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 (Senate Reference No. 16-18) – S. LaVere

7. 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

9. 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       Absent
A. Downs         M. Coussement
J. Malanson
M. Masters
K. Pollock, Chair
B. Redman
A. Schwab
B. Valliere

ATTACHMENTS ON BACK
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.
MEMORANDUM

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.

Slate

Melanie Bookout
Lee Roberts
Karla Zepeda
MEMORANDUM

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;

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstention</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Non-Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Argast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Drummond</td>
<td>Greg Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hersberger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn Peterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Pollock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Lavere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Soptelean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongli Luo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Wesse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar Nazarov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nila Reimer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

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

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Mark Jordan, Chair
University Resources Policy Committee

DATE: January 19, 2017

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

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
Anne Argast
James Hersberger
Mark Jordan
Suzanne Lavere
Hongli Luo
Zafar Nazarov
Nila Reimer
Gordon Schmidt

Opposed

Abstention

Absent
Carl Drummond
Shawn Peterson
Kathy Pollock
Walter Sopulean
David Wesse

Non-Voting
Greg Justice
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
M. Coussement
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.

In Favor:  
Ben Dattilo  
Daren Kaiser  
Zafar Nazarov  
Brenda Valliere  
Lesa Rae Vartanian

Opposed:  
Marcia Dixson

Non-Voting:  

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.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair
Executive Committee

DATE: January 31, 2017

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
Andrew Downs
Jeff Malanson
Mark Masters
Kathy Pollock
Beverly Redman
Abe Schwab
Brenda Valliere

Opposed

Absent

Non-Voting
Martha Coussement
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). Campus-wide 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 24th.
   3.4. Central administration shall provide decision-making criteria (e.g. number of colleges, number of administrative FTE) by February 17th.
   3.5. Information from January 5th 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 3rd. 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 13th.
   3.8. Three campus-wide brainstorming sessions about the academic structure of IPFW by March 24th. 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 31st.
   3.10. Campus organizations (e.g. departments, colleges, IPSGA, APSAC, CSSAC, Deans Council, senate governance committees) may submit proposals for academic reorganization by April 7th.
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 28th

3.12. The Senate shall recommend an academic structure by May 5th.
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
A. Downs
J. Malanson
M. Masters
K. Pollock, Chair
B. Redman
A. Schwab
B. Valliere

Opposed

Non Voting
M. Coussement

Absent
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.
MEMORANDUM

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
Andrew Downs
Jeffrey Malanson
Mark Masters
Kathy Pollock
Beverly Redman
Abe Schwab
Brenda Valliere

Opposed

Abstention

Absent

Non-Voting
Martha Coussement
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.¹

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 boards², 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.

¹ The AAUP’s “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” can be found in American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, 11th ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), 117-22; online at https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities; and as an appendix to this Statement on Shared Governance.
² 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.
MEMORANDUM

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

Jordan Marshall
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”

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue:</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ticket sales</td>
<td>99,477</td>
<td>99,421</td>
<td>87,085</td>
<td>110,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees</td>
<td>2,054,269</td>
<td>2,046,966</td>
<td>1,920,419</td>
<td>1,787,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>270,250</td>
<td>306,000</td>
<td>300,750</td>
<td>326,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>434,278</td>
<td>473,352</td>
<td>440,770</td>
<td>503,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp provided by a third party</td>
<td>148,768</td>
<td>158,800</td>
<td>151,148</td>
<td>158,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct government support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct institutional support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Transfers to Institution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees</td>
<td>2,801,104</td>
<td>2,821,898</td>
<td>3,835,987</td>
<td>3,283,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect facilities</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>412,000</td>
<td>348,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA &amp; conference distributions</td>
<td>328,727</td>
<td>373,102</td>
<td>435,868</td>
<td>474,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast rights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions and parking</td>
<td>17,207</td>
<td>27,147</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>32,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties and sponsorships</td>
<td>97,725</td>
<td>129,865</td>
<td>168,573</td>
<td>181,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports camp revenue</td>
<td>30,894</td>
<td>46,111</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>5,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>105,418</td>
<td>115,305</td>
<td>122,767</td>
<td>136,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26,849</td>
<td>87,592</td>
<td>37,956</td>
<td>33,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>6,762,966</td>
<td>7,097,559</td>
<td>7,878,962</td>
<td>7,393,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student aid</td>
<td>2,082,934</td>
<td>2,131,392</td>
<td>2,327,678</td>
<td>2,332,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees</td>
<td>27,517</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching salaries paid by Univ</td>
<td>882,248</td>
<td>915,973</td>
<td>981,110</td>
<td>938,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching salaries paid by third party</td>
<td>19,760</td>
<td>29,327</td>
<td>25,534</td>
<td>33,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support salaries paid by Univ</td>
<td>746,083</td>
<td>811,283</td>
<td>971,691</td>
<td>973,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support salaries paid by third party</td>
<td>129,008</td>
<td>129,473</td>
<td>125,614</td>
<td>124,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance payments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>120,651</td>
<td>124,717</td>
<td>98,320</td>
<td>99,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team travel</td>
<td>961,989</td>
<td>960,341</td>
<td>1,030,903</td>
<td>1,115,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and uniforms</td>
<td>241,715</td>
<td>270,057</td>
<td>277,128</td>
<td>294,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game expenses</td>
<td>150,289</td>
<td>162,313</td>
<td>182,213</td>
<td>175,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising and marketing</td>
<td>173,240</td>
<td>195,114</td>
<td>264,180</td>
<td>239,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports camp expenses</td>
<td>18,578</td>
<td>16,899</td>
<td>23,372</td>
<td>8,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct facilities</td>
<td>118,630</td>
<td>98,555</td>
<td>105,413</td>
<td>51,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit groups</td>
<td>50,011</td>
<td>29,152</td>
<td>41,471</td>
<td>43,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect facilities</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>412,000</td>
<td>348,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical expenses and insurance</td>
<td>398,972</td>
<td>401,033</td>
<td>397,461</td>
<td>409,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>45,171</td>
<td>54,867</td>
<td>62,190</td>
<td>63,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expense</td>
<td>269,556</td>
<td>340,279</td>
<td>337,719</td>
<td>324,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total expenditures</td>
<td>6,786,352</td>
<td>7,088,525</td>
<td>7,546,796</td>
<td>7,629,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Institution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
<td>6,786,352</td>
<td>7,088,525</td>
<td>7,546,796</td>
<td>7,629,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Excess (deficiency) of revenue | over expenditures | (23,386.00) | 9,034.00 | 332,166.00 | (236,831.00) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ticket sales</td>
<td>89,244</td>
<td>91,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct government support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct institutional support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Transfers to Institution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees</td>
<td>299,974</td>
<td>314,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>413,504</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind</td>
<td>270,492</td>
<td>268,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>106,112</td>
<td>155,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast rights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA distributions</td>
<td>299,785</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference distributions</td>
<td>186,474</td>
<td>394,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions and parking</td>
<td>27,358</td>
<td>157,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties and sponsorships</td>
<td>105,015</td>
<td>31,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aid</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>156,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48,374</td>
<td>43,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>7,383,770</td>
<td>10,981,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Excess (deficiency) of revenue | over expenditures | $ 60,926 |

| Transfers to Institution | - | - |
| Conference Realignment | - | - |
| Total Athletics Related Debt | - | - |
| Total Institutional Debt | 127,745,846 | 14,620,960 |
| Value of Athletic Dedicated Endow | 3,322,094 | 51,373,193 |
| Value of Institute Dedicated Endow | 75,286,923 | 30,873,381 |
| Athletics Related Capital Exp | - | - |
| Total expenditures | 10,590,833 | - |
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 categories

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>80,241</td>
<td>45,482</td>
<td>99,719</td>
<td>102,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Athletic Grand Total Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Income</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Rental Inc (422000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Act/Fees (420000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts (415000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees (401080)</td>
<td>1,995,815</td>
<td>1,914,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Fountain &amp; Other (423000)</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>32,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec &amp; Sports Income (427000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin-Season Tickets (427050)</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>44,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin-Disc Seats Tix (427010)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin-Staff Seats Tix (427015)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin-Single Tix (427020)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>53,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin-Disc Single Tix (427025)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Income (427130)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships (427135)</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Fees-Athletics (427195)</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Fees (427215)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Charg (427190)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>4,196,126</td>
<td>4,343,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Non-Budgeted Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,683,295</td>
<td>3,683,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,405,407</td>
<td>1,405,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,098,702</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,098,702</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Budgeted Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,643,807</td>
<td>4,643,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,026,980</td>
<td>2,026,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,400</td>
<td>150,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Athletic Grand Total Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,830,574</td>
<td>1,772,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Term Lect</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Staff (406600)</td>
<td>113,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Regular (506110)</td>
<td>86,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service - Regular (506120)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp AP - Regular (506130)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Temporary (506140)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Temporary (506150)</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Student (506160)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service (506170)</td>
<td>115,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Compensation (508000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits (512000)</td>
<td>773,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salary &amp; Wages</td>
<td>3,032,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; R Equipment replacement</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championships budget</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Service (520000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise for Res (512000)</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Other (522000)</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; Laborato (523000)</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing / Office Sup (524000)</td>
<td>94,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Expenses (525000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning / Sanitatio (528000)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight &amp; Demurrage (529000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraphic/Telex (530000)</td>
<td>67,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Maintenance (531000)</td>
<td>20,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services &amp; (533000)</td>
<td>627,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs &amp; Maintenance (540000)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (535000)</td>
<td>1,030,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Equipment - No (536000)</td>
<td>334,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Equipmen (537000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Charg (541000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Taxes &amp; Issu (542000)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (543000)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses (546000)</td>
<td>413,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Scholarships F (491010)</td>
<td>2,613,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Scholarships,F (491010)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supplies &amp; Exp</td>
<td>5,314,638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,337,042</td>
<td>8,326,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4,927,527)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 reflected
  - 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 categories
- 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
     - GES—4.7
     - HPC—3.6 (4)
   - FAC—2.4, 4.3
     - PDS—1.4 (2), 1.6 (1)
   - SAC—1.1 (2), 2.6, 2.12 (1), 4.4, 4.8, 4.9
     - SCOA—2.11
   - URPC—1.6 (2), 2.1a, 2.10, 2.11 (1), 2.12, 3.4, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12
     - ACITAS—1.2, 2.9, 3.8
     - LS—3.9
     - 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