Minutes of the
Sixth Regular Meeting of the Seventeenth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
February 9, 1998
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of January 12 and 26, 1998

3. Acceptance of the agenda - S. Hollander

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
   a. Purdue University - J. Hersberger
   b. Indiana University - M. Downs

5. Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick

6. Committee reports requiring action

7. New business

8. Committee reports "for information only"

9. The general good and welfare of the University

10. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: W. Frederick
Parliamentarian: J. Clausen
Sergeant-at-Arms: N. Younis
Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

1. Call to order: W. Frederick called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of January 12 and 26, 1998: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

   S. Hollander moved to approve the agenda as distributed.
   The agenda was approved.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

   a. Purdue University:

      J. Hersberger: Since we last met a number of things have taken place with regard to Senate involvement in the reorganization of OLS. On Wednesday, January 28, I met with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor to discuss procedures and common ground, which resulted in a meeting on Thursday, January 29. The Presiding Officer, the Vice Chancellor, Dean Lane, Dean Pugh, Professors Wakley and McDonald of OLS, and I met to discuss where we were, how we had gotten there, where we should go, and what we should do. We agreed to try to arrange a meeting with the accreditation team when they were on campus to discuss the reorganization aspect of things. That meeting, in fact, took place on Tuesday, February 3, with the same group that I just mentioned augmented by Professors Downs, Karim and Pfeffenberger. I can speak only from my perspective. I think that the meetings all went well. I think the meeting with the accreditation team went particularly well, and I have hope that this issue will be resolved in a way that will prevent problems from occurring in future accreditations when they involve reorganization of faculty. From my perspective, it was obvious that the Senate should have been involved at a much earlier stage than it was. I hope that will happen in the future. For the immediate issue, in terms of OLS' long-term faculty governance and where it should be placed, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has asked the Presiding Officer of the Senate to have the appropriate body of the Senate come up with a long-term recommendation.

   b. Indiana University:
M. Downs: I was present at the meeting with the accreditors and I was encouraged to find out that they were sympathetic, understanding, and appeared to be very flexible about problems on this campus regarding the accreditation of OLS. I have high hopes that this will work out without any additional tension or controversy.

5. **Report of the Presiding Officer - W. Frederick:**

W. Frederick. I have forwarded SD 97-10 (Projected Move of OLS) to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate for consideration. Along with that I will include an email I received from Vice Chancellor English which I will read:

I am requesting of the Senate leadership that a review be undertaken of the status of OLS on the IPFW campus. The review would be completed and forwarded to the IPFW administration with recommendations. (Fenwick W. English, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)

I would also like to remind you that there is a Faculty Convocation scheduled for February 16 at noon in CM159. If you look on the "issues du jour" bulletin board I believe you will find already one resolution to be introduced at the Convocation. Please encourage all to attend. This is a faculty convocation and the rules regarding speaking and voting are on the notice that you received in campus mail regarding the Convocation. This is the first time in 34 years of this institution that the faculty have voted to meet in Convocation. . . . I think it is important that all people be present and all views be heard. 

6. **Committee reports requiring action.** There was nothing under this item.

7. **New business:** There was no new business.

8. **Committee reports "for information only":** There was nothing under this item.

9. **The general good and welfare of the University:**

P. Hamburger: I believe that there is a Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee of the Senate. I would like to raise a question. There is much unnecessary information on the bulletin boards and very little useful information. I would like to see information that the faculty use—like promotion and tenure or travel forms— which we can download instead of running around trying to find this information. It would be much easier for the faculty to use these forms off the computer, and it would save a lot of time and lots of problems for the faculty.

J. Tankel: I have a question. I am directing this to the Presiding Officer. On "issues du jour" bulletin board, as of this morning, there is a copy of Senate Document SD 92-13, which is referred to in the resolution which has been proposed for the Convocation. I am asking the Presiding Officer of the Senate how the apparent contradiction between the rules, as laid out in SD 92-13 for evaluation of the chancellor and vice chancellor, and the resolution, if this resolution is passed, will be resolved? If you want me to go further into explaining what I think is the contradiction, I will do so.

W. Frederick: According to Robert's Rules, . . any contradictions or concerns that call for a point of order can only be dealt with once the motion is on the floor. So it would be premature for me to make any kind of judgment as to whether it is in conflict with any
other document at this point. It is not before the body, and the body has not been convened.

R. Manalis: I feel obligated to express myself on one matter, at least, and that is from my point of view. I think that the Senate should be spending its time on matters that pertain more closely to the mission of IPFW, which is to teach and to pursue knowledge. I would like to suggest that the Senate spend its time on issues such as recruitment of local area high school students, retention, and ever-changing information technology and its impact at IPFW. Funding at IPFW is a hot issue, also. I have a suggestion. Why don't we have an open forum here at IPFW and invite faculty, administrators and selected state legislators to work together and combine our strengths to come up with some ideas as to how we might proceed. Another issue is general education. I would like to see the Senate and its committees working on these issues.

J. Wilson: I have a piece of information to share with the body given some discussion under "good and welfare" at the November meeting regarding the January pay date for Purdue employees. There was some concern about moving it up to December because of tax ramifications. I don't know if all of you have checked your statements from your financial institutions, if you have direct deposit, but my financial institution indicates that my paycheck went in on December 31. The discussion about tax ramifications may be moot if in fact they're going in on December 31 anyway.

J. Hersberger: Since you raised it, I would just like you to know that mine went in on January 2 as Purdue University indicated it would.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty