1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of March 16, 2015

3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
   a. Indiana University – J. Badia
   b. Purdue University – P. Dragnev

5. Report of the Presiding Officer – A. Downs

6. Committee reports requiring action
   a. Nominations and Elections Committee (Senate Reference No.14-24) – L. Vartanian
   b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 14-27) – M. Wolf
   c. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 14-28) – M. Wolf
   d. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 14-29) – N. Borbieva
   e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 14-30) – C. Gurgur
   f. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 14-31) – N. Borbieva
   g. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 14-32) – C. Gurgur
   h. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 14-33) – K. Pollock
   i. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 14-34) – K. Pollock

7. Question Time
   a. (Senate Reference No. 14-25) – J. Malanson
   b. (Senate Reference No. 14-26) – K. Pollock

8. New business

9. Committee reports “for information only”
   a. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 14-27) – K. Pollock
   b. Executive Committee (Senate Reference No. 14-28) – K. Pollock
   c. Peter Iadicola’s Report (Senate Reference No. 14-29) – P. Iadicola

10. The general good and welfare of the University

11. Adjournment*

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

Appointing
J. Badia
A. Downs
K. Pollock (Chair)
A. Schwab
N. Younis

Non Voting
J. Malanson

Absent
J. Casazza

P. Dragnev
Attachments:

“Slate for the election of Senate Committees and Subcommittees” (SR No. 14-24)
“Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: University Advancement Advisory Subcommittee” (SD 14-27)
“Open Access Policy Resolution” (SD 14-28)
“Resolution on Reduction of CL FTE at IPFW” (SD 14-29)
“Dual Credit Task Force Report” (SD 14-30)
“Faculty evaluation of administrators” (SD 14-31)
“Universal class scheduling possibility M/W mirroring T/R afternoons” (SD 14-32)
“Amendment to the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate: Continuing Lecturers” (SD 14-33)
“Creation of an ad hoc committee to review and recommend changes to Senate committee and subcommittee structures and functions” (SD 14-34)
“Question Time –re: Changing IPFW’s managing partner” (SR No. 14-25)
“Question Time –re: Discontinuation of Tennis Program” (SR No. 14-26)
“End-of-the Year Committee Reports” (SR No. 14-27)
“Senate Membership” (SR No. 14-28)
“D-1 Athletic Report” (SR No. 14-29) see website for reference (158 pages)
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Senate
FROM: Nominations and Elections Committee
DATE: April 13, 2015
SUBJ: Slate for the election of Senate Committees and Subcommittees

Here is the slate for the committees and subcommittees of the Senate for which the Nominations and Elections Committee has responsibility. The elections will be held online starting at the Senate meeting in April. There will be a link sent to all Senators to vote, and senators will have one week to cast their vote. After that week is over the election is closed.

sm

NOTE: Questions concerning this document should be addressed to Lesa Rae Vartanian at Ext. 15786
Committee Nominees
April 2015 Senate Election

[ ] = unit has reached maximum number allowed

Athletics Subcommittee
Vacancies: 5

David Dunham, LIB       Otto Chang, ACFN
Jens Clegg, ILCS       Becky Salmon, NURS
David Young, PSY       Christopher Ganz, FINA

Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee
Vacancies: 2 [No A&S seats available]

Hosni Abu-Mulaweh, ENGR
Martha Coussement, CFS

Calendar Subcommittee
Vacancies: 4

Jody Ross, PSY       Yuan Zhang, MATH
David Dunham, LIB       Ryan Yoder, PSY
M. Gail Hickey, EDUC       Gordon Schmidt, OLS
Yuan Zhang, MATH       Prasad Bingi, MGMT/MKT
Nodir Adilov, ECON       Bridget Leonard, MKT
Bongsu Kang, ENGR       Barbara Smith, COM
Yihao Deng, MATH

Campus Appeals Board
Vacancies: 5

David Dunham, LIB       Michelle Kelsey Kearl, COM
Hosni Abu-Mulaweh, ENGR       Chad Thompson, ENGL
Brenda Lundy Jackson, PSY       Bridget Leonard, MKT

Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee
Vacancies: 3

Peter Ng, CS       Hedayeh Samavati, ECON
Florence Mugambi, LIB       Prasad Bingi, MGMT/MKT
Pamela Reese, CSD       Susan Skelkoff, LIB
Florence Mugambi, LIB       M. Gail Hickey, EDUC
Rama Cousik, CEPP       Aranzazu Pinan-Llamas, GEOS
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Vacancies: 2

Linda Wright-Bower, MUS  
Ali Alavizadeh, MCET  
Gang Wang, PHY  
Audrey Ushenko, FINA  
Shannon Bischoff, ENGL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Vacancies: 0

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Vacancies: 0

GENERAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE
Vacancies: 3

Hosni Abu-Mulaweh, ENGR  
Martha Coussément, CFS  
Linda Wright-Bower, MUS

GRADE APPEALS SUBCOMMITTEE
Vacancies: 5 [no DSB seats available]

Suzanne LaVere, HIST  
Michelle Kelsey Kearl, COM  
Martha Coussément, CFS  
Bongsu Kang, ENGR  
Cheryl Rockwell, NURS  
Guoping Wang, PHY  
Shannon Bischoff, ENGL  
Susan Skelkoff, LIB  
Yihao Deng, MATH  
Talia Bugel, ILCS

HONORS PROGRAM COUNCIL
Vacancies: 4 [no DSB seats available]

Kimberly O’Connor, OLS  
Suzanne LaVere, HIST  
Michelle Kelsey Kearl, COM  
Nila Reimer, NURS  
Timothy Grove, PHY  
Mikhael Antone, VCD  
Suin Roberts, ILCS  
Cheryl Rockwell, NURS  
Sue Mau, MATH  
Martha Coussément, CFS  
Pamela Reese, CSD  
Nancy Jackson, MUS  
Mieko Yamada, SOC  
Florence Mugambi, LIB  
Andrew Kopec, ENGL  
Margaret Brown Vega, ANTH  
Talia Bugel, ILCS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS
Vacancies: 2

Audrey Ushenko, FINA  
Shannon Bischoff, ENGL
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
Vacancies: 2

Florence Mugambi, LIB
Jens Clegg, ILCS

Ahmadreza Hedayat, ENGR
Paresh Mishra, OLS

LIBRARY SUBCOMMITTEE
Vacancies: 4

Suzanne LaVere, HIST
Martha Coussement, CFS
Ryan Yoder, PSY

Adam Coffman, MATH
Ahmadreza Hedayat, ENGR
Paresh Mishra, OLS

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS
COMMITEE
Vacancies: 2

Daniel Miller, PSY
Hongli Luo, CEIT

Audrey Ushenko, FINA
Gordon Schmidt, OLS

PURDUE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON
INSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS
Vacancies: 3

Daniel Miller, PSY
Nashwan Younis, ENGR

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Vacancies: 2

Daniel Miller, PSY
Ali Alavizadeh, MCET

Audrey Ushenko, FINA
Suzanne LaVere, HIST

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY
COMMITTEE
Vacancies: 8

Anne Argast, GEOS
Hongli Luo, CEIT
Audrey Ushenko, FINA
Shannon Bischoff, ENGL

Suzanne LaVere, HIST
Nila Reimer, NURS
TO: Executive Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate  
FROM: Mike Wolf, Chair, University Resources Policy Committee  
RE: Amendment to the Bylaws of the Fort Wayne Senate: University Advancement Advisory Subcommittee

WHEREAS, IPFW Central Administration has consolidated functions and structures formerly under the Office of the Chancellor into the Office of Advancement led by a Vice Chancellor for Advancement; and

WHEREAS, one of the main functions of this office will be to increase revenue and resources at IPFW; and

WHEREAS, shared governance works best with Fort Wayne Senate advice; and

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate Bylaws state that the University Resource Policy Committee…”shall be concerned with, but not limited to, consideration of such matters as planning and optimal utilization of the physical facilities of the University, including buildings, the library, scientific and other equipment, and educational aids; staff needs, utilization and planning; interdepartmental and interinstitutional cooperation for improved facilities and staff utilization; and nonacademic planning, including architecture, landscaping, parking, and traffic.”

WHEREAS, no current Fort Wayne Senate committee or subcommittee has the direct charge to provide advice to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Advancement under its current structure,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate be amended to add a University Advancement Advisory Subcommittee that reports to the University Resources Policy Committee with the composition of:

10 Faculty & 4 Ex Officio Members (Vice Chancellor of Advancement; Director of Alumni Relations; Executive Director of Marketing Communications, Director of Advancement Services).

Duties

The Subcommittee will carry out the following four responsibilities:

To advise the Senate, through the University Resources Policy Committee, on any and all matters that affect advancement;
To advise the Vice Chancellor for Advancement on matters of advancement;
To serve as a forum for discussion about advancement issues generally;
To consult on plans for all areas of advancement.

Approving    Approving    Absent
Suleiman Ashur    Kathy Pollock
Sarah Didier    Nila Reimer
Peter Dragnev    Wade Smith
Cyndy Elick    Mike Wolf
Cigdem Gurgur
Peter Iadicola
TO: Executive Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate  
FROM: Mike Wolf, Chair, University Resources Policy Committee  
RE: Open Access Policy Resolution

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the University is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge, and;

WHEREAS, the Faculty of Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that in keeping with that commitment, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Grant of License and Limitations

Each Faculty member grants to The Trustees of Purdue University permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles. More specifically, each Faculty member grants to The Trustees of Purdue University a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository, provided that the articles are not sold.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out)

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. Faculty members retain responsibility for complying with any incompatible licensing or assignment agreements they have executed before the adoption of this policy. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or his or her designate will waive application of the license for a particular article or delay access for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member.

Deposit of Articles

Each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the author’s final version of each article no later than the date of its publication at no charge to the appropriate representative of the Academic Affairs Office in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the Academic Affairs Office. The Academic Affairs Office will make the article available to the public in an open-access repository. The Academic Affairs Office, in consultation with Faculty Senate, is responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the faculty from time to time. The policy will be reviewed after three years and as needed thereafter.

Approving  Approving  Approving  Absent
Suleiman Ashur  Cyndy Elick  Mike Wolf  Kathy Pollock
Sarah Didier  Peter Iadicola  Wade Smith  Nila Reimer
Peter Dragnev  Cigdem Gurgur
TO: Fort Wayne Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee, Noor Borbieva, Chair
RE: Resolution on Reduction of CL FTE at IPFW
DATE: March 27, 2015

WHEREAS, Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum No. 03-1 states, “IPFW will observe a 10% CL FTE limit in the percentage of the total campus faculty FTE (defined as tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and CL appointments); and

WHEREAS, currently approximately 20% FTE are CL (Continuing Lecturers) at IPFW.

WHEREAS, there are unfulfilled needs for tenure track position that are not fulfilled because of budgetary constraints and with the growth of CLs, they are being utilized to teach courses and to fulfill duties that were designated for tenure track faculty.

WHEREAS, IPFW provides no ladder of advancement for the CL position as it provides for other full time faculty at this university.

WHEREAS, SD 88-25 section E1 provides for promotion of faculty to the rank of assistant professor. All department Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Documents must include the provision for promotion to Assistant Professorship in these documents noting procedure and criteria.

BE IT RESOLVED, that faculty who hold the rank of CL, who are qualified to be considered for the rank of Assistant Professor and where there is a programmatic need for tenure track faculty as determined by the department chairperson, dean of the college and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and will be given an opportunity to apply for promotion and tenure within the department that they reside and will be reviewed following the procedures and criteria approved by these respective units for the consideration of their case for tenure and promotion.

FURTHERMORE, they will be provided one opportunity to achieve tenure and if during their third year review if they fail to make sufficient progress such that it is anticipated that they will fail to achieve this status and rank may withdraw their application and continue in the position of CL. If their case for tenure and promotion is successful they will receive a salary and benefits that are commensurate with their new position. If they fail to achieve tenure and promotion at the requisite time will like all other faculty applicants who do not meet the criteria will end their position at IPFW.

FURTHERMORE, CLs who chose to remain in the CL status will continue along with their appointment following the reappointment guidelines for CLs in their academic unit.

FURTHERMORE, this policy will remain in effect until the percentage of FTE that are CL is reduced to be in accordance with OAA Memorandum, No. 03-1.

Approving Disapproving Abstain Non-Voting
N. Borbieva C. Gurgur B. Valliere C. Sternberger
B. Dattilo
R. Rayburn
L.R. Vartanian
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: Cigdem Z. Gurgur, Chair, Educational Policy Committee
       Mike Wolf, Chair, University Resources Policy Committee
DATE: March 27, 2015
SUBJECT: Dual Credit Task Force Report
DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for implementation

WHEREAS, The Fort Wayne Senate charged the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) and the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) addressing SD 12-12 with conducting an investigation “to determine the costs and benefits of IPFW’s participation in the Dual Credit Program”; and

WHEREAS, The Dual Credit Task Force collected and analyzed data for each question in SD 12-12; and

WHEREAS, The Dual Credit Task Force report offers suggestions for the improvement of the program;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fort Wayne Senate reviews the report to put forward any further charge for the respective Senate committees, EPC and URPC.
To: EPC and URPC
From: Yvonne Zubovic, Chair of the Dual Credit Task Force
Subject: Report in response to SD 12-12
Date: March 27, 2015

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) and the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) were charged by the Senate (SD 12-12) with conducting an investigation “to determine the costs and benefits of IPFW’s participation in the Dual Credit Program.” In particular, three items were to be addressed.

1. A comparison of the qualifications of the faculty who are teaching in the high schools and the qualifications of limited term faculty who are hired to teach the same courses on campus.

2. A detailed summary of the revenue and costs of IPFW to participate in the Dual Credit Program.

3. An assessment of the impact of program participation on student recruitment and enrollment and graduation rates.

EPC and URPC created a joint task force to undertake this investigation. The Dual Credit Task Force has collected and analyzed data for each question specified in SD 12-12. The results of the analysis are summarized in this report. In addition, at the conclusion of the report the Task Force has offered suggestions to consider for the improvement of the Dual Credit program.

Dual Credit Task Force Members:

Peter Dragnev, MATH
Cigdem Gurgur, MGMT/MKT
Peter Iadicola, SOC
Ann Livschiz, HIST
Mike Wolf, POLS
Yvonne Zubovic, MATH
Part 1: Comparison of Faculty Qualifications

Beginning in 2006, the Collegiate Connection Program initiated the School Based Program in which IPFW offers college-level courses in the high schools which are taught by IPFW approved high school teachers. Students in the Collegiate Connection Program may enroll in on-campus courses, however, many more high school students are enrolled in Dual Credit through the School Based Program. For example, in Spring 2014 out of 3087 high school students taking IPFW classes, 94.3% were enrolled in the School Based Program only, 3.7% were enrolled in Collegiate Connection only, and 2.0% were enrolled in both. Throughout the report, DC will denote Dual Credit and CC will denote Collegiate Connection.

The teacher approval process for the Dual Credit program is described on the Collegiate Connection website [http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/cc/educators/approval-process.html](http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/cc/educators/approval-process.html) and includes a link to the Teacher Appointment Criteria for each course. Although the qualifications required for approval differ across departments, the qualifications are intended to match the departmental standards used to approve adjunct faculty teaching on the IPFW campus and are required by the accreditation standards of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, IPFW's accreditation body for Dual Credit. The requirements that a Dual Credit teacher have at least a Master’s degree in the discipline or a related area as well as at least three years of teaching experience at the secondary or college level are common although not universal criteria.

For the Fall 2014 semester departments provided information on the highest degree of education attained by their Dual Credit (DC) instructors and/or the Limited Term Lecturers (LTL). This information is summarized by school/college for those departments with both DC and LTL instructors during that semester in Table 1. The first row for each school/college displays the number of faculty and the percentage for each degree category among DC instructors. The second row displays the same information for LTLs. ETCS is the only school/college for which the percentage with an Associate’s or Bachelor’s degree is greater for DC faculty than for LTL faculty. It is noted that each of the DC instructors in ETCS with a Bachelor’s degree is working toward a Master’s degree. Among faculty reported under the “Other” category are those with a Master’s or Doctorate besides those listed (e.g., D.A. in VPA), candidates who are ABD in their discipline, and candidates in the process of earning a graduate degree. Note that some departments included this final group in the “Associate’s/Bachelor’s” category rather than in the “Other” category.

While this table shows a comparison of the highest degree earned, it does not provide information about whether the degree is in the discipline or a related area. The Task Force has requested information to determine the equivalence between DC and LTL credentials for this criterion, but has not been successful in collecting useful data. This has been identified as an area of concern that should be addressed.
Table 1. Comparison of Highest Degree Earned by Dual Credit Teachers and LTLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th># of Depts.</th>
<th>DC or LTL</th>
<th># of Faculty</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Semester = Fall 2014 (Only Depts. With Dual Credit Included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc., Bach.</td>
<td>PhD, JD, EdD, MD/DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEPP 3 DC 3 0.0% 66.7% 33.3% 0.0%
LTL 14 0.0% 85.7% 14.3% 0.0%
COAS 17 DC 129 7.8% 92.2% 0.0% 0.0%
LTL 143 9.8% 74.1% 13.3% 2.8%
DSB 3 DC 9 0.0% 100.0% 0.0% 0.0%
LTL 1 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.0%
ETCS 5 DC 6 50.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0%
LTL 7 14.3% 71.4% 14.3% 0.0%
VPA 4 DC 26 11.5% 84.6% 0.0% 3.8%
LTL 63 42.9% 49.2% 3.2% 4.8%
Total 32 DC 173 9.2% 89.6% 0.1% 0.1%
LTL 228 18.4% 67.5% 11.0% 3.1%
Part 2: Summary of Revenue and Costs

As mentioned previously, starting in the mid 2000’s IPFW expanded its Collegiate Connection program to include IPFW courses delivered at the high schools by high school instructors. Curriculum is approved by IPFW departments and high school teachers/instructors (referred to as DC faculty) are certified by IPFW department chairs or designees. This is a very important lever to control the quality of the delivered courses.

Since 2011, students paid tuition of **$25 per credit hour** for courses on the State Dual Credit/Concurrent Enrollment Priority Course List (some Math, English, American Government, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Modern Languages courses). These courses are supported by the State at the current rate of **$50 per credit hour**. The list of IPFW Priority Dual Credit Courses is available on the website [http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/cc/high-school/fees.html](http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/cc/high-school/fees.html). Additional background information about the Priority Course List can be found in the Indiana Dual Credit Frequently Asked Questions Document of the Indiana Department of Education at the website [http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/ccr/dual-credit-final-3.6.15.pdf](http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/ccr/dual-credit-final-3.6.15.pdf). Courses that are not on the Priority Course List collect **$105 per credit hour** in tuition.

A request was made for a more detailed summary of revenue, but was not received in time for inclusion in this report.

This tuition and state support is used to cover expenses incurred at University level (the Division of Continuing Studies, DCS) and Department level (overload for faculty supervising the teacher-faculty, professional development for teacher-faculty, etc.). The DCS Dual Credit Program Expenses for 2013-2014 are provided in Table 2. The Collegiate Connection 2013-2014 Expenses and 2014-2015 Budget are provided in Table 3.

Table 2. Division of Continuing Studies Expenses for the Dual Credit Program in 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS Dual Credit Program Expenses 2013-2014</th>
<th>Sum. ‘13</th>
<th>Fall ‘13</th>
<th>Spr. ‘14</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart. Incentive/Faculty Stipend ($350 or $500)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,700</td>
<td>50,887</td>
<td>131,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Connection Transfer ($30 per section)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pers Service ($100 pd Honoria to Instructors)</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits/Travel mileage (instructors)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>96,532</td>
<td>51,187</td>
<td>149,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Salary (A -65%)</td>
<td>14,189</td>
<td>14,189</td>
<td>14,189</td>
<td>42,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical wages (B - 100%)</td>
<td>7,883</td>
<td>7,883</td>
<td>7,883</td>
<td>23,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical wages (C - 10%)</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded Faculty (D - to oversee program)</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>9,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>10,843</td>
<td>13,013</td>
<td>12,907</td>
<td>36,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,615</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,431</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,396</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S & E Expenses:**

| Office Supplies | 0 | 58 | 0 | 58 |
| Printing/Copying/Postage | 902 | 269 | 56 | 1,227 |
| Advertising/Publicity | 0 | 650 | 0 | 650 |
| Memberships | 0 | 0 | 550 | 550 |
| School visits/Confer./NACEP Conf. | 1,735 | 3,664 | 706 | 6,105 |
| Hospitality | 364 | 2,405 | 777 | 3,546 |
| Miscellaneous/Other expenses | 0 | 299 | 130 | 429 |
| **Subtotal** | **3,000** | **7,345** | **2,218** | **12,564** |

**Total Expenses in DCS** | $39,040 | $144,492 | $93,836 | $277,367

---

Table 3. Collegiate Connection Expenses in 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collegiate Connection 2013-2014 Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Wages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; E:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (External)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (Internal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Printing &amp; Office Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Professional Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity/T-shirts/Other Minor Equip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality/Food Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total S &amp; E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historically, approximately 25% of the IPFW dual-credit students choose to continue their college education at IPFW. Clearly, when students enroll at IPFW and transfer dual credit courses some tuition is lost. Some of these losses are covered by tuition obtained from students that choose to enroll in other institutions of higher education. At this time the funding of the program is not of urgent concern, although proposals to reduce the funding will impede on maintaining the quality of delivery.

**Part 3: Student Recruitment, Enrollment and Graduation Rates**

**Student Recruitment:**

Table 4 below shows the number of high school students enrolled in IPFW Collegiate Connection (CC) courses along with the percentage that subsequently enroll as IPFW degree-seeking students by academic year. The left portion of the table includes CC students at any level in high school. CC enrollments are by academic year and may include students duplicated between years. Note that some CC students in 2013-2014 will not have graduated from high school yet, which may explain, in part, the low percentage of admits from that year.

The right portion of the table provides the same information described above but restricted to CC students who are in their senior year in high school. Of all CC seniors subsequently admitted, all but six were high school admits. With the exception of the 2013-2014 academic year the percentage of CC high school seniors admitted into an IPFW program has varied between 24% and 28%.

While the CC enrollments have increased substantially since 2006, the percent of CC seniors who are later admitted as degree-seeking students has remained relatively constant. The question that remains unanswered from this data is “What percent of these students were influenced to come to IPFW because of the CC experience?”

Table 4: Percent of Collegiate Connection students who are later admitted into degree seeking students at IPFW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>High School Students in IPFW Collegiate Connection</th>
<th>Only High School Seniors in IPFW Collegiate Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Enrolled in CC</td>
<td>Percent Later Admitted to IPFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment:

Spring 2004 is the last semester that on-site high school classes taught by IPFW faculty were offered. School Based Program courses with classes taught by IPFW certified high school instructors began in the Summer 2006 Semester. Since 2006, Collegiate Connection (CC) includes students taking: School Based Program Dual Credit classes only, on-campus courses through Collegiate Connection only, and a combination of both. Figure 1 below displays the number of CC students enrolled by semester across academic years, including an Academic Year (AY) Total summing fall, spring, and summer numbers. Two academic years prior to the start of the School Based Program are included for comparison.

Figure 1: Number of students enrolled in Collegiate Connection

![Graph showing the number of CC students enrolled by semester across academic years.](image)

The number of students enrolled in CC has increased substantially since the School Based Program was initiated. For example, CC enrollments rose from 216 in Fall 2006 to 3,328 in Fall 2013. A similar increase has occurred in the spring semesters. Summer enrollments have been relatively stable over that time, reflecting the students enrolled in on-campus CC only.

A similar trend is apparent for CC credit hours. Figure 2 displays the credit hours by semester across academic years, again including an Academic Year (AY) Total summing fall, spring, and summer credit hours. The number of credit hours has increased substantially in fall and spring semesters, for example from 983 credits in Fall 2006 to 14,576 credits in Fall 2013. The credit hours for the summer have remained relatively stable during the same time period.
While Figure 1 provides information on the number of CC students enrolled, it does not demonstrate the impact on IPFW enrollments. To assess this impact consider the percent of IPFW students that are part of Collegiate Connection in any given year. This percentage is displayed in Figure 3. The graph shows that a growing percentage of IPFW’s enrollment is due to CC, and this group is primarily students in the School Based Program. For the 2013-2014 academic year, these students represented close to 25% of the fall and spring enrollments.

Figure 3: Percent of IPFW Student Enrollment represented by Collegiate Connection Students

Figure 4 shows that a growing percentage of IPFW’s credit hours is due to CC, primarily students in the School Based Program. For the 2013-2014 academic year these students took
approximately 11% and 6% of the fall and spring credit hours, respectively. Clearly the impact of the program growth is more dramatic in IPFW head count than in credit hours.

Figure 4: Percent of IPFW Student Credit Hours represented by Collegiate Connection Students

Since IPFW is not the only institution participating in the School Based Program, consider the profile of Dual Credit experience for IPFW’s high school admits. In Figure 5 high school admits are classified according to their dual credit status by academic year. Note that academic year is labelled so that 2007 represents the 2006-2007 year. A student’s Dual Credit Status is denoted using: Red = no Dual Credit hours, Yellow = only IPFW Dual Credit hours, Green = Only Dual Credit Hours from Other Institutions, and Blue = Dual Credit from both IPFW and Other Institutions. While initially numbers of high school admits were increasing, the numbers have declined since the 2010-2011 academic year. Also, the number of high school admits with no Dual Credit has declined since 2008-2009. Not surprisingly, the number of students with Dual Credit from IPFW has steadily increased.

Figure 5: Number of High School Admits Classified by Dual Credit Status
Figure 6 displays similar information about this classification as the portion of the distribution. By the 2013-2014 academic year, the percentage of students admitted directly from high school with no Dual Credit had decreased to 52.6%. Students admitted with Dual Credit from IPFW (25.6%) and from IPFW and Other Institutions (14.7%) made up over 40% of the high school admits in that same year. This stands in stark contrast to the 2006-2007 year when the vast majority (85.4%) of high school admits had no Dual Credit earned.

Retention and Graduation Rates:

Various metrics for student success concern retention and progress to graduation. To explore the relationship between participation in Dual Credit and retention, Figure 7 displays freshman fall semester to sophomore fall semester retention rates for students classified according to Dual Credit status. Clearly, retention rates are lowest for those students having no Dual Credit. However the next lowest retention rates are for those students who have taken Dual Credit Courses only from IPFW. Recall that this was also the next largest group of students among the four categories. The highest retention rates are found in the small group of students who have only Dual Credit from other schools.

Since not every high school student is eligible to enroll in Dual Credit, cohorts for each academic year were created consisting of students who: (1) earned a high school GPA of at least 3.0 on a four point scale, and (2) finished in the top 50% of their high school class. Cohort students were categorized by those with Dual Credit versus those with no Dual Credit. Not every high school reports GPA and/or high school percentile, so the cohort sizes ranged from 89 to 479 for those with Dual Credit and 307 to 763 for those without Dual Credit. Figure 8 displays freshman fall semester to sophomore fall semester retention rates for these cohorts. The retention rate for those students in the cohort with Dual Credit is from 4.8% to 12.5% higher than the retention rate for
those with no Dual Credit. So comparing students with more similar high school credentials still demonstrates that students with Dual Credit are retained at a higher rate.

Figure 7: Freshman to Sophomore Year Retention Rates by Dual Credit Status

![Retention Rates by Dual Credit Status](image)

Figure 8: Freshman to Sophomore Year Retention Rates for Cohorts

![Retention Rates for Cohorts](image)

Figure 9 shows the percent of all high school admitted students who earn a Bachelor’s degree within four years, separated by Dual Credit status. Note that the End of Admitted Year = 2008 indicates that the student was admitted in the 2007-2008 academic year. Clearly, the graduation rates are the lowest for those students who have not taken any Dual Credit. The next lowest rates are for those taking only IPFW Dual Credit, with a few exceptions. Figure 10 displays the same
information as Figure 9 for the cohort of students described above. Not surprisingly, the graduation rates are again higher for those students who have taken some Dual Credit.

Figure 9: Percent Earning a Bachelor’s Degree within Four Years by Dual Credit Status

A question that remains unanswered is how students who have taken Dual Credit perform in follow-up courses once enrolled at IPFW. Since some Dual Credit courses may be prerequisites to IPFW courses at the sophomore level and higher, it is essential that students taking these courses in the high school are appropriately prepared.
Suggestions to Consider for the Improvement of the Program

(1) Faculty Qualifications

A common teacher appointment criterion is that the degree be in the discipline or a related discipline. We suggest adding the following columns to the DC and LTL Teacher Credential Reporting Templates: (1) area or discipline of the highest degree attained; (2) number of graduate credits earned for those working toward a graduate degree.

(2) Budgetary Constraints

A pressing concern is the issue of maintaining the level expertise of the DC faculty working force. Recent moves by the legislature to remove incentives for teachers attaining a Master’s degree have resulted in a significant withdrawal of high school teachers pursuing these degrees. A further study of the historical trend in overall percent of teachers with Master’s is pressing. DC faculty themselves have raised this issue. The concern as far as resources is that IPFW may not be able to deliver its mission in the concurrent enrollment program at the quality associated with the Indiana and Purdue brands.

Because of budgetary constraints IPFW was forced to remove its match of tuition remission for Dual Credit teachers having development plans to complete Graduate programs at IPFW. A System-wide funded plan for professional development of prospective dual-credit teachers may be needed to address the issue.

(3) Recruitment, Retention and Graduation

Several additional sources of data may provide insight into the answer to “What percent of these students were influenced to come to IPFW because of the CC experience?” An investigation of whether Dual Credit has increased the percentage of students from participating high schools who enroll as IPFW degree seeking students is suggested, in light of implemented recruitment practices, may yield some effective strategies for increasing these enrollment rates.

While retention and graduation rates are important metrics to consider, another measure of the quality of the program is the success rates of Dual Credit students in subsequent courses. A suggestion is to conduct a study of student performance in courses for which a Dual Credit course is a prerequisite.

(4) Quality Concerns

The quality of the program should be an important concern in any discussion related to the Dual Credit Program. The committee suggests experimenting with other models of Collegiate Connection faculty collaboration and supervision. In several discipline areas it is very difficult to recruit high school faculty who possess the Master’s degree requirement in the subject area or related subject. It is recommended that the program experiment with developing a model of utilizing faculty from the university as master
teachers who will collaborate with the high school faculty in the delivery of the course. This collaborative work may involve offering lectures on site or remotely, providing more guidance in the development of classroom activities including lectures, class discussions, student in-class work, and class simulations. This model will not only enhance the quality of the course, but also establish a greater connection between the high school faculty and students, and IPFW faculty. This model of delivery will further differentiate the IPFW brand as providing more of the college experience in the high school classroom. These master teachers from the campus should receive a stipend to pay for their services that are offered in this more extensive collaborative model of delivery of the course.

(5) Accreditation

IPFW is accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships. As such, NACEP requires that: “Instructors teaching college or university courses through the concurrent enrollment program meet the academic requirements for faculty and instructors teaching in the sponsoring postsecondary institution.” This standard is not required by other Dual Credit-providing institutions of higher education in Northeast Indiana, which leaves IPFW unable to partner with many teachers lacking degree requirements that end up becoming certified by institutions without these standards. IPFW should develop a strategy of how our accreditation standards should be used moving forward given that accreditation is not a requirement for Dual Credit in Indiana. Should our higher standards be highlighted to persuade school districts to partner with IPFW on Dual Credit? Should IPFW work with NACEP to promote its standards as a baseline accreditation for all institutions in Indiana with the Indiana Commission on Higher Education, state legislators, and Department of Education? Should IPFW abandon its NACEP accreditation?
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee
DATE: March 27, 2015
SUBJECT: Faculty evaluation of administrators

WHEREAS SD 92-13 instated a process whereby all academic administrators would be evaluated regularly and that all members of the Voting Faculty should be invited to participate in evaluating the administrators under whom they work; and

WHEREAS in SD 97-23 (now 09-07) FAC recommended that department chairs and associate deans be evaluated by departmental faculty each year according to the governance procedures of individual schools/colleges/divisions and all administrators above the level of associate dean be evaluated through a process called Upward Feedback, administered by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis; and

WHEREAS SD 97-23 established FAC as responsible for overseeing these processes and if necessary making changes; and

WHEREAS recent inquiries by FAC revealed that most of the schools/colleges/divisions do not include administrator evaluation in their governance documents; and

WHEREAS there is considerable variation in the processes schools follow when evaluating chairs and associate deans; and

WHEREAS not all schools have been implementing the process on a regular basis; and

WHEREAS the existence of the policy is often not communicated to new deans, leading to a disruption of the process when there is a change of leadership; and

WHEREAS there is no method by which school-level program directors are evaluated, leaving them the only class of administrator that supervises faculty but is not evaluated by those faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED, that FAC be charged with creating a standard set of yearly procedures for the evaluation of chairs, associate deans, and program directors, to be incorporated into school/college/division governance documents and implemented by deans.

FURTHERMORE, that FAC design a system of oversight to ensure that these procedures are carried out fairly and consistently on a yearly basis and according to defined procedure.

FURTHERMORE, that FAC create a mechanism for the communication of these procedures in the case of change in leadership.

In favor: N. Borbieva, C. Gurgur, R. Rayburn, B. Valliere, L.R. Vartanian
Opposed: B. Dattilo, C. Sternberger
Did not vote/non-voting:
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Cigdem Z. Gurgur, Chair
Educational Policy Committee
DATE: February 27, 2015
SUBJ: Universal class scheduling possibility M/W mirroring T/R afternoons

WHEREAS, Educational Policy Committee accomplished the investigation by analyzing data for a three year time-frame, Fall 2012 – Spring 2015; and

WHEREAS, Educational Policy Committee established that IPFW Registrar already had a system in place permitting class scheduling of M/W afternoons mirroring T/R afternoons, with good student enrollments; and

WHEREAS, IPFW Registrar works with individual departments to follow the approved class scheduling patterns; and

WHEREAS, IPFW Registrar accommodates desires of departments when there is a need to stray from the approved class scheduling patterns, including pro-active discussion with chairs to satisfy departmental requirements for certain courses;

BE IT RESOLVED, That IPFW Registrar continues with the current system in place.

Approving
Noor Borbieva
Benjamin Dattilo
Peter Dragnev
Carl Drummond
Cigdem Gurgur
Jane Leatherman
Ann Livschiz

Disapproving

Abstain/Did Not Vote

Non-Voting
Patrick McLaughlin
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: Executive Committee
DATE: 30 March 2015
SUBJECT: Amendment to the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate: Continuing Lecturers

DISPOSITION: To the Nominations and Elections Committee for submission to the Voting Faculty for approval; upon approval, to the presiding officer for implementation

WHEREAS, This resolution to amend the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate was originally adopted by the Senate in April 2014; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendment was only voted on by 69 out of 323 Voting Faculty, and fell only one vote short of the necessary two-thirds majority required for ratification; and

WHEREAS, Continuing Lecturers have a different status and rights in each department, school, and college on the IPFW campus and are not counted among the Voting Faculty in the constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate (provisions I.C and I.D); and

WHEREAS, Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum No. 03-1 (hereafter referred to as OAA 03-1) states, “IPFW will observe a 10% CL FTE limit in the percentage of the total campus faculty FTE (defined as tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and CL appointments); and

WHEREAS, the following table demonstrates that in the 2013-14 academic year Continuing Lecturers represented a more significant component of the faculty than was originally expected or intended;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical/Non TT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Lecturers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10% Rule</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

WHEREAS, OAA 03-1 specifies that Continuing Lecturers “have departmental service responsibilities appropriate to their teaching assignment and an expectation of continuing professional development”; and
WHEREAS, Continuing Lecturers are often urged during the reappointment processes to engage in school/college and university service exceeding what is called for in OAA 03-1; and

WHEREAS, Continuing Lecturers are reappointed through the same basic process as probationary tenure-track faculty and are eligible for merit increases through the same process as tenure-line faculty; and

WHEREAS, Continuing Lecturers use the same grievance processes as Purdue and Indiana University tenure-line faculty; and

WHEREAS, Continuing Lecturers are held to many of the same standards and expectations as tenure-line faculty; and

WHEREAS, the charge to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (Fort Wayne Senate Bylaw 5.3.2) was amended on 15 April 2013 to define Faculty as including “tenured and tenure track faculty, clinical faculty, continuing lecturers, limited term lecturers, and visiting instructors”;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Constitution of the Fort Wayne Senate be amended as indicated below (additions are underlined):

VII. Governing Body: The Senate
   A. Membership
      1. Composition. The Senate shall be composed of
         a. The Presidents of Indiana University and Purdue University
         b. The chief administrative officer of IPFW
         c. The chief academic officer of IPFW
         d. The chief financial officer of IPFW
         e. The Speakers of the Faculty
         f. The chief officer in charge of student affairs at IPFW
         g. Additional members of the Faculty selected according to procedures in this Article
         h. The elected representative of the continuing lecturers at IPFW

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that upon ratification of this amendment by the Voting Faculty, a review of the Bylaws of the Senate will be necessary to ensure conformity with this amendment, and that the amendment will go into effect once that review is complete.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Executive Committee

DATE: 30 March 2015

SUBJECT: Creation of an ad hoc committee to review and recommend changes to Senate committee and subcommittee structures and functions

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for implementation

WHEREAS, committees and subcommittees make the greatest contribution to shared governance when they are operating efficiently;

WHEREAS, the burden of committee work falls disproportionately on senators who make up a small percentage of the faculty;

WHEREAS, members of the faculty are denied opportunities to serve when they are not senators;

WHEREAS, there are inconsistencies and a lack of clarity in the Bylaws about committee and subcommittee membership and duties;

WHEREAS, there has been, and continues to be, significant change at IPFW and within the Indiana University and Purdue University systems;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that an ad hoc committee be formed to review the Bylaws and make recommendations regarding the structure and function of Senate committees and subcommittees;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ad hoc committee include one (1) member from Educational Policy Committee (EPC), Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), Nominations and Elections Committee (N&E), Student Affairs Committee (SAC), University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), along with the Parliamentarian and Presiding Officer as non-voting members and that the ad hoc committee members be named before the end of the 2015 spring semester from the list of committee members for the 2015/16 academic year;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the recommendations of the ad hoc committee be submitted to the Senate no later than the February 2016 meeting.
Question Time

What is the status of the discussions and/or negotiations on changing IPFW’s managing partner from Purdue University to Indiana University?

Jeffrey Malanson
Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee
An article about cutting tennis appeared on the Journal Gazette website on Saturday March 29, 2015. When was the decision made? Who was consulted before the decision was made?

Executive Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Kathy Pollock, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

DATE: 17 March 2015

SUBJ: End-of-the-Year Committee Reports

Attached are brief reports from Senate committees and subcommittees of their activities and actions for the past year.

Chairs:
- Academic Computing Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee (A. Montenegro)
- Subcommittee on Athletics (R. Vandell)
- Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (J. Malanson)
- Calendar Subcommittee (E. Ohlander)
- Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee (M. Montesino)
- Curriculum Review Subcommittee (L. Corbin)
- Educational Policy Committee (C. Gurgur)
- Faculty Affairs Committee (N. Borbieva)
- General Education Subcommittee (A. Downs)
- Graduate Subcommittee (M. Sharma)
- Honors Program Council (S. LaVere)
- Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (J. Badia)
- International Services Advisory Subcommittee (J. Niser)
- Library Subcommittee (S. LaVere)
- Nominations and Elections Committee (L. Vartanian)
- Professional Development Subcommittee (A. Downs)
- Purdue University Committee on Institutional Affairs (P. Dragnev)
- Student Affairs Committee (C. Erickson)
- University Resources Policy Committee (M. Wolf)
- NCAA Faculty Representative (E. Blumenthal)
TO: The Senate
FROM: Andres Montenegro, Chair
      Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee
DATE: March 26, 2015

The Academic Computing and Information Technology Advisory Subcommittee has no ongoing
document under deliberation at this time, however our committee is conducting a very important
discussion about the future of our Learning Management System. At the ACITAS meeting on the 4th
of March we discussed the possibility of Purdue University moving to the Canvas Learning
Management system and away from Blackboard Learn.

They are conducting a pilot right now. It is possible, maybe likely, that if they chose to move to
Canvas we will need to move as well. We do not have any faculty in the pilot but have the
opportunity to get "sandbox" so we can get into a sample class and see how it works.

ACITAS resolved:
1. To encourage IPFW faculty get involved in the Canvas pilot.
2. Inform the University Senate about the relevance of the discussion.
3. Suggest a possible survey to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, consulting our
   academic community about the effectiveness of the two LMS.
4. Encourage the members of ACITAS to request sandboxes of the Canvas pilot.
5. I anticipate an incoming meeting of ACITAS by mid April, to assess a formal report about this
   business.

Membership:

Lowell Beineke
Elliott Blumenthal (Faculty rep)
Mark DeLaney
James Hersberger
Kelly Hartley Hatton
Christine Kuznar
Kim McDonald

Rachel Rayburn
Shawna Squibb
Robert Vandell
James Volez
Wendy Wilson (Comp Coordinator)
David Young

Membership: Sandra Berry, Samantha Birk, Elizabeth Boaintight, Noor Borbieve, M. Davidson,
Damian Fleming, Karen Van Gorder, C. Gurgar, Andres Montenegro, Alison Ryneearson, Gary Steffen,
Caryl Truesdell
Nothing to report at this time.

DATE: March 22, 2015
FROM: The Senate
TO: Max Montoya, Chair

DATE: March 23, 2015
FROM: Max Montoya, Chair
TO: The Senate
Laurel Robinson
Peter 
Ann Lattimer
Middle Fire
Conflict of Interest

Wolf
Chair

The Senate

DATE: March 27, 2015
FROM: Andrew Downie Chair

General Education Subcommittee

The Senate

arto

Pamela Johnson
Ken Finnegan
David Dicksen (PTI)
Tony Blackburn

Membership

No report was received.

Committee: General Education Core (STCO)

Finally, the GES has been following and participating in statewide discussions of the Statewide and changes to existing education courses.

The GES has reviewed the General Education Core assessment reports that were submitted at the end of the 2014-15 school year and is reviewing proposals for new General Education courses.
April

A project focused on developing the subcommittee's website and creating a database of open access policies in the state library's collection. In addition, the subcommittee will review and prepare special needs grants in the May 2015 meeting. The subcommittee also worked on preparing an open access policy document.


DATE: March 27, 2015

International Education Advisory Subcommittee

TO: The Senate

John Niese, Chair

FROM: Sharon Heslop

Sharon Heslop (ex officio)

John Niese (ex officio)

Kim

Scott Pair (ex officio)
Grant process. If you are interested in action, then
and as a result, the feedback and considerations incorporated into the summer
summer vacation and submitted in the fall. The spring is the period when feedback is

March 27, 2015
FROM: Professional Development Subcommittee
Annette Dowling, Chair
TO: Senate Reference No. 14-27

We collected nominations for spring elections and we are working on preparing the online ballot.

March 27, 2015
FROM: Senate Reference Committee
TO: Senate Reference No. 14-27
TO: The Faculty
FROM: Sarah Mettert
Secretary of the Faculty
DATE: April 13, 2015
SUBJ: Senate Membership, 2015-2016

Officers

Presiding Officer: Andrew Downs
Parliamentarian: Jeffrey Malanson
Sergeant-at-Arms: Gary Steffen

Senators

Ex-Officio Members
Vicky Carwein
Mitchell Daniels
Carl Drummond
George McClellan
Michael McRobbie
David Wesse

Speakers
Janet Badia, Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty, 2014-16
Mark Masters, Speaker of the Purdue University Faculty, 2015-17

Departmental and School Members
Tiffin Adkins, LIB, 2015-18
Ali Alavizadeh, MCET, 2015-18
Sarah Beckman, NURS, 2014-17
Shannon Bischoff, ENGL, 2015-18
Noor Borbieva, ANTH, 2014-17
Steve Carr, COM, 2015-18
Jeff Casazza, THTR, 2013-16
Chand Chauhan, MATH, 2013-16
Chao Chen, ENGR, 2014-17
Benjamin Dattilo, GEOS, 2014-17
Suining Ding, CVPA, 2015-18
Quinton Dixie, PHIL, 2014-17
Cigdem Gurgur, MGMT/MKT, 2013-16
Mark Jordan, BIOL, 2014-17
Daren Kaiser, PSY, 2013-16
Suzanne LaVere, HIST, 2015-18
Jane Leatherman, PROFS, 2014-17
Eric Link, A&S Dean
Marc Lipman, MATH, 2014-17
Hongli Luo, CEIT, 2015-18
Daniel Miller, PSY, 2015-18
John Niser, CFS, 2013-16
Ann Obergfell, CHHS Dean
Winfried Peters, BIOL, 2015-18
Gyorgy Petruska, CS, 2014-17
Kathy Pollock, ACFN, 2014-17
Mohammad Qasim, CHEM, 2015-18
Rachel Rayburn, PPOL, 2013-16
David Redett, MATH, 2014-17
Nila Reimer, NURS, 2014-16
Hedayeh Samavati, ECON, 2013-16
Gordon Schmidt, OLS, 2015-18
Hao Sun, ENG, 2013-16
Audrey Ushenko, FINA, 2015-18
Brenda Valliere, DAE, 2014-17
Augusto De Venanzi, SOC, 2015-16
Nancy Virtue, ILCS, 2015-18
Gang Wang, PHYS, 2015-18
Linda Wark, HS, 2014-17
Michael Wolf, POLS, 2015-18
Linda Wright-Bower, MUS, 2015-18
Max Yen, ETCS Dean

At-Large
Arts and Sciences
Anne Argast, 2015-18
Abraham Schwab, 2014-17
Lesa Vartanian, 2013-16

Education & Public Policy
Gail Hickey, 2013-16

Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science
Nashwan Younis, 2014-17
STUDENT AND EMPLOYEE SURVEYS ON IPFW DIVISION I ATHLETIC PROGRAM

Peter Iadicola
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
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Executive Summary

A survey of students and employees was conducted over a two week period beginning with the second week in the semester. The survey was conducted to complete the research that was conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Division I Athletics that was formed by the University Resources Committee. Students who were enrolled in the capstone course for the major in sociology designed the survey and survey instruments. The survey was designed to measure student and employee opinions on the benefits of the division I athletic program and whether the benefits are worth the costs. The respondents were organized into the following stakeholder groups for analysis of the findings; division I student athletes, students who were not division I athletes, administrative employees, faculty employees, and staff employees. Frequencies of response and cross-tabulation with calculations of Chi Square statistics were used to present the findings.

The survey indicated that there are important areas of agreement as measured by the majority opinion across all stakeholder groups regarding the benefits of the division I athletic program. The benefits identified by majority within each stakeholder group included the role the program plays in creation of community and school spirit, creating student oriented events, and contributing to a positive image for the university in the local community and the state of Indiana. Across both student stakeholder groups there is agreement on the contributions of the division I program including student recruitment, health and wellness, and creating diversity. The majority of both student stakeholder groups also see that the athletic program does contribute to the prestige of the university.

There are important differences in perceptions between division I students athletes and the students who are not division I athletes. Many of these differences are purely a result of the different roles that the athlete’s play compared to students who are not division I athletes. However, many of the differences may be a result of the different roles of these positions and how they intersect with the division I program.

The report concludes with some suggestions as to how to spread the benefits of the program more broadly across the various stakeholder groups.
Introduction

This survey was conducted to complete a study of the cost and benefits of IPFW’s continued participation in division I athletics. As required by IPFW Senate document 12-25, Continue Participation in Summit League, the University Resources Policy Committee assembled a task force representative of all major stakeholders to the university and athletic program for completion of an assessment of the cost and benefits of IPFW’s participation as a Division 1 university and to issue a report to the Senate by the February 2014 meeting. The task force was composed of representatives from the various stakeholder groups of IPFW and its division I athletic program. This included representatives from faculty (a male and female representative), student government, from the alumni, from the administration as selected by the Chancellor, and a representative from the athletic program. The committee was composed of the following representatives; Professor Peter Iadicola, committee chair and representing faculty, Professor Christine Erickson, representing faculty, Ms. Kelley Hartley Hutton, Athletic Director, Mr. Steven Sarratore, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, Ms. Pone Vongphachanh, representing IPFW Alumni, and Mr. Christopher Hinton, student representative.

The University Resources Policy Committee report from the task force was issued to the senate on March of 2013 (see Senate Reference No. 13-38). The task force had discussed the development of a survey of stakeholder groups including students, university employees, and alumni but unfortunately ran out of the necessary time to develop and execute the survey before the report was due to the senate. During the fall semester, I took on the task of completing this survey. Thus, this survey content and its results are solely my responsibility and not the responsibility of the task force.

During the fall semester, I incorporated the project of a survey on the perceived benefits of the stakeholders identified by the task force as a research project to be designed by the graduating seniors who were enrolled in the capstone course for the sociology major. Under my supervision, the students and I discussed the research on the costs and benefits of division I athletics to universities and identified key areas for