## FORT WAYNE SENATE AGENDA **MONDAY FEBRUARY 13, 2017** 12:00 P.M., KT G46

- 1. Call to order
- 2. Approval of the minutes of January 9, 2017
- 3. Acceptance of the agenda K. Pollock
- 4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties

  - a. Indiana University A. Downs
    b. Purdue University M. Masters
- 5. Report of the Presiding Officer J. Malanson
- 6. Special business of the day
  - Memorial Resolution (Šenate Reference No. 16-18) S. LaVere
- Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 16-19) A. Downs b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 16-21) M. Jordan c. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 16-22) M. Jordan

  - d. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 16-23) K. Pollock
    e. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 16-24) K. Pollock
    f. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 16-25) K. Pollock

  - g. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 16-26) K. Pollock
- 8. New business
- Committee reports "for information only"
  - a. Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 16-20) J. Malanson
  - b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 16-5) K. Pollock
- 10. The general good and welfare of the University
- 11. Adjournment\*

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

**Approving** Non Voting <u>Absent</u> M. Coussement

A. Downs

J. Malanson

M. Masters

K. Pollock, Chair

B. Redman

A. Schwab

B. Valliere

A 44 - 1. ... - ... 4 - .

# Attachments:

- "Memorial Resolution James Haw" (SR No. 16-18)
- "Slate for the Election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review" (SR No. 16-19)
- "Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee Resolution" (SD 16-21)
- "Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: University Resources Policy Committee" (SD 16-22)
- "Revision of VPA P&T Document" (SD 16-23)
- "Academic Reorganization Process" (SD 16-24)
- "College of Education and Public Policy Procedures for Electing Senators" (supersedes SD 88-16 and SD 88-32) (SD 16-25)
- "Statement on Shared Governance" (SD 16-26)
- "Annual Report on Athletics Budget" (SR No. 16-20)
- "Report on Designated Items" (SR No. 16-5)

# In Memoriam JAMES ALFRED HAW December 11, 1945-January 9, 2017

After an illness of several years, James Haw died in January 2017 at the age of 71.

James Haw came to IPFW in 1972 with a Ph.D. from the University of Virginia. He retired in 2009, after almost four decades of extraordinary service to IPFW. His main research field was the era of the American Revolution. Jim published two books, eleven journal articles, and various other works. His books, which were very well received, are both biographies of American Revolutionary leaders, Maryland's Samuel Chase and John and Edward Rutledge of South Carolina. Both are the first and only full-length scholarly biographies of their subjects.

Professor Haw taught a variety of courses in U.S. history from the colonial period through the Civil War plus U.S. foreign policy. Most of those courses had not been offered at IPFW before his arrival and represented important additions to the curriculum.

Jim effectively and generously served the university and the department in a variety of capacities. He served as chair of the History Department for six years. Perhaps his most enduring service contribution came during the period when the Indiana and Purdue programs at IPFW were being combined into one. Jim was one of the four-member committee that wrote IPFW's unified academic regulations. As chair of the Educational Policy Committee of the Senate in 1983-1985, he helped design a number of important policies, including the Campus Connection for high school students and policy governing departmental involvement in Continuing Education.

Jim was a respected and active scholar and one of the most effective teachers in the department. He was also very generous and helpful. His door was always open to students and to younger history faculty who needed advice on teaching strategies, student engagement, and all matters pertaining to IPFW policies.

Beyond his career at IPFW, Jim was also a noted and avid bird watcher (and not just his revered St. Louis Cardinals). He was known in NE Indiana for his expertise and generosity to all people who were interested in bird watching. As the president of the local Audubon society stated, Jim "really was a mentor for all [birders] in northeastern Indiana." Jim, in his 50-some years of birding, was a meticulous observer and note-taker of different birds. He not only compiled an impressive "life list" of over 700 bird species, but also kept careful records on bird populations. For many years, Jim organized the local Audubon Society's annual spring and fall field trips and the Christmas Bird Count.

Jim is buried in his home state of Missouri. We will miss him very much.

TO: Indiana University Senators

FROM: Andrew Downs, Chair

Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs

DATE: 31 January 2017

SUBJ: Slate for 2017-2018 Faculty Board of Review Election

Here is the slate of Indiana University tenured faculty members who have indicated their willingness to serve on the IPFW Faculty Board of Review. Members of this body will be elected by Senators with Indiana University affiliation at the Senate meeting on February 13.

jр

## Slate

Melanie Bookout Lee Roberts Karla Zepeda

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Mark Jordan, Chair

University Resources Policy Committee

DATE: January 19, 2017

SUBJ: Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee Resolution

WHEREAS, the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) is the parent committee of the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS); and

WHEREAS, BAS requested that URPC review a resolution to request that the Administration present an overview of the status of the University budget semiannually; and

WHEREAS, URPC completed the review;

Gordon Schmidt

BE IT RESOLVED, That the attached resolution be considered by the Senate.

Approved Anne Argast James Hersberger Mark Jordan	Opposed	Abstention	Absent Carl Drummond Shawn Peterson Kathy Pollock	Non-Voting Greg Justice
Suzanne Lavere Hongli Luo			Walter Soptelean David Wesse	
Zafar Nazarov				
Nila Reimer				

TO: Mark Jordan, Chair

University Resources Policy Committee

FROM: Jeffrey Malanson, Chair

**Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee** 

DATE: January 11, 2017

SUBJ: Semiannual Budget Presentations by Administration

WHEREAS, IPFW has faced significant budgetary shortfalls in recent years as a result of declining enrollments and increasing unavoidable expenses; and

WHEREAS, Repeated changes to the budget reporting template used by Purdue University have greatly complicated the process of creating and distributing easily understandable budget summary documents to the campus community; and

WHEREAS, It is essential for the Fort Wayne Senate and the Faculty to have an accurate understanding of IPFW's budget and overall financial situation if it is to effectively participate in the governance of the university;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Senate requests that the administration make a presentation on the status of IPFW's budget and overall financial situation at the September Senate meeting each year that includes:

- An overview of changes to IPFW's state allocations and tuition and fee rates;
- Information on revenues gained or lost as a result of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education's performance funding metrics;
- An assessment of IPFW's budgeted tuition revenue as compared to our anticipated actual tuition revenue;
- A discussion of unavoidable expenses that constrain our overall budget, including, employee benefits, debt service, deferred maintenance, utilities, and other sizable unavoidable expenses;
- Other information necessary to understand IPFW's budget and overall financial situation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Senate requests that the administration make a supplemental presentation on the status of IPFW's budget and overall financial situation at the February Senate meeting each year that includes:

- An assessment of IPFW's budgeted tuition revenue as compared to our anticipated actual tuition revenue for Spring semester;
- A discussion of other major changes to IPFW's budget and overall financial situation since the September presentation to the Senate;
- The plan for the budget process to determine the budget for the next academic year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Presiding Officer of the Fort Wayne Senate shall be responsible for working with the administration to coordinate these budget presentations each year, including issues of specific interest or concern beyond those indicated in this resolution that the Senate would like to see addressed in the presentations.

Approve
Hosni Abu-Mulaweh
Nurgul Aitalieva
Martha Coussement
Cigdem Gurgur
Steven Hanke
Jeffrey Malanson
Jordan Marshall

Not Approve Abstain

**Absent**Suining Ding

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Mark Jordan, Chair

University Resources Policy Committee

DATE: January 19, 2017

Gordon Schmidt

SUBJ: Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: University Resources

**Policy Committe** 

WHEREAS, A representative of the Voting Faculty has been elected to serve on the campus Space Allocation Committee starting in January 2017; and

- WHEREAS, This representative will serve a 2.5-year term running through Spring 2019, with terms running for 3 years from that point forward; and
- WHEREAS, Space allocation falls under the responsibilities of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) as outlined in bylaw 5.3.5.2.1.1., "Consideration of such matters as planning and optimal utilization of the physical facilities of the university . . ."; and
- BE IT RESOLVED, That the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate be amended as follows, with the adoption of a new provision:
- 5.3.5.2.1.6. The University Resources Policy Committee shall receive a brief report from the Voting Faculty representative to the campus Space Allocation Committee each semester.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Anne Argast			Carl Drummond	Greg Justice
James Hersberger			Shawn Peterson	
Mark Jordan			Kathy Pollock	
Suzanne Lavere			Walter Soptelean	
Hongli Luo			David Wesse	
Zafar Nazarov				
Nila Reimer				

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair

**Executive Committee** 

RE: Revision of College of Visual Arts Promotion and Tenure Document

Date: January 31, 2017

WHEREAS, the College of Visual and Performing Arts had revised their promotion and tenure document so as to be in compliance with SD 14-35 and SD 14-36; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the revised document and finds that it is in fact in compliance with SD 14-35 and SD 14-36;

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate approve the attached "College of Visual and Performing Arts Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures" document as their current promotion and tenure document.

Approved: Opposed: Non-Voting
A. Downs M. Coussement

J. Malanson

M. Masters

K. Pollock, Chair

B. Redman

A. Schwab

B. Valliere

Senate Document SD 16-23 (Supersedes SD 10-18) (Approved, 4/11/2011)

TO: Kathy Pollock, Chair

**Executive Committee** 

FROM: Lesa Rae Vartanian, Chair

**Faculty Affairs Committee** 

RE: Revision of VPA P & T Document

Date: January 27, 2017

DISPOSITION: To the Executive Committee for inclusion in the next senate meeting

WHEREAS, the College of Visual and Performing Arts had revised their promotion and tenure document so as to be in compliance with SD 14-35 and SD 14-36; and

- WHEREAS, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the document and provided feedback that the College of Visual and Performing Arts successfully incorporated into their revised document; and
- WHEREAS, the College of Visual and Performing Arts has approved by college vote their revised promotion and tenure document, and has asked the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee to bring their document to the Senate floor for approval; and
- WHEREAS, the Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the revised document and finds that it is in fact in compliance with SD 14-35 and SD 14-36;
- BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate approve the attached "College of Visual and Performing Arts Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures" document as their current promotion and tenure document.

<u>In Favor:</u> <u>Opposed:</u> <u>Non-Voting</u>
Ben Dattilo Marcia Dixson
Daren Kaiser
Zafar Nazarov

Lesa Rae Vartanian

Brenda Valliere

# Memorandum

**To:** Lesa Vartanian, Chair

Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

From: Craig Humphrey, Chair

VPA Promotion and Tenure Committee

**Date:** 18 January, 2016

**Re:** Revised VPA Promotion and Tenure Document

This memo is to inform the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs committee that the College of Visual and Performing Arts (VPA) Promotion and Tenure Committee has completed the revisions requested to the VPA Promotion and Tenure Documents so as to comply with SD 14-35 and SD 14-36, and to request that the Faculty Senate FAC move approval/formal recognition of the revised VPA document as in alignment with SD 14-35 and SD 14-36 at an upcoming Senate meeting.

# College of Visual and Performing Arts Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures

## **PREAMBLE**

The University criteria for tenure and promotion, as stated in SD 14-36, provide the framework for this decision process. Guidelines for all faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are found in SD 14-35. The College of Visual and Performing Arts adopts the criteria in SD 14-35 Guiding Principles of Promotion and Tenure. In all tenure and promotion cases, candidates must refer to the tenure and promotion criteria listed by their departmental governance document

#### 1.0 PROCEDURES

#### 1.1 Timetable

Each faculty member must be considered for tenure no later than during the penultimate year of the contractual probationary period. In a case where extraordinary personal circumstances may have an adverse affect on the faculty member's academic performance, an exception to the normal policy may be considered. Senate Document 91-20 presents guidelines and procedures for extending the probationary period for justifiable cause.

# 1.2 Development and Presentation of the Case

Each candidate must prepare a dossier for Promotion and/or Tenure in accordance with the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format Guidelines, Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum 99-1, or subsequent revision. The candidate must identify the criteria documents to be used. These must have been in effect during 6 years before case.

Each case for promotion and tenure shall be forwarded to the Department Committee by the date stipulated by the Department. The Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts shall determine and publish the College level due dates each year, allowing sufficient time for the case to be considered in turn by the Department Committee, Department Chair, College Committee and Dean before the date it is due to the University Committee.

Updates can be added to the case after the department committee votes, but no new information, further revisions or addenda to the case are allowed after the department has voted, with the exception of minor spelling or grammar corrections or the addition of awards or notice of publications received after the case was submitted. Any changes made to the case on the recommendation of the Department Chair must be forwarded to the previous decision level. Both the Department Committee and the College Committee will conduct open ballots on each promotion case and each tenure case. The results of the vote and a letter detailing the recommendation will be appended to the case as it is forwarded to the next level. The administrator or committee chair at each level will inform the candidate in writing of the vote or recommendation on the nomination, with a clear and complete statement of the reasons, detailing both the majority and the minority opinions. At the time the case is sent forward to the next level,

the administrator or committee chair will also send a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons to the previous level(s).

The candidate has the opportunity to provide written response within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation at all levels within the College which will be forwarded with the case. A case may be withdrawn when it is being considered by the Department or College, except for tenure cases in the penultimate year.

## 1.3 External Review Process

Each promotion or tenure dossier will include a minimum of six independent external review letters evaluating the candidate's area of excellence.

By March of the calendar year in which the case will be presented, the candidate and department chair together develop a list of potential reviewers, with the majority of names coming from the chair. The rank of the evaluators should be that to which the candidate seeks promotion or higher, and their credentials should identify them as competent and respected in their field. Professionals from outside academia should also be recognized as experts in their respective fields. Co-authors, doctoral chairs, or friends of the candidate are not appropriate reviewers. The chair will contact each individual to determine willingness to serve as a reviewer.

Materials sent to external reviewers will include a copy of the candidate's CV; information about IPFW, including teaching load and research expectations; and department, college and campus promotion and tenure criteria. As described above, materials supporting a case based on excellence in teaching may include a teaching portfolio or other evidence of teaching excellence; a case based on research may include several key pieces of published research; one based on creative endeavor may include slides, recordings, compositions, or video.

Evaluators should be asked to review the candidate's work in accordance with the promotion and tenure criteria provided. They may also be asked to comment on the significance of the work, its contributions to the field, and the quality of the journals, performing venues or galleries that are referenced. Evaluators should not be asked if they would tenure or promote the candidate at their campus.

Review letters will be made available to the candidate so they can be summarized in the dossier. The reviewers should be aware of this understanding.

When preparing the case, the faculty member should include the evaluators' CVs, their relationship to the candidate, if any, a copy of the letter that was sent to them, and an account of the process used to obtain the reviews. All solicited letters will be included.

#### 2.0 DECISION LEVELS

# 2.1 Committee Composition and Procedures

Nominations for promotion and/or tenure are considered at several levels. The preponderance of the evaluation of a candidate shall occur at the first (departmental) level.

The department level excepted, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before the College Committee.

No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for promotion or tenure is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own promotion or tenure nomination.

The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential, and only the committee chair may communicate a committee's decision to the candidate and to the next level. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared.

# 2.2 Department Committee

The composition and function of the department committee shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the College. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the College or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

All full-time tenure-track members of the department should be consulted about each case for promotion and tenure. The majority of the departmental committee shall be persons possessing the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires. If fewer than three persons are eligible to serve on the department committee, the department shall submit to the Chair the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department committee. From this list, the Chair shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to between three and five.

# 2.3 College Committee

The College Committee serves to review and evaluate all cases for promotion and/or tenure according to the criteria set forth by the candidate's department and the College of Visual and Performing Arts. The members of the College Committee shall be elected by the voting faculty of the College of Visual and Performing Arts according to procedures established by that faculty as articulated in VPA "Governance Document," 93-1, revised 4/02. The committee is comprised of five tenured associate or full professors representing all departments. Members must have prior P&T committee experience at the department level. The College Faculty Affairs Committee will solicit at least five nominees and will submit these names to the faculty by mail ballot. The nominee from each department with the highest vote total will be declared elected. The nominee with the next highest vote total will be selected as the at-large member of the committee. The committee will elect a chair from the voting faculty members.

Members voting on a case should be at the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires. In years in which a case for full professor is before the committee, each department will forward names of eligible committee members to the Dean, who will supplement the list with others from outside the College to constitute a committee of five members to consider that case.

Members of the college committee may serve at the department level, but not at the campus level in the promotion and tenure process while serving on the college committee

Members of the college committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be staggered and may not be longer than three years.

Department chairs may not serve in the years when cases from their respective departments are being presented, except in such case as the eligible voting members in that department be too few, in which case the chair could serve at the specific request of the department.

The Dean may not serve on the college committee or participate in meetings.

The college committee shall review how well the process has adhered to documented procedures, review the recommendation of the lower levels. If the committee questions a decision of a lower level, it may review the case based on department criteria.

Committee members may not abstain from voting, and proxy voting will not be allowed.

Committee members may recuse in the event of a conflict of interests. Recusals will be determined by a majority vote of all committee members. The recusing individual must leave the room during deliberations.

# 2.4 Campus Committee

The College Faculty Affairs committee shall conduct a faculty election for three nominees to serve on the campus committee. The slate of candidates will be selected from among tenured faculty of the College. The names of three nominees will be forwarded to the chief administrative officer by the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair

**Executive Committee** 

DATE: January 31, 2017

Brenda Valliere

SUBJ: Academic Reorganization Process

- WHEREAS, IPFW is currently going through a Realignment process to divide the campus into separate Indiana University and Purdue University operations; and
- WHEREAS, The College of Health and Human Services will lose three departments (Dental Education, Medical Imaging, and Nursing) to the new IU operation, necessitating at least a minor reorganization to find new academic homes for the remaining two HHS departments (Hospitality and Tourism Management and Human Services); and
- WHEREAS, Realignment affords IPFW and its faculty the opportunity to re-envision the university from the ground up, including the possibility for a new academic structure; and
- WHEREAS, The reprogramming of student and academic information systems will be undertaken at significant expense as a result of Realignment, and these systems would have to be reprogrammed again at significant expense if reorganization is delayed to a future date; and
- WHEREAS, The timeline for reprogramming student and academic systems, as well as the requirement that any new academic organization be approved by the Purdue University Board of Trustees, necessitates the completion of the academic reorganization process by June 2017; and
- WHEREAS, Any academic reorganization process should be faculty driven and collaboratively undertaken with the administration:
- BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate adopts the following procedure to facilitate the academic reorganization process.

Approved	Opposed	Absent	Non-Voting
Andrew Downs			Martha Coussement
Jeff Malanson			
Mark Masters			
Kathy Pollock			
Beverly Redman			
Abe Schwab			

# Academic Reorganization Process Spring 2017

- 1. Goal: Recommend an academic structure through a process that follows the principles of shared governance
- 2. Steering Committee
  - 2.1. The Executive Committee of the Senate shall be the steering committee of this process
  - 2.2. Duties of the Steering Committee: Administer the academic reorganization design process (e.g. refine the process and schedule, develop a communication strategy, schedule meetings, gather and disseminate information, monitor progress). Campuswide meetings shall be facilitated by the Steering Committee.
- 3. Academic Structure Design Process
  - 3.1. It should not be necessary to start from scratch. The information in Plan 2020 and the information in program USAP reports may prove helpful, but programs/departments should not feel bound by this information.
  - 3.2. Programs/Departments shall be asked to:
    - 3.2.1. Define their core values and mission
    - 3.2.2. Define what they are, could be, should be
    - 3.2.3. Identify programs/departments with which they might partner and programs/departments with which they might be grouped to create a college
    - 3.2.4. Think of the conventional and the unusual when identifying partners and groupings
  - 3.3. Information from programs/departments must be submitted to the Steering Committee by February 24<sup>th</sup>.
  - 3.4. Central administration shall provide decision-making criteria (e.g. number of colleges, number of administrative FTE) by February 17<sup>th</sup>.
  - 3.5. Information from January 5<sup>th</sup> OAA sponsored meeting at the Alumni Center, programs/departments, and decision-making criteria from the central administration must be shared with campus at least one week before campus-wide meetings
  - 3.6. Three campus-wide meetings to discuss IPFW's core values and mission to be completed by March 3<sup>rd</sup>. These meetings are open to the entire campus community. IPSGA, APSAC, and CSSAC shall be invited to sponsor other meetings and/or to submit comments and recommendations.
  - 3.7. Summary of the campus-wide meetings about the core values and mission of IPFW shall be disseminated by March 13<sup>th</sup>.
  - 3.8. Three campus-wide brainstorming sessions about the academic structure of IPFW by March 24<sup>th</sup>. These meetings are open to the entire campus community. IPSGA, APSAC, and CSSAC shall be invited to sponsor other meetings and/or to submit comments and recommendations.
  - 3.9. Summary of the campus-wide brainstorming sessions shall be disseminated by March 31<sup>st</sup>.
  - 3.10. Campus organizations (e.g. departments, colleges, IPSGA, APSAC, CSSAC, Deans Council, senate governance committees) may submit proposals for academic reorganization by April 7<sup>th</sup>.

## 3.11. Conference Committee

3.11.1. Membership: Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management; one (1) member of the Deans Council, one (1) representative of APSAC, one (1) member of CSSAC, Presiding Officer; Speaker of the Purdue University Faculty; Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty; chairs or representatives of the Educational Policy Committee, Executive Committee; Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee, and University Resource Policy Committee

# 3.11.2. Duties

- 3.11.2.1. Discuss findings of the department/program meetings and the campus-wide public meetings
- 3.11.2.2. Discuss submitted proposals
- 3.11.2.3. Develop a single proposal
- 3.11.2.4. Hold three campus-wide meetings to discuss the proposal
- 3.11.2.5. Revise the proposal based on campus-wide meetings if necessary
- 3.11.2.6. A proposal receiving a majority of votes from the Conference Committee shall be delivered to the Senate by April 28<sup>th</sup>
- 3.12. The Senate shall recommend an academic structure by May 5<sup>th</sup>.

Supersedes SD 88-16 (Amended & Approved 2/13/1989) and SD 88-32 (Amended & Approved 4/24/1989)

## **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair

**Executive Committee** 

DATE: February 2, 2017

SUBJ: College of Education and Public Policy Procedures for Electing Senators

WHEREAS, Article VII.A.5. of the Constitution of the Faculty states that "Methods of nomination and election [of senators], and of filling seats vacated before the end of a term, shall be proposed and implemented by the Voting Faculty of those [major] units according to methods consistent with generally accepted principles of democratic representation. These methods must be defined in the documents which define the protocols of faculty governance within each unit; and the protocols must be approved by the Senate by simple majority vote."; and

WHEREAS, The College of Education and Public Policy (CEPP) has revised their procedures for electing senators;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate approves CEPP's revised procedures for the election of senators.

Approved Opposed Non Voting Absent
A. Downs M. Coussement

71. DOWIIS

J. Malanson

M. Masters

K. Pollock, Chair

B. Redman

A. Schwab

B. Valliere

Supersedes SD 88-16 (Amended & Approved 2/13/1989) and SD 88-32 (Amended & Approved 4/24/1989)

#### COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND PUBLIC POLICY

# IV. Faculty

**E. Service in the Fort Wayne Senate and Senate Subcommittees**: Voting faculty in each of the three departments will elect one representative to serve in the Fort Wayne Senate. Departments will inform the Leadership Committee about the departmental representative. Additional representatives, if needed based upon the allocation formula utilized by the Senate, will be chosen at-large in an election coordinated by the Leadership Committee. Elected senators will serve three-year terms.

Representatives or nominees for the three subcommittees for the Senate will be elected at the college level: Curriculum Review Subcommittee, Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee and the Graduate Subcommittee.

The Leadership Committee will coordinate the election of the members/nominees on the 3 subcommittees when vacancies occur. Elected members of the subcommittee will serve 3 year terms.

The Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee representative will be elected at the college level. The nominees for Curriculum Review Subcommittee, and the Graduate Subcommittee will be elected at the college level and then forwarded to the full faculty senate for a vote of the representatives for the campus.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair

**Executive Committee** 

DATE: January 31, 2017

SUBJ: Statement on Shared Governance

- WHEREAS, Meaningful shared governance involves the administration and the faculty, along with the Boards of Trustees, and, where appropriate, the Community Advisory Council, working together for the betterment of the university; and
- WHEREAS, Legitimate differences of opinion exist as to what does and does not constitute meaningful shared governance; and
- WHEREAS, Breaches of shared governance, either real or perceived, can breed distrust and discontent among and between the faculty and the administration; and
- WHEREAS, Adoption of a Statement on Shared Governance detailing expectations for shared governance processes at IPFW that is agreed to and adhered to by both the faculty and the administration can prevent future breaches and help to restore trust between faculty and administration:
- BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate adopts the attached Statement on Shared Governance; and
- BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate requests the central administration indicate its willingness to abide by the principles and procedures outlined in this statement.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent
Andrew Downs			
Jeffrey Malanson			
Mark Masters			Non-Voting
Kathy Pollock			Martha Coussement
Beverly Redman			
Abe Schwab			
Brenda Valliere			

# Fort Wayne Senate Statement on Shared Governance

## **Shared Governance**

The Fort Wayne Senate views the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" as the starting point of reference for all conversations about shared governance at IPFW.<sup>1</sup>

The Constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate empowers the faculty to recommend policies regarding students and faculty; to make recommendations on academic organization, the budget, and other university operations; to determine the academic calendar, policies for class scheduling, and policies for student participation in athletics; and to review and approve academic degrees and curriculum; among other responsibilities. These powers can only be meaningfully exercised in an environment in which shared governance is acknowledged and supported by the faculty, the administration, and other university boards, councils, and constituencies.

The AAUP defines shared governance as being carried out by three interdependent components: governing boards<sup>2</sup>, presidents (the chancellor and the central administration), and faculty. According to the AAUP, "a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems."

This relationship of "interdependence . . . calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort." The AAUP notes that what constitutes "appropriate joint planning and effort" will vary from situation to situation, but asserts that "two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand." To phrase (2) another way, each component might not have an *equal* voice in any particular decision, but each component should at least have *a* voice.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The AAUP's "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" can be found in American Association of University Professors, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), 117-22; online at <a href="https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities">https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities</a>; and as an appendix to this Statement on Shared Governance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> IPFW's status as a campus within both the Indiana University and Purdue University systems means that it does not have its own governing board, instead being overseen by the Boards of Trustees of the two parent institutions. IPFW has a Community Advisory Council, but as currently constituted, its powers do not mimic those of a governing board. In practice, IPFW operates at a greater remove from its governing boards than what is ideally envisioned in the AAUP's "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities."

The AAUP provides guidelines for the areas of university management and governance where each institutional component should have the primary voice. In the case of faculty, "The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." The precise meaning and scope of these areas of primary responsibility can and should be a subject of discussion on any university campus, but in general it is desirable to give the faculty as wide a latitude in these areas as possible. The AAUP recommends that on matters of primary faculty responsibility, "the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty." Such communication should be made early and as quickly as possible, as faculty should "have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board." Within this set of expectations, the AAUP recognizes that "Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice."

In order to fully support shared governance at IPFW, the Senate proposes the following procedures.

#### **Procedures**

- 1. In all university decision-making processes having any implications for shared governance, the central administration should consult with the faculty. This consultation may be with either the Senate, the faculty leaders, the relevant Senate committee(s) and/or subcommittee(s), or some combination thereof. For decisions affecting shared governance at the college or department level, relevant administrators should consult with equivalent faculty representatives at the lower levels.
- 2. In all university decision-making processes that require active faculty participation, such as a study or investigation, the development of a set of recommendations, or any ongoing effort to leverage faculty expertise, the default starting point should be the utilization of existing shared governance bodies (i.e., the Senate, its committees and subcommittees) rather than creating new committees, task forces, working groups, etc.
- 3. In situations where, after consultation with the faculty, it is determined that existing shared governance bodies cannot or should not be used to accomplish the desired ends, the central administration should work with the faculty to develop a mutually acceptable process for conducting the proposed work that honors the principles of shared governance. Part of this shared governance process should be the establishment of clear expectations for how many faculty will participate, how they will be selected, what they will be asked to do, and how their work will be used.
  - a. The Senate should have the opportunity to endorse the proposed shared governance process and method of selecting faculty to participate.
  - b. Faculty should always be elected to participate in shared governance processes. How they are elected should depend on the specific process to be undertaken and whose

interests the faculty are expected to represent (e.g., the interests of all faculty, college faculty, or department faculty). At an absolute minimum, the Senate Executive Committee should be charged with selecting faculty for participation in shared governance processes when other forms of election are not feasible or preferable. Under no circumstances should the administration appoint faculty to participate in shared governance processes.

- 4. Shared governance processes will generally take one of two forms: limited-term processes focused on producing a discrete product or ongoing processes focused on longer-term work.
  - a. Whenever faculty participate in a limited-term shared governance process, the results of that process shall be submitted to the Senate for review.
  - b. Whenever faculty participate in an ongoing shared governance process, they shall submit a brief annual report to the Senate Executive Committee, or an appropriate Senate committee or subcommittee, detailing their work and its ongoing or anticipated uses on campus.

## **General Provisions**

- 1. Nothing in this Statement on Shared Governance should be construed to apply to situations wherein the administration seeks to use faculty expertise outside of shared governance processes (e.g., an award selection committee).
- 2. While seeking faculty, staff, student, and community feedback on administrative decisions is laudable, the feedback-seeking process alone does not constitute a meaningful shared governance process.
- 3. With existing ongoing administrative committees with shared governance responsibilities that operate outside of shared governance processes, every reasonable effort should be made to bring them into alignment with the procedures outlined in this Statement on Shared Governance and with the Fort Wayne Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Jeffrey Malanson, Chair

**Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee** 

DATE: January 25, 2017

SUBJ: Annual Report on Athletics Budget

WHEREAS, On 17 October 2016, the Fort Wayne Senate amended the Senate Bylaws for the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS) to include the charge to "Review and comment on the annual athletic budget, and supporting activities in the fall semester each year"; and

- WHEREAS, This charge was previously the responsibility of the Subcommittee on Athletics (SCOA) (now the Athletics Advisory Subcommittee); and
- WHEREAS, The Athletics budget has undergone significant changes in recent years in an effort to make it a more accurate reflection of the real costs of Athletics at IPFW and to make those costs more transparent to the university community; and
- WHEREAS, The Athletics budget has come under increasing scrutiny in recent years as a result of IPFW's enrollment declines and the resulting loss of revenues; and
- WHEREAS, A review of Senate records suggests that SCOA never submitted an annual report on the Athletics budget to the Senate;
- BE IT RESOLVED, That the Senate accept this report from BAS, which provides an overview of the recent changes to the Athletics budget, as well as a year-over-year assessment of the Athletics budget.

Approve Not Approve Abstain Absent
Hosni Abu-Mulaweh
Nurgul Aitalieva
Martha Coussement
Suining Ding
Cigdem Gurgur
Steven Hanke
Jeffrey Malanson

# **Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee Report on the IPFW Athletics Budget**

**Note**: All data referenced in this report was provided to the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee by Senior Associate Athletic Director Tim Heffron, and is included as an Appendix.

Athletics appears an Auxiliary Fund within the IPFW university budget. This means that Athletics is responsible for managing its own balance sheet. Athletics has three general sources of revenue: Student Activity Fees, the IPFW General Fund, and Athletics-generated revenue. Student Activity Fee and General Fund revenues combine to form the institutional subsidy for Athletics.

Student Activity Fees: For 2016-17, students pay \$13.10 per credit hour of tuition as a Student Activity Fee. Current university policy allocates 65% of the Student Activity Fee (\$8.515) to Athletics.

*IPFW General Fund*: For 2016-17, 4.4% of IPFW's General Fund revenues are allocated to Athletics. Action Plan 41 dictates that in future years Athletics will continue to be budgeted at the rate of 4.4% of the General Fund.

Athletics-Generated Revenue: This revenue comes in a variety of forms, including tickets sales, NCAA and Summit League distributions, appearance guarantees, interest income, and other sources. This revenue is generated by Athletics and its operations, and is used by Athletics to support its operations.

The Athletics budget and annual expenses are reported in two documents. Athletics has an annual IPFW budget, and must also submit an annual financial audit to the NCAA. IPFW and the NCAA require much (but not all) of the same information; however, there are important differences in how that information is presented. The IPFW budget is developed each spring and is an attempt to project anticipated revenues and expenditures for the next fiscal year. The NCAA financial audit is an accounting of all revenues and expenditures prepared after the close of the fiscal year; it reflects what actually took place. As a result, the information contained in the IPFW and NCAA documents does not perfectly align. Both documents have also undergone significant changes in recent years, making meaningful comparisons of the current year's document to prior year problematic.

The Appendix to this report includes a breakdown of recent historical IPFW Athletics budgets and NCAA financial audits, as well as brief explanations of all of the changes that were made to the respective reporting templates over the past five years. This report highlights the changes that account for major increases or decreases in Athletics revenues and/or expenditures.

# **Changes to How the IPFW Athletics Budget is Reported**

IPFW utilized the same Athletics budget template from 2011-12 to 2014-15. On the revenue side, budgeted revenue (including the three broad revenue categories discussed above) and non-budgeted revenue (including third-party contributions and indirect facilities charges) were broadly categorized. On the expenditures side, expenses were reported by team or operating unit within Athletics.

Significant changes were made to the budget template for FY 2016 (2015-16), with additional refinements made in FY 2017 (2016-17). On the revenue side, sources of revenue have been much more specifically broken down. For FY 2017, the full General Fund subsidy to Athletics is reflected in the operating income of Athletics. On the expenditures side, prior to FY 2016, scholarships were not budgeted, and a portion of many salaries associated with Athletics coaches and employees appeared in the university's General Fund budget but not in the Athletics budget. This meant that in prior years the costs of Athletics to the university, as those costs were reflected in the Athletics budget, were underreported. Starting with the FY 2016 Athletics budget, Athletics scholarships and all salaries are reflected in the Athletics budget. The result is that the FY 2016 Athletics budget is a far more transparent and accurate document than those from previous years. These changes, while positive, make comparisons with prior year budgets quite difficult.

Also on the expenditures side, expenses are now broken down by Cost Center across Athletics rather than by team. This brings the Athletics budget more in line with how all other unit budgets are reported at IPFW, and clarifies the kinds of expenses Athletics makes and how they change over time. The other major change, not fully reflected in the spreadsheet included in the Appendix, is that while Athletics scholarships are now a budgeted expense, as of FY 2017 that expense no longer shows up as part of the Athletics budget. Purdue University, whose budget templates we utilize, wants to track all student scholarships in a uniform manner, which requires moving that expense category out of Athletics. A clear picture of the Athletics budget would see this expense moved back in, as was done for the data used in this report, but this will no longer be the default reporting template.

# **Changes to the NCAA Financial Audit**

The NCAA financial audit remained consistent from 2010-11 to 2013-14, but underwent major revisions in 2014-15 and 2015-16. In both years, additional revenue and expenditure categories were added in order to better reflect the variety of activities various Athletics programs engage in. The most notable change on the revenue side in 2014-15 was the renaming of "Indirect Facilities" to "Indirect Institutional Support," and the inclusion in this category of Athletics' portion of university HR, Accounting Services, and IT expenses, along with Physical Plant.

Two bigger changes appear in the 2015-16 financial audit, one as a result of the NCAA, and one as a result of IPFW. The NCAA added a new revenue subcategory to Indirect Institutional Support called "Athletic Facilities Debt Service, Lease and Rental Fees" that is designed to more fully reflect the Athletics portion of institutional debt. This added a new \$1.6 million dollars in revenue to the Athletics budget, although IPFW would be paying most, if not all of this money even if the Athletics department went away.

The 2015-16 financial audit is the first one where IPFW fully reported Athletics scholarships and salaries as part of the Athletics budget. On the revenue side of the financial audit, this shows up as an almost \$1.9 million increase in the "Direct institutional support" category. When combined with the \$1.6 million revenue increase due to the revised definition of Indirect Institutional Support, and other changes, it shows up as an Athletics budget that increased by \$3.2 million in a single year. Corresponding increases in salaries and facilities expenditures show up as a \$2.9 million increase in Athletics expenditures. It must be reiterated that one significant portion of

this increase is the result of a more accurate reporting of Athletics expenses on salaries and scholarships, and that another significant portion of this increase is debt payments that IPFW was already making and will continue to make regardless of Athletics.

Comparison of FY 2016 (2015-16) and FY 2017 (2016-17) IPFW Athletics Budgets
The Athletics budget, as reflected in the IPFW budget documents for FY 2016 and FY 2017,
remained stable, showing a decrease of \$11,000 in expenses out of a budget of more than \$8.3 million.

Revenues: Athletics budgeted a decline in Student Fee revenue of \$80,000 as a result of enrollment declines, but budgeted modest increases in almost all of the Athletics-generated revenue categories. The notable exception here is "Voluntary Support," which is budgeted to decrease by \$111,800. The "Administrative Charge," which is the General Fund subsidy, is listed as \$500 for FY 2016, but in reality it was about \$10,000 more than the "Administrative Charge" of \$4.92 million for FY 2017.

Expenditures: Expenditures are broken down as Salaries and Wages (S&W) and Supplies and Expenses (S&E). Athletics budgeted a decline in Administrative S&W, which includes coaches, of \$58,500, and a decline in Employee Benefits of \$113,000. All told, Athletics S&W is budgeted to decline by \$186,000. Most of this decline in S&W is offset by increases in S&E, primarily in the areas of "Personal Services," which sees a budgeted increase of \$270,000, and "Travel," which sees a budgeted increase of \$82,000. Athletics Scholarships for FY 2017 declined by \$237,000.

Under Personal Services, the most significant increases were the Athletics medical insurance premium (an increase of \$50,000), medical deductible (\$70,000), guarantees paid (\$121,000), and the cost of officials (\$27,000). These four categories account for a \$268,000 increase year-over-year. One note on guarantees paid: not reflected in the budget is the totality of the revenue generated as a result of the guarantees. This year's game against the IU men's basketball team was possible because of the guarantees paid investment, and generated \$170,000 in ticket revenue. We do not know if there will be a similar rate of return on this investment in future years, but it is important to recognize that none of these expenses occur in a vacuum.

All told, S&E expenditures were budgeted to increase by \$175,000. When combined with the \$186,000 decline in S&W expenditures, it totals an overall decrease of \$11,000 in the Athletics budget for FY 2017.

## **Final Notes**

- 1. A meaningful comparison of the most recent NCAA financial audits cannot be completed at this time due to both the significant changes that the reporting template underwent in 2014-15 and 2015-16 (the most recent years for which Audit documents are available), and the inclusion for the first time in the 2015-16 Audit of all salary and scholarship data.
- 2. Not reflected in the Athletics budget, or in this report, is the tuition paid by student-athletes. Many student-athletes receive full scholarships, but many more only receive partial scholarships or do not receive any scholarship money. In any conversation about the overall

- financial impact of Athletics on IPFW's budget, it is important to weigh this added source of revenue for the university.
- 3. The presumed intent of requiring an annual report on the Athletics budget is to make transparent to the university community the costs of participation in Intercollegiate Athletics, and NCAA Division I Athletics in particular. As recent conversations on campus surrounding Athletics and its budget have made clear, though, the costs are not easily understood. Administrators, Athletics personnel, faculty, and community members utilize financial data from different sources and from different years, and often present that data in uninformed or misleading ways. The fact that IPFW budget data and the NCAA financial audit essentially present two different pictures of the costs of Athletics significantly complicates matters. It is essential that we strive to develop a common understanding of the Athletics budget so that we, as a campus community, can engage in meaningful conversations about the costs of Athletics based on shared facts.

Major update on categories and their definitions
--

#### Continued updating categories and definitions

Revenue:	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Revenue:	2014-15	Revenue:	2015-16
1 Ticket sales	99,477	99,421	87,085	110,841	1 Ticket sales	89,244	1 Ticket sales	91,282
2 Student fees	2,054,269	2,046,966	1,920,419	1,787,267	<ol> <li>Direct government support</li> </ol>	-	2 Direct government support	-
3 Guarantees	270,250	306,000	300,750	326,536	3 Student fees	1,931,525	3 Student fees	1,860,486
4 Contributions	434,278	473,352	440,770	503,752	4 Direct institutional support	3,160,449	4 Direct institutional support	5,040,491
5 Comp provided by a third party	148,768	158,800	151,148	158,833	5 Less - Transfers to Institution	· · · · ·	5 Less - Transfers to Institution	· · ·
6 Direct government support	-	-	-	-	6 Indirect Institutional Support	577,000	6 Indirect Institutional Support	561,000
7 Direct institutional support	2,801,104	2,821,898	3,835,987	3,283,638	7 Guarantees	299,974	6A IIS - Ath Fac Debt Serv, Lease, Rent	1,640,592
8 Indirect facilities	350,000	412,000	348,000	358,000	8 Contributions	413,504	7 Guarantees	314,825
9 NCAA & conference distributions	328,727	373,102	435,868	474,258	9 In-Kind	270,492	8 Contributions	268,176
10 Broadcast rights	-	-		-	10 Comp provided by a third party	106,112	9 In-Kind	155,435
11 Concessions and parking	17,207	27,147	2,639	32,638	11 Broadcast rights	-	10 Comp provided by a third party	159,501
12 Royalties and sponsorships	97,725	129,865	168,573	181,842	12 NCAA distributions	299,785	11 Broadcast rights	-
13 Sports camp revenue	30,894	46,111	27,000	5,408	13 Conference distributions	186,474	12 NCAA distributions	394,229
14 Investment income	103,418	115,305	122,767	136,620	14 Concessions and parking	27,358	13 Conference distributions	157,938
15 Other	26,849	87,592	37,956	33,404	15 Royalties and sponsorships	105,015	14 Concessions and parking	31,860
16 Total revenue	6,762,966	7,097,559	7,878,962	7,393,037	16 Sports camp revenue	6,000	15 Royalties and sponsorships	99,652
10 Iour revenue	0,702,700	1,071,557	7,070,702	1,373,031	17 Investment income	217,464	16 Sports camp revenue	6,000
Expenditures:					18 Other	48,374	17 Investment income	156,280
17 Student aid	2,082,934	2,131,392	2,327,678	2,332,570	19 Total revenue	7,738,770	18 Other	43,704
18 Guarantees	27,517	5,750	6,799	43,000	1) Iotal revenue	7,730,770	19 Bowl Revenues	
19 Coaching salaries paid by Univ	882,248	915,973	981,110	938,752	Expenditures:		Total revenue	10,981,451
20 Coaching salaries by third party	19,760	29,327	25,534	33,908	20 Student aid	2,241,267	Total Tevenue	10,761,751
21 Support salaries paid by Univ	746,083	811,283	971,691	973,038	21 Guarantees	16,175	Expenditures:	
22 Support salaries paid by third party						865,827	20 Student aid	2 270 070
23 Severance payments	129,008	129,473	125,614	124,925	<ul><li>22 Coaching salaries paid by Univ</li><li>23 Coaching salaries by third party</li></ul>	803,827	20 Student and 21 Guarantees	2,270,070 36,046
24 Recruiting	120,651	- 124,717	98,320	99,016	24 Support salaries paid by Univ	838,739		1,606,597
							22 Coaching salaries paid by Univ	1,000,397
25 Team travel	961,989	960,341	1,030,903	1,115,979	25 Support salaries paid by third party	106,112	23 Coaching salaries by third party	1 252 400
26 Equipment and uniforms	241,715	270,057	277,128	294,446	26 Severance payments	161 725	24 Support salaries paid by Univ	1,252,499
27 Game expenses	150,289	162,313	182,213	175,495	27 Recruiting 28 Team travel	161,735	25 Support salaries paid by third party	159,501
28 Fund raising and marketing	173,240	195,114	204,180	239,244		1,236,658	26 Severance payments	140.450
29 Sports camp expense	18,578	16,899	23,372	8,851	29 Equipment and uniforms	258,288	27 Recruiting	148,450
30 Direct facilities	118,630	98,555	105,413	51,595	30 Game expenses	195,149	28 Team travel	1,177,438
31 Spirit groups	50,011	29,152	41,471	43,818	31 Fund raising and marketing	235,030	29 Equipment and uniforms	301,022
32 Indirect facilities	350,000	412,000	348,000	358,000	32 Sports camp expense	8,302	30 Game expenses	195,121
33 Medical expenses and insurance	398,972	401,033	397,461	409,044	33 Spirit groups	35,305	31 Fund raising and marketing	272,328
34 Memberships and dues	45,171	54,867	62,190	63,464	34 Ath fac debt serv, leases, rental fees	82,833	32 Sports camp expense	2,914
35 Other operating expense	269,556	340,279	337,719	324,723	35 Direct facilities	4,943	33 Spirit groups	36,431
36 Sub Total expenditures	6,786,352	7,088,525	7,546,796	7,629,868	36 Indirect Institutional Support	577,000	34 Ath fac debt serv, leases, rental fees	1,719,064
37 Transfers to Institution		-	-	-	37 Medical expenses and insurance	418,353	35 Direct facilities	70,382
38 Total expenditures	6,786,352	7,088,525	7,546,796	7,629,868	38 Memberships and dues	62,058	36 Indirect Institutional Support	561,000
					39 Other operating expense	334,070	37 Medical expenses and insurance	361,851
					40 Total expenditures	7,677,844	38 Memberships and dues	61,610
Excess (deficiency) of revenue							39 Student-Athlete Meals (non-travel)	13,163
over expenditures	(23,386.00)	9,034.00	332,166.00	(236,831.00)	Excess (deficiency) of revenue		40 Other operating expense	345,346
					over expenditures	\$ 60,926	41 Bowl Expenses	<u> </u>
							Total expenditures	10,590,833
					41 Transfers to Institution	-	-	
					42 Conference Realignment	-	Excess (deficiency) of revenue	
					43 Total Athletics Related Debt	-	over expenditures	
					44 Total Institutional Debt	127,745,846	-	
					45 Value of Athletic Dedicated Endow	3,322,094	50 Transfers to Institution	_
					46 Value of Institute Dedicated Endow	75,286,923	51 Conference Realignment	_
					value of institute Dedicated Endow	13,200,723	52 Total Athletics Related Debt	14,620,960
							53 Total Institutional Debt	121,800,226
							54 Value of Athletic Dedicated Endow	3,087,381
							55 Value of Institute Dedicated Endow	51,373,193
							56 Total Athletics Related Capital Exp	ر 1,3,175 را ر <sub>1</sub> 15
							50 Total Autorics Related Capital Exp	-

#### 2014-15 NCAA Financial Audit Changes in categories and definitions

Revenue

Indirect Facilities becomes Indirect Institutional Support
New definition adds HR, Accounting Services, and IT with Physical Plant

In-Kind donations become a new category leaving the Contributions category

NCAA Distributions and Conference Distributions become two different cagegories

#### Expenses

Athletic Facilities Debt Service, Leases and Rental Fees are split off from Direct Facilities

New information is reported on....

Transfers to Institution

Conference Realignment

Total Athletics Related Debt

Total Institutional Debt

Value of Athletic Dedicated Endowments

Value of Institute Dedicated Endowments

#### 2015-16 NCAA Financial Audit Changes in categories and definitions

Income

Indirect Institutional Support - Athletic Facilities Debt Service, Lease and Rental Fees not charged to Athletics becomes a new category

Contributions are not provided and used in the same reporting year

Bowl income becomes a new category

#### Expenses

Athletic Facilities Debt Service, Lease and Rental Fees now includes the above Indirect Institutional Support of these items

Student-Athlete Meals (non-travel)

**Bowl Expenses** 

New information is reported on....

Total Athletics Related Capital Exp

#### 2015-16 Changes in IPFW's budgeting procedures that affect this report

IPFW no longer charges a portion of an athletic salary to the general fund.

An athletic salary is now charged to athletics with one exception, NCAA Compliance as it is located in the Chancellors budget.

Example: 2014-15 salaries were \$1,704,566 for 15-16 I estimate we will report \$2,859,096

West Lafayette Budgeting tool IPFW 2016 and 2017 Budget Template

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Beginning Balance	80,241	45,482	99,719	102,631
Revenue				
Budgeted Revenue				
Student Fee Income	2,190,913	2,125,381	1,931,495	2,026,980
Interest Income	6,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Continuing Education Transfer	8,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Institutional Support				1,038,935
NCAA Distributions	237,900	248,000	258,100	298,042
Organizational Income (Tickets)	112,500	125,500	125,200	84,300
Organizational Income (Guarantees)	305,000	278,500	297,500	301,000
Organizational Income (Marketing)	339,613	490,000	550,000	51,000
Organizational Income (Entry Fees)	22,000	15,000	17,000	16,800
Organizational Income (Gifts)	154,800	199,583	397,600	269,950
Organizational Income (Other Revenue)	62,400	76,400	96,400	8,400
Subtotal Budgeted Revenue	3,439,126	3,568,364	3,683,295	4,105,407
Non-Budgeted Revenue	202.000	121 000	170.000	150 400
Third Party Contributions	392,000	424,000	170,000	150,400
Indirect Facilities	365,000	377,000	490,000	388,000
Subtotal Non-Budgeted Revenue	757,000	801,000	660,000	538,400
Total Revenue	4,196,126	4,369,364	4,343,295	4,643,807
Expenditures  Pudgeted Expenditures				
Budgeted Expenditures	11.000	11.000	11.000	11.000
Athletic Reserve	11,000	11,000 497,456	11,000	11,000
Intercollegiate Men's Basketball Intercollegiate Women's Basketball	512,664 326,777	339,736	479,173 416,501	601,872 450,464
Intercollegiate Men's Volleyball	191,278	207,428	215,730	248,770
Intercollegiate Women's Volleyball	209,140	213,312	213,730	212,396
Intercollegiate Men's Tennis	65,429	70,898	86,572	91,438
Intercollegiate Women's Tennis	78,973	78,979	83,626	114,382
Intercollegiate Men's Soccer	131,529	126,292	149,782	172,120
Intercollegiate Women's Soccer	163,204	156,857	162,208	212,116
Intercollegiate Men's Baseball	248,515	240,679	219,015	247,660
Intercollegiate Women's Softball	221,809	242,781	232,890	224,600
Intercollegiate Men's Cross Country	27,883	29,289	28,950	35,747
Intercollegiate Women's Cross Country	38,734	39,365	39,826	51,058
Intercollegiate Women's Indoor Track	38,734	39,365	39,826	51,058
Intercollegiate Women's Outdoor Track	38,734	39,365	39,826	51,058
Intercollegiate Men's Golf	104,636	106,660	103,721	105,883
Intercollegiate Women's Golf	88,854	89,898	98,619	92,463
Athletic Training	51,680	48,450	46,990	46,800
Cheerleaders	27,500	27,500	26,900	33,360
Pep Band	16,000	16,000	26,000	77,360
Sports Information and Promotion	155,331	150,885	152,250	171,787
Intramural Sports (Coed)	57,700	57,782	57,782	100
Marketing and Promotions	161,375	135,197	135,200	161,900
Athletic Department	471,647	603,190	617,578	640,015
Subtotal Budgeted Expenditures	3,439,126	3,568,364	3,683,295	4,105,407
Non-Budgeted Expenditures	-,,,0	- ,- ~~,~ ~ .	-,,	,,.07
Athletic Training	392,000	424,000	170,000	150,400
Athletic Department	365,000	377,000	490,000	388,000
Subtotal Non-Budgeted Expenditures	757,000	801,000	660,000	538,400
Total Expenditures	4,196,126	4,369,364	4,343,295	4,643,807
Ending Balance	80,241	45,482	99,719	102,631
Lifeting Deliance	00,241	43,462	99,/19	102,031

Athletic Grand Total Income	FY 2016	FY 2017
Operating Income		
Housing & Rental Inc (422000)	-	-
Special Act/Fees (420000)	-	-
Grants & Contracts (415000)	-	7,500
Student Fees (401000)	1,995,815	1,914,351
Food/Fountain & Othe (423000)	5,150	32,290
Rec & Sports Income (427000)	-	-
Admis-Season Tickets (427005)	32,500	44,500
Admis-Disc Seas Tix (427010)	-	-
Admis-Staff Seas Tix (427015)	-	-
Admis-Single Tix (427020)	50,000	53,806
Admis-Disc Singl Tix (427025)	100	-
Admis-Other (427050)	-	-
Guarantees (427100)	288,000	396,250
Advertising (427120)	-	-
Performance Income (427130)	-	-
Sponsorships (427135)	2,750	32,500
Entry Fees-Athletics (427195)	19,100	19,100
Clthg/Mdse Sales (427215)	1,000	-
Camp Fees (427220)	-	-
Fw Parking Inc (427226)	-	-
Concessions Income (427235)	30,000	-
Memberships (427270)	-	-
Ncaa Distributions (427300)	495,000	352,000
Athletic Conf Distr (427305)	-	154,712
Other Rec Sports Act (427900)	-	-
Other Sales & Servic (428000)	3,300	3,400
Administrative Charg (430000)	500	4,917,465
Indirect Cost Recove (445000)	-	-
Other Operating Inco (446000)	12,500	-
Voluntary Support (466000)	308,900	197,100
Interest Income (467000)	-	300
Capital Gains (468000)	- 1	
Endowment/Trust Inco (469000)	23,900	185,000
Capital Gains (471000)	2,000	16,500
Non Mandatory Transf (491000)	139,900	1
Total Income	3,410,415	8,326,775

1,414,100 1,494,959

4,927,527

Athletic Grand Total Expenses	FY 2016	FY 2017
Salary & Wages		
Salary And Wages (506000)		
Administrative S & W (506010)	1,830,574	1,772,072
Limited Term Lectur (506040)	14,000	14,000
Grad Staff (506080)	113,250	128,350
Clerical Regular (506110)	86,200	58,416
Service - Regular (506120)	13,000	14,000
Temp AP - Regular (506130)	-	-
Clerical Temporary (506140)	-	-
Service Temporary (506150)	77,000	82,966
Clerical Student (506160)	100	5,000
Service Student (506170)	115,400	102,550
Other Compensation (508000)	100	-
Employee Benefits (512000)	773,680	660,246
Total Salary & Wages	3,023,304	2,837,599
Supplies & Expense		
Contingency	-	-
Miscellaneous	-	-
R & R Equipment replacement	51,000	51,000
Championships budget	20,000	20,000
Supplies & Service (520000)	-	-
Merchandise for Resa (512000)	17,700	20,900
Maintenance & Other (522000)	15,600	14,200
Classroom & Laborato (523000)	2,250	130
Printing / Office Su (524000)	94,700	108,145
Agriculture Expenses (525000)	-	-
Cleaning / Sanitatio (528000)	350	550
Freight & Demurrage (529000)	-	-
Telecommunication/Po (530000)	67,600	62,720
Rentals & Maintenanc (532000)	20,950	57,150
Personal Services & (533000)	627,998	897,540
Repairs & Maintenanc (534000)	1,600	800
Travel (535000)	1,030,800	1,112,869
Minor Equipment - No (536000)	334,800	373,940
Capitalized Equipmen (537000)	-	-
Administrative Charg (541000)	-	-
Legal, Taxes & Insur (542000)	90	103
Financial (543000)	2,500	5,000
Other Expenses (546000)	413,100	387,820
Stdt. Scholarships,F (558000)	2,613,600	-
Stdt. Scholarships,F (491010)	-	2,376,309
Total Supplies & Exp	5,314,638	5,489,176
Total Expenses	8,337,942	8,326,775
Balance	(4,927,527)	-

#### 2015-16 IPFW Budget Changes in categories and definitions

#### Overall

As of 15-16 scholarships and general fund salaries become budgeted The non Budgeted items are no longer refected

Indirect Facilities becomes Indirect Institutional Support not reflected anymore In-Kind Parkview Sport Medicine and OrthoNorthEast

#### Revenue

Categories now match with the general ledger in a standard IPFW wide system

#### Expenses

Categories now match with the general ledger in a standard IPFW wide system MAP and Compliance Expenses now in the Athletic budget

#### 2016-17 IPFW Budget Changes in categories and definitions

#### Overall

Institutional Support is listed so the balance is zero
Scholarships are no longer reported as expense in the athletic budget so not to double count
NCAA Distributions and Conference Distributions become two different cagegories
The NCAA Compliance Budget moves back in the Chancellor's area

## Differences between NCAA Financial Audit (Actuals) and IPFW Budget (Estimates)

Items in the NCAA Report (Actuals) and not in the IPFW Budgeting system (Estimates)

Indirect Institutional Support

In-Kind donations

Value of Trade

Foundation payments to 3rd parties

3rd party payments to staff

Athletic Honor Scholarships

Reduce Gift income if it is not spent

TO: The Senate

FROM: Executive Committee

Fort Wayne Senate

DATE: August 24, 2016

SUBJ: Report on Designated Items

Listed below is a list of designated items that Executive Committee has charged other committee/subcommittees with. Executive Committee is distributing this for information only.

- 1. EPC Tip sheet on childcare arrangements
- 2. SAC Review policy on Graduate Assistantships in Athletics
- 3. Portions of Action Plan 41 to various committees and subcommittees (numbers in parentheses are individual bullet points for the Action Plan item):
  - EC—2.8
  - EPC—1.4 (1), 2.5, 3.2, 3.6
    - o GES—4.7
    - o HPC—3.6 (4)
  - FAC—2.4, 4.3
    - o PDS—1.4 (2), 1.6 (1)
  - SAC—1.1 (2), 2.6, 2.12 (1), 4.4, 4.8, 4.9
    - o SCOA—2.11
  - URPC—1.6 (2), 2.1a, 2.10, 2.11 (1), 2.12, 3.4, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12
    - o ACITAS—1.2, 2.9, 3.8
    - o LS—3.9
    - o UAAS—2.9, 3.7, 3.8
- 4. URPC Proposal submitted by faculty members as part of Action Plan 41 feedback to move from NCAA D1 Athletics to NAIA
- 5. PDS Proposal submitted by Lidan Lin that Featured Faculty Awards and Excellence in Research Award be consistently reviewed, and also Featured Faculty Award be increased from \$1000 to \$2000.
- 6. EPC Reporting of mid-term grades for all freshmen
- 7. EPC Meet with Admissions about potential students; request that Admissions look at best practices at other institutions and how IPFW compares
- 8. FAC Suspension of VEPR