense. Logically, however, the increases in salaries had to come from the increases in income.

The allocation process for the equity/special merit monies went as follows. Deans received 2% of their faculty base, which was allocated following department/school merit policies and procedures. In addition, deans submitted prioritized lists of faculty for special equity and/or merit to my office for consideration. Criteria for special equity awards included the percent difference from CUPA for the appropriate discipline and rank, years in rank, and level of performance based on department/school merit definitions. Criteria for special merit awards were annual accomplishments, again using department/school definitions, looking roughly at the top 15%.

I met with each dean to review their lists, and together we compiled recommendations which were approved by the Chancellor. We set no quotas by school. The final award amounts were determined by fund availability and designed to address a significant number of individuals.

Questions 3 and 4 concerned the outcome of the process. The total awarded for special faculty merit/equity was \$237,750. A total of 114 individual faculty, or 34.2% of the total 333 full-time for 2001-02 faculty below the level of dean, received an award. The distribution of funds was 56.4% for equity and 43.6% for merit. Forty (40) faculty received an equity award; 61, a special merit award, and 13 received both equity and special merit. We did not set targets for either the number of faculty or the distribution of awards between equity and special merit. Our only goal was to respond to the recommendations made by the deans following the announced criteria with rewards that would be significant. I am not sure that the resulting proportions have any particular meaning. In general the HR literature suggests a 30% merit target; Jack Welch would make it 15%. Comparatively, our distribution seems reasonable.



Question 6. The final question is whether we “plan to continue the current process and general allocation structure.” The answer is “it depends.” The first contingency is the progress we made on our equity/market problem with this year’s effort. Do we still have faculty with significant equity issues? Our salary studies should answer that question later this year. The second contingency is the action of the legislature on our biennial budget request. For that one, your guess is as good as mine at this time. I believe, however, that I speak for the Chancellor that if it is appropriate and if we can afford it, we will.

I hope these responses help clarify this year’s process. If you have other questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

M. Nusbaumer: Compared to the 2% given to the departments, do you have some comparison versus what total was spent for the equity and the merits?

S. Hannah: I can't answer that. We can get that number for you.

M. Nusbaumer: I am simply looking at some comparison between the amount of money given for special consideration versus the standard consideration.

M. Younis: Where can we get the school criteria?

S. Hannah: Look at your department merit. Most departments use their promotion and tenure guidelines when they do their merit allocations. Sometimes departments have committees; some leave it up to the chair. The procedures vary dramatically across the campus.

N. Younis: My question was not about the department. My question was about the school level.

S. Hannah: In some cases, like in Education, they only have school criteria. In most cases this is done by departmental promotion and tenure documents. Sociology has point systems.

P. Iadicola: Am I to assume that essentially the nominees for both the equity and the merit pool came principally from departments or the lowest administrative level?

S. Hannah: They came from the dean. I require that each dean who sends me a name to be able to support that with documentation based on what went on in the department. Usually that's the case. I'm not going to say that occasionally a dean hasn't asked a department why a name is missing.

P. Iadicola: I guess what I am asking is, what proportion of those who entered into the pool for consideration came from outside a department dean?

S. Hannah: A tiny handful. There are occasions, and I can think of one right now, where a faculty member has made an outstanding contribution, but it has been for a university contribution. It wasn't something that would have been recognized in the department or in the school. It was something that was recognized at the university level, so that name came from me.

If you have specific questions, please call me.

9. New business:

J. Grant moved to approve the following resolution:

Whereas, Barbara Blauvelt has served as the Secretary of the Senate and Secretary of the Faculty at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne since its current organization in Fall 1980; and

Whereas, Barbara Blauvelt has been an inestimable resource to the campus by providing the IPFW community with a written record of the Senate's proceedings by keeping faculty informed about the procedures established for the Senate under its Constitution and Bylaws, by professionally and cheerfully assisting the IPFW community in locating needed documents and making them available in a timely manner to the Senate and the faculty, and for so much more; and

Whereas, she has even delayed her retirement to be of service once again today;

Therefore be it resolved, That the members of the Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate express their heartfelt gratitude for the work Barbara Blauvelt has done for this campus and the manner in which it has been provided, and that we wish her good luck in all her new endeavors.

Second.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

10. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (SR No. 02-5) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar presented SR No. 02-5 (Proposal for Undergraduate Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language) for information only.

b. Educational Policy Committee (SR No. 02-6) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar presented SR No. 02-6 (Task Force on General Education Assessment) for information only.

J. Clausen was given speaking privileges with regard to this item and made the following report:

J. Clausen: As you see, the document is dated January 30, 2002. During the spring semester, the document was discussed at meetings of both Educational Policy Committee

(EPC) and the General Education Subcommittee (GES) and, with the approval of those committees, the VCAA appointed a task force last spring:

- Bill Bruening (A&S Advisor, GES member)
- Yvonne Zubovic (A&S faculty, Assessment Council Member)
- Steve Sarratore (GE, Assessment Council, and past EPC member)
- Jeanette Clausen (GE, Assessment Council, and past EPC member)

In June 2002, VCAA Hannah and the task force members attended an assessment workshop organized by the American Association of Higher Education and the Higher Learning Commission. During the workshop, the task force developed a comprehensive plan for improvement of assessment at IPFW and a specific plan of action for General Education (GE) assessment, with a timeline for reporting to the North Central Association in June 2004.

Problems with the old GE assessment measures, which consisted of surveys of students enrolled in GE courses and surveys of faculty teaching Area VI courses, include:

- the measures were indirect rather than direct; i.e., we asked students their opinions as to what they had learned, rather than assessing student learning via portfolios, tests, or other direct means.
- the measures were course-based rather than program-based; i.e., the surveys were administered to students enrolled in courses approved for GE, creating the impression that individual courses were being assessed (even though results were never tracked by course, only aggregate data were examined)

The TF has begun working on our plan to develop a program-based assessment plan for IPFW General Education. Over the summer the task force:

- completed a draft of GE learning objectives based on the GE goals stated in SD 99-25;
- collected sample learning objectives from syllabi for selected courses in each GE area;
- assigned responsibility for separate areas to individual task force members.

At the beginning of the semester, each TF member began recruiting members for GE area subcommittees. That process is nearly complete. The next steps are to work with the area committees to refine the draft learning objectives as needed (based on CURRENT syllabi for approved courses) and to develop assessment measures based on program goals. During AY 2002-03, Areas I-III will develop assessment plans to be tested during 2003-04, and during AY 2003-04, Areas IV-VI will develop plans to be tested during

2004-05. The TF will report on a regular basis to GES, EPC, and the Assessment Council.

c. Executive Committee (SR No. 02-7) – P. Hamburger:

P. Hamburger presented SR No. 02-7 (Committee report regarding selection of Senate secretary) for information only.

d. Executive Committee (SR No. 02-8) – J. Grant:

J. Grant presented SR No. 02-8 (Committee report regarding Senate secretarial search, job description, and Senate office space) for information only.

11. The general good and welfare of the University:

P. Hamburger: After the Faculty Convocation I got questions from several people concerned about the number of new people who were hired as Continuing Lecturers. Some raised a concern about whether Continuing Lecturers are replacing tenure-track faculty. Others raised a concern about instructors who are teaching graduate-level courses. There are some Continuing Lecturers with PhDs that should be tenure track. I didn't have any time to look into the details of this. I am just letting you know that it is a concern of some faculty. Additionally, one of the main concerns is that, while IPFW conducts searches for every single job including clerical and support jobs, Continuing Lecturer positions are filled with no search. . . . There is no application process. There is no committee. It is basically an arbitrary choice by department chairs. I will try to form a question for question time for the next meeting.

S. Hannah: The only thing I want to say is that I will answer all those questions in great detail. I don't want you to leave this room, however, with incorrect information. In terms of understanding what a Continuing Lecturer is, it is to replace part-timers. It is a quality-control effort on behalf of the university. The whole point was conversion of part-timers to a more continuing relationship. I will put together something more systematic in terms of numbers: where they are, who they are. Also, understand that in every case they are recommended by the department and evaluated by the department. It is a quality effort.

P. Hamburger: I understand that. However, will this replace positions that should be tenure-track positions? I support the Continuing Lecturers as long as it replaces part-time faculty. Are there others who are teaching high-level courses, particularly graduate-level courses? How does this affect the whole faculty? I don't really have any idea about numbers. It is still a main concern and the university and the Faculty Affairs Committee should look into it. Are they replacing only part-time faculty, or will it also replace other faculty who could be tenure track faculty? These are major issues. . . .

M. Nusbaumer: I would like to draw to your attention that this is the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the **temporary** parking lot and to the Senate's often-expressed concern regarding the lack of aesthetic value that this lot adds to this campus.

R. Barrett: I would ask Senator Branson if he would pass along my thanks to Dave Danielson and his crew for once again helping to make this campus look fantastic for the start of a new semester.

. . .

M. Wartell: Please note that we start this year on a really positive note. The chairs in this room no longer pinch you when you sit down. This room has been totally redone thanks to Senator Branson and Mr. Danielson and his crew. It does look nice.

You know about enrollments. We could not be doing a whole lot better. Some of the pressure has been taken off us with respect to space because some enrollment growth has ended up being in Continuing Studies: we're doing much more business in distance education now. While at one point there were only 100 parking spaces left on the campus during one day, we are not quite overflowing yet. However, it certainly takes a long time to get off campus at noon. Finding a parking space I'm sure is difficult for some of your students, but they would have less difficulty if they liked to walk.

In keeping with the positive nature of giving folks kudos, . . . I do want to point out that Lowell Beineke has just been named editor of a very prestigious mathematical education journal. That's really great.

Our women's volleyball team won the Purdue invitational tournament. They came away with our first division one tournament win, which was really very exciting.

In general the year has gotten off to a really good start. I wish you the best during this year. We may be challenged in the legislature once again, although our increases in enrollment should set us in really good stead to handle it. Faculty positions next year will grow if we receive enrollment change funds, and the VCAA has already begun authorizing searches.

Walt and I are continuing to work on ensuring that we have residence halls by fall of 2004. We think that we have a way to do it, nothing is a guarantee. Thanks and keep up the good work.

S. Hannah: I would like to remind you of other good things. Jim Farlow, outstanding researcher, will speak on September 19 at 3:00 in Walb. His talk will be about sinkholes.

P. Iadicola: There are several events that this campus is sponsoring or cosponsoring in regard to the remembrance of 9-11. I just want to point out one that is sponsored by the Peace Studies Program and the Sociology program and that is the moment of silence around the Peace Pole to memorialize all those who died on 9-11, as well as since that day. I am told that the bell tower will ring during the moments of the crash of the airliners. It starts at 8:30 a.m. at the Peace Pole which is just left of the gazebo on campus. It will end at 10:03 when the last bell is sounded.

R. Sedlmeyer asked everyone to introduce themselves.

12. The meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.

Barbara L. Blauvelt

Secretary of the Faculty