

**To: Fort Wayne Senate**

**From: Ad Hoc Committee To Review the Relationships between IPFW and  
Indiana University and Purdue University**

**Date: May 3, 1989**

**Subject: Endorsement of committee report**

**Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for transmittal to the presidents and the boards of trustees of  
Indiana University and Purdue University**

**Resolved, That the Fort Wayne Senate endorse the following report of the Ad Hoc Committee To  
Review the Relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University.**

# Report of the Ad Hoc Committee To Review the Relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University April 1989

By vote of the Fort Wayne Senate, an Ad Hoc Committee To Review IPFW's Relationships to Indiana University and Purdue University was established 20 April 1987. This committee was charged with examining "all aspects of the University's relationships with Indiana University and Purdue University," including:

- Selection, attraction, and retention of students, faculty, and administrators
- Academic and nonacademic program development
- Employee compensation and benefits programs
- Fiscal and funding policies and procedures
- Academic transferability
- Flexibility in meeting regional needs
- Governance
- Physical development.

The committee was directed to "seek information from a wide range of sources inside and outside the universities," and to "identify any aspects of the relationships to Indiana University and Purdue University which should be modified to encourage IPFW's fulfillment of its missions."

At the 14 September 1987 Senate meeting, seven senators were elected to serve on the committee: Marian Adair, Jeanette Clausen, Arthur Friedel, Steven Hollander, Frederick Kirchoff, David McCants, and David Onwood. This committee subsequently established five subcommittees: Subcommittee C, to investigate the university's relationship to the community; Subcommittee F, to investigate faculty concerns; Subcommittee M, to consider management and fiscal policy; Subcommittee P, to consider academic programs; and Subcommittee S, to consider student concerns.<sup>1</sup> During the following months, these committees gathered information. Questionnaires were administered to faculty, students, and members of the community; open hearings were held; administrators were interviewed; faculty members volunteered information about their experience with the strengths and weaknesses of system affiliation. The five subcommittees then submitted their reports to the ad hoc committee, which prepared the general report that follows.

In the months since the commencement of this process, IPFW has undergone significant changes in administration and academic structure. New persons have assumed the positions of Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and several academic deans and other administrators have been appointed. A new President of Indiana University has begun to redefine the university's intercampus relationships. New schools have altered the organization of IPFW's faculty. For these reasons, it is important to keep in mind

that the findings and the conclusions and recommendations that follow in this report reflect the views of some individuals no longer associated with IPFW and some circumstances that may have changed.

## FINDINGS

The Committee's findings appear in five sections, below, corresponding roughly to the areas examined by the five subcommittees established in 1987.

### Management and Fiscal Policy

Five major areas related to management and fiscal policy emerged from the study:

- Decision-Making
- Record Keeping and Reporting
- Resources and Facilities
- Employee Benefits
- Participation in System-Wide Governance Structures.

### The Limited Autonomy of IPFW Decision-Making

From the perspective of the IU and Purdue systems, IPFW is a small entity—a perception exacerbated by the tendency to treat IU or Purdue components of the campus separately. As a result, IPFW often has little voice in designing the management policies under which it operates, and system-wide management and fiscal-policy decisions often ignore the unique nature of IPFW.

Generally, at the Chancellor's and Vice Chancellors' levels, IPFW management and fiscal policy decisions are made in close concert with and are at least somewhat directed by the Purdue-West Lafayette [PUWL] administration. For example, PUWL gives IPFW its budget parameters, and then the IPFW budget is formulated within those parameters and defended at PUWL by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs. PUWL exerts similar dominance in IPFW's contacts with the Indiana Legislature and various funding agencies. Most administrators report that this system works smoothly; however, they acknowledge that its effectiveness derives in large part from the fact that many of them came to IPFW from PUWL or, to a lesser extent, Indiana University-Bloomington [IUB]—a view that supports the concern of some faculty that strong identification of the Financial Affairs office with PUWL may discourage its staff from developing IPFW-specific policies or questioning main-campus decisions that ignore the special nature of IPFW. One administrator, concerned that too much decision-making must go through PUWL, cited the example of cutting a new door in a wall: IPFW makes the request, but

then it is in the hands of the PUWL architects. Another compared IPFW's role in determining its own budget to "a kid hoping for Santa to bring him a present." While IPFW administrators appear to be playing a more active role in the universities' liaison with the state legislature, in past years this has been an area of conflict and could become so again in the future.

Below the Vice Chancellors' levels, there is considerable variation in the autonomy of decision-making, largely depending on the position of the individual IPFW administrative unit in the IU or PU system. Some units must closely follow IUB or PUWL guidelines; others enjoy what they term "complete autonomy" in decision-making.

### **Record Keeping and Record Reporting**

The duplication of forms and dual data entry caused by participation in two university systems adds to the expense of running IPFW. In addition, the large number of procedures requiring data entry at PUWL creates a time lag in the processing of IPFW records. One administrator complained that PUWL data entry also tends to be more error-prone than work done locally. The two university systems carry out some tasks, such as the production of paychecks, IPFW might otherwise have to do for itself, but there may be advantages in assuming functions like the production of "official" transcripts. Some administrators praise PUWL's sophisticated accounting system and consider it an example of the value of being part of a larger university system. Others complain that it is more codified than need be—"overly cumbersome and overly elaborate . . . designed by accountants rather than management people." Currently, one IPFW school translates PUWL budget statements into an alternative format in order to make this information comprehensible to administrators without formal training in accounting. It is difficult to sort out the understandable desire of some administrators to do things on their own from significant criticisms of the current system. It would be useful to have the current system reviewed by an agent with no vested interest in the outcome.

Too often, campus statistics provided by the two university systems refer to PU or IU students, faculty, enrollments, etc., instead of total figures for the campus. As a result, IPFW is regarded as a smaller, less important institution than in fact it is.

### **The Physical Plant, Library, and Other Campus Resources**

Management and fiscal policies regarding campus resources vary widely, depending upon the relationship the unit has with its counterpart at IUB or PUWL. For example, the Physical Plant has a very close working relationship with PUWL, as does the Library with IUB. Other campus resources, such as the Athletic Office and Computing & Data Processing, have more distant relationships with IUB and PUWL.

Prompt availability of IUB library materials was frequently cited as an example of positive system interaction. On the other hand, because IPFW's annual payments to IUB for system library expenses are not treated as an IPFW contribution in the IUB library budget, services to IPFW are not predicated on its actual contribution. This lack of knowledge may or may not be to IPFW's advantage; however, it gives us no grounds to defend the current level of services when cuts are threatened. From the perspective of the IUB library, services to IPFW are a drain on their resources, not a source of income. In addition, the research library standards IPFW is forced to apply to its collection are sometimes inappropriate to the campus. For example, IPFW wants to become a central agency for local materials, but IUB standards do not allow cataloguing of pamphlets 50 pages or less in length—a category into which many local publications fall.

While access to system libraries and computers is a decided benefit to IPFW, there remain subtle distinctions between the campuses. IUB faculty, by virtue of their campus affiliation, have privileges at 55 major research libraries; IPFW faculty lack these privileges. Similarly, computer software and databases available to IUB and PUWL faculty are not always available to IPFW faculty. In general, decisions about which resources will be available to IPFW are made downstate, without meaningful consultation. As a result, access to some resources is denied, and access to other resources (e.g., PUWL's super-computer) is provided *and charged for* even though the resource may have little or no value to IPFW.

### **Employee Benefits**

General personnel and payroll decisions related to IPFW are made at PUWL, and are usually based upon Purdue policies for Purdue staff and IU policies for IU staff. Consultation with appropriate IPFW staff prior to such decisions' being made is increasing, but is not yet usual. Benefit packages offered by the two university systems are different, but comparable. Given this fact and the general intricacies of the two systems, IPFW faculty and staff are at a disadvantage when they do not know the right persons to contact at IUB and PUWL when local personnel are unable to answer non-routine questions about benefits.

Policies appropriate for large residential campuses are not always appropriate for a commuter campus with a substantial number of part-time students. The history of IPFW parking policies illustrates this problem. Current policies continue to constitute a hardship for associate (part-time) faculty—a category unusual at IUB and PUWL, but all too usual at IPFW. Until now, these faculty, who may teach at the university only a few hours a week, have paid the same amount for a parking permit as full-time faculty and staff. Nor is parking the only area in which IPFW associate faculty have been adversely affected by PUWL policies, which do not permit IPFW to remit fees

for courses required by departments for associate faculty development.

IPFW's size and makeup sometimes operate to the advantage of the larger campuses, and seldom to its own. Protection staff at PUWL are divided into categories—police, fire, etc.—and paid as specialists; their IPFW counterparts are expected to handle all the jobs but, being less specialized, are paid less. It is not always recognized that by including IPFW in their insurance pools, both IUB and PUWL lower costs for their own faculty. IPFW faculty and staff tend to be younger and therefore healthier. In this instance, it could be argued that the regional campuses of both university systems are being used to support main-campus programs.

### **Costs and Benefits of Participation in System-Wide Governance Structures**

Meetings with IU and Purdue administrators and participation in system-wide committees, boards, etc., have various costs. Many administrators and faculty report little such interaction; a few report weekly travel from Fort Wayne to conduct university business. For some, this interaction is productive; others complain that much of their travel is a waste of resources and, far more important, time. While some system bodies, such as the two Boards of Trustees, make a point of meeting at different campuses, geographical logic tends to centralize meetings where the universities' presence is strongest. Thus, few system events take place at Fort Wayne; many at West Lafayette, Indianapolis, and Bloomington.

Duplication of administrative and academic record-keeping procedures is a cost not merely to IPFW but to IUB and PUWL as well. Significant central-service fees, paid by IPFW to both institutions, affect the funds actually remaining for use at IPFW. While these fees in some instances cover costs that would otherwise be borne by IPFW, the relationship between fees and benefits is sometimes cloudy. Moreover, community groups concerned with IPFW's funding are not always aware of the reallocation of IPFW-designated funds to IUB or PUWL.

On the other hand, experts on management and fiscal-policy matters at various levels of both universities are readily accessible to IPFW staff and frequently provide assistance and information that is needed for IPFW-specific purposes, rather than system demands. The excellent reputations of IU and Purdue provide a positive image for IPFW. In some instances, system affiliation results in lower bids from vendors. Access to resources, such as the IU library system, is clearly a benefit.

### **Programs and Program Development**

Subcommittees P and F administered a questionnaire to all faculty and administrators with faculty appointments, to which there were 160 responses. Subcommittee P also held two open hearings and consulted various statistical

reports relative to enrollments and funding at state university campuses in Indiana.

Unlike IUB and PUWL, which prepare students for a national or international labor market, IPFW serves students who in large part intend to live and work in northeastern Indiana. For this reason, its programs should be more strongly coordinated with regional needs than those at the larger campuses. Many individuals expressed reservations as to how well IPFW is addressing the needs of northeastern Indiana. Success stories about regional development invariably include a first rate institution of higher education, committed both to general education and to the specific research or training needs of the area. In the nation as a whole, fewer than one in five jobs is in manufacturing; in IPFW's general region, one in three jobs is in manufacturing. Clearly, programs in engineering and technology should be a feature of the campus, as well as other professional programs, such as business, education, and health care. The campus should prepare local citizens to take a productive role in the regional economy and it should also enable currently employed personnel to complete appropriate graduate degree programs. At the same time, IPFW should provide all students with a liberal-arts education, teaching them the intellectual skills, aesthetic awareness, and ethical standards that underlie personal fulfillment and civic responsibility.

These goals suggest that the model for IPFW should be a strong undergraduate college of arts and sciences flanked by a collection of professional schools. Professional and all graduate programs should reflect the specific needs of the area. Such an institution would be different from the state's large research universities at Bloomington and West Lafayette; it would clearly be more than a simple extension of selected research-university programs.

Treated as a local substitute for IUB or PUWL, IPFW will never escape the label "second rate." Treated as an institution with its own identity, it will come to be seen as a partner with IUB and PUWL in the state's system of higher education. Insofar as programs are concerned, the value of IPFW's relationships with Indiana University and Purdue University should be judged in terms of their contribution to this model.

### **Program Control**

Separate conditions and therefore different concerns apply to the control of undergraduate and graduate programs at IPFW.

#### *Undergraduate*

With the exception of true "system schools"—Public and Environmental Affairs, Labor Studies, the Medical School—undergraduate programs at IPFW are autonomous. While IPFW shares master course lists with other campuses in the IU and PU systems, its departmental degree requirements can vary considerably from those at IUB and PUWL, and similarities are often the result, not of an effort to achieve

uniformity within the system, but of the standards of accrediting agencies. Some individuals continue to think of IPFW as a feeder campus, from which students regularly transfer to IUB or PUWL to complete degree programs.<sup>2</sup> However, the number of students who do so is small and does not in itself provide a rationale for greater uniformity within the systems.

IPFW's undergraduate autonomy has enabled the campus to develop programs responsive to community needs and faculty strengths. On the other hand, the absence of communication between undergraduate programs within the IU and PU systems may discourage fruitful cross-fertilizations. New courses, course changes, and course deletions are announced within the systems, but not the rationales behind them; changes in curriculum are not announced.

### *Graduate*

Graduate programs are an exception to IPFW's curricular autonomy, but it is difficult to determine the effects of system affiliation in this area. Answering the Committee's questionnaire, the ratio of respondents who believe that the current relationship between IPFW and Bloomington and West Lafayette discourages graduate-program development to respondents who believe the relationship encourages development was nearly 6:1.<sup>3</sup> While it is evident that many faculty members blame IUB and PUWL for blocking the development of graduate programs at IPFW, the information is largely anecdotal and usually concerns individual administrators rather than official policy. There is, however, evidence that IUB and PUWL graduate governance bodies do not always grasp the regionally defined nature of IPFW's mission and that they evaluate its programs and course proposals with little knowledge of Fort Wayne, IPFW, or the concept of the urban university. They make decisions appropriate to their own campuses, and in many cases assume that difference from IUB or PUWL programs is a sign of academic inferiority.

This problem is illustrated by the minutes of the (PUWL) Graduate Committee of the Department of Mathematics during the period 1984-1985, when IPFW's M.S. in Applied Mathematics was under consideration. Repeated changes were suggested in the proposal, the stated rationale for which was a set of variations on the phrase "this is what we require at West Lafayette." There is no evidence from the minutes that local needs were ever a question—despite the fact that the program was prepared to meet the specific requirements of the Fort Wayne area. The result is a program that has not been particularly successful in attracting Fort Wayne students. The fate of IPFW's M.A. in the Humanities proposal was determined by similar conditions. The committee appointed by the (IU) Graduate School to review the proposal, largely composed of IUB faculty, objected to the program because it was not appropriate for the IUB campus. Eventually the proposal faded into limbo when the dean of the Graduate School refused to act on it.<sup>4</sup>

Other graduate programs, like the M.B.A. and the M.S. in Chemistry, were held up for an unreasonable length of time by the internal politics of the IU and PU systems (respectively). IPFW departments may lack the clout—or the insider status—that is required to shepherd new degree proposals through the intricacies of the IU and PU systems.

The relationship between the IPFW M.S. in Engineering and the PUWL Continuing Education M.S. in Engineering is a somewhat different problem. West Lafayette's televised program is in direct competition with IPFW's, thus undermining the development of the local program. Faculty complain that courses proposed for IPFW are turned down at the system level, only to reappear as Continuing Education courses.

The role of IPFW programs within the graduate schools of IU and Purdue has never been adequately studied. At the graduate level, the relationship between IPFW and the larger campuses has developed—when it has developed at all—in a haphazard, piecemeal manner. If decisions affecting IPFW's graduate programs are made by IUB or PUWL administrators or committees, it is important not only that IPFW have a voice in the decision-making process, but also that Bloomington and West Lafayette personnel possess accurate information about IPFW and its faculty. If IUB and PUWL offices continue to handle the administration of graduate programs, they should make a concerted effort to overcome the physical barrier between IPFW and the central campuses. If IPFW graduate programs are system programs, then IPFW faculty should be encouraged to participate in all aspects of graduate education. If this participation is unwelcome, then IPFW's graduate programs should be given autonomy.

### **Program Resources**

Increased awareness of the extent of IPFW's underfunding has encouraged some people to blame IUB and PUWL for the campus' financial plight. While this is a problem beyond the scope of the present report, several points should be raised:

- The argument that IPFW's relationship with IU and Purdue promotes the fiscal well-being of the campus is not borne out by current budget allocations. IPFW is not only funded significantly below the large research campuses at Bloomington and West Lafayette, it is also funded below the non-health components of IUPUI and comparable but smaller IU or Purdue campuses at Gary, Calumet, and South Bend. Within the IU and Purdue systems, only the smaller campuses in smaller metropolitan areas are funded at a level below IPFW. (See Appendix B.)
- Lower funds for salaries, equipment, etc. at IPFW tend to perpetuate the conception of the campus as a second-rate institution. Low starting salaries make it difficult to hire qualified faculty; inadequate research support undercuts faculty efforts to develop their own careers and with them the reputation of the

campus. Without the resources and graduate teaching opportunities of the research campuses, IPFW is at a disadvantage in recruiting faculty in many areas. It could be argued that starting salaries at IPFW should for this reason be higher than those at IUB and PUWL; in fact, they are considerably lower. (We will return to this problem in discussing IPFW faculty. It is important to note that it plays a role in the overall quality of IPFW's academic programs.)

- Given the growth of the campus and its relatively young faculty, IPFW does not have the resources from turnover and reallocation available at IUB and PUWL. As a result, budget allocations affect IPFW differently than IUB or PUWL. It is not clear that this difference has been taken into account.

In a number of instances, requests for funding or equipment from outside sources have been denied IPFW because the campus is treated as part of IU or Purdue. Despite the support of local IBM management, a request for support of a new IBM PS2 lab was rejected by the regional office, on the grounds that money had already been contributed to IU and to Purdue. Other local colleges can apply for regional grants from IBM with success, but IPFW cannot. In addition, a number of local companies—GTE, Magnavox, General Motors, Indiana Michigan Power—make substantial contributions to PUWL but little or none to IPFW. If corporations like IBM treat IPFW as an integral part of IU or Purdue, then IPFW requests for funding should be coordinated with those of the larger campuses.

Some departments report that while equipment received by PUWL through donations or grants is sometimes provided to Purdue-only campuses like Calumet, none has been made available to EET or Engineering because IPFW is treated as a joint IU-Purdue campus. On the other hand, at least one department reports that it receives equipment from PUWL that PUWL no longer needs. This issue may call for a review of PUWL's policy with regard to surplus or unneeded equipment.

## Faculty

IPFW faculty express a mix of experiences and opinions about the relationship with IUB and PUWL; however there is broad concern over two issues—salaries and governance.

### General Attitudes toward Affiliation with IUB and PUWL

Just over half of the respondents to the faculty survey indicated that IU or Purdue affiliation was very important or somewhat important in attracting them to IPFW. Slightly fewer indicated that this factor is important to them now or is likely to be so in the future. Only about one-fourth of the respondents indicated that the opportunity for interaction with IUB or PUWL faculty was very important or somewhat important in attracting them to IPFW, a source of present satisfaction, or future satisfaction. About half of the respondents indicated that this factor was somewhat

unimportant or very unimportant in attracting them to IPFW, as a source of present satisfaction, or of future satisfaction. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they never or seldom interacted with IUB or PUWL faculty.

In contrast to the indications that affiliation or interaction with IUB or PUWL would be of slightly less importance to faculty in the future, other factors were marked as areas that would increase in importance. These were being part of a developing department or program, teaching in the area of research specialization, quality of faculty, quality of student body, salary and fringe benefits, employment security, research support, quality of facilities, and the presence of graduate programs. In the context of this data, significance to faculty of the IU and Purdue affiliations would seem to be reduced. (In addition, it should be noted that because some respondents may have treated the affiliation questions as votes for or against campus independence, their responses to these questions may not be as reliable as their responses to others.)

### Faculty Salaries and Research Support

The inequity in faculty salaries at IPFW and IUB and PUWL has already been cited. The following statistics indicate 1988 salaries at the three campuses in thousands of dollars a year:

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor
PUWL	57.8	40.6	34.1	21.1
IUB	54.5	38.6	32.3	...
IPFW	42.5	34.0	27.3	19.3

Differences at the upper level of the salary scale are open to multiple explanations; differences at the lower end, however, can only reflect current disparities in funding among the three campuses. These differences have a profoundly negative effect on IPFW faculty morale and on the ability of IPFW to retain qualified faculty. Moreover, low starting salaries offered in recent years have made it increasingly difficult to fill vacant positions with qualified faculty.

The President of Purdue University recently explained that PUWL faculty are able to receive higher percentage salary increments because their salaries are supported by substantial outside funding.<sup>5</sup> Since such funding support is school specific, it would appear that there is no way to extend it beyond PUWL (or IUB). Were IPFW faculty given the same opportunities to compete for grants as faculty at the larger campuses, there would be little objection to this situation. However the heavier teaching load and, in most instances, lack of significant start-up money for IPFW researchers places them at a severe disadvantage. There is also a weak perception that the prestige of IUB and PUWL gives faculty at the larger campuses an additional advantage in securing grants. Whether this is true or not, it is indisputable that IPFW faculty are financially penalized

because they teach at Fort Wayne rather than at PUWL or IUB, and that this situation reflects actions taken—or not taken—by Purdue University, the agent responsible for the fiscal affairs of the campus.

On a more positive note, it should be observed that in recent years the local and system-wide procedures for notifying IPFW faculty of grant opportunities have improved considerably. However, the need to pass through approval levels at PUWL in addition to those at IPFW requires a longer lead time for IPFW proposals.

Just as the notion of being part of a system exacerbates the problem of salary discrepancies, it also encourages other comparisons that tend to undermine faculty morale. Eighty-seven percent of faculty respondents believe that IUB or PUWL faculty perceive IPFW faculty as inferior to them as researchers.<sup>6</sup> While only 25% of IPFW faculty believed themselves inferior to IUB or PUWL faculty as researchers, this percentage is still disquieting—especially when one considers that respondents could have chosen the category “different from Bloomington or West Lafayette colleagues.” (In contrast, 85% of IPFW faculty consider themselves equal to or better than the PUWL or IUB faculty as teachers; this is clearly an area in which local faculty think more highly of themselves.)

### Faculty Governance

The structure of faculty governance at IPFW reflects the evolutionary processes by which departments have been introduced to Fort Wayne, the ways in which the academic programs of those departments overlap and interact, and local efforts to conform to governance structures of the two university systems.

Most undergraduate academic programs are housed in autonomous units, which have wide freedoms in the development of course content and degree requirements. These units form the core of faculty governance at Fort Wayne: they have, through the Senate, the right of review of each others' undergraduate programs.

Some academic programs (“system” programs) are restricted by ties to other campuses. Currently, all but one of these programs is represented in the Senate; however, the Senate's right to review them has yet to be tested, so there remain some questions about their role in IPFW governance.

The system-wide governance structures of the two universities are similar but different. In both, ultimate authority rests with a board of trustees. In the Indiana University system the University Faculty Council determines academic policies in keeping with the provisions of a constitution approved by the IU Board of Trustees. At present, the parallel Purdue body—the PU Intercampus Faculty Council—lacks decision-making authority; however a body with powers comparable to the IU Faculty Council is currently under consideration. In both instances, IPFW representation is or will be determined on the basis of IU

or PU faculty, rather than the IPFW faculty as a whole. In the PU system, with its small number of regional campus faculty, the proposed council will be virtually a PUWL institution. IPFW policies must conform to policies established by both of these system governing bodies, in neither is or will their voice be proportional to actual size of the IPFW faculty.

The effect of conforming to two sets of university regulations has usually meant that IPFW has been forced to adopt the lowest common denominator. A privilege granted in one system but denied at another usually ends up denied at IPFW; in particular, the PU system has seemed willing to submit to IU restrictions, but unwilling to extend IU freedoms. The long ordeal through which a set of uniform IPFW academic regulations was developed reflects this process.

The powers and responsibilities of the Fort Wayne Faculty are enumerated in the Constitution of the Faculty. Historically, the adoption and amendment of such documents at Purdue University have involved approval by the Purdue Board of Trustees; the Indiana University Board has not been involved, an approval from the President being considered sufficient.

Were these approvals to be mere formalities, this situation would raise no difficulties. However, actions (or inaction) by the Purdue Board has precipitated a number of problems. These involve the following:

1. The Board's not taking up (indeed, perhaps not considering) Fort Wayne Constitutional matters until several months after they are submitted to PUWL. (It is not certain that the President's Office, through which these documents are channelled, expeditiously transmits these proposals to the Board.)
2. The Board's not communicating effectively with the IPFW faculty.
  - a. The Board's amending Fort Wayne Constitutional documents without inviting representatives of the Fort Wayne Senate to address the issues before the Board acts. (It is not certain that the President's Office does not initiate these amendments.)
  - b. The Board's failing to explicitly inform the Fort Wayne faculty that such amendments have been initiated. Since the adoption and amendment procedures explicitly require documents to be approved by the Fort Wayne Senate, the Fort Wayne Faculty, and the Board, then the amendment of the document after its approval by the former agencies raises questions about its status, absent subsequent concurring amendment by the Senate and Faculty.

These conditions would be cause for grave concern if they were found to exist on any campus of any “normal” university. As they apply to IPFW, the cause for concern is heightened: Indiana University faculty subject to these



Purdue University system actions may perceive them as insensitive, arbitrary, and capricious. Usually, however, the effect of IPFW's peculiar governance is confusion rather than anger. As the recent attempt to alter IPFW's calendar indicates, significant decision-making is often replaced by debates over what may or may not be a campus right.

IPFW's rights as an institution should not rest on the goodwill of individual university administrators. They should be defined by the two Boards of Trustees and by the governance bodies that determine system regulations. When questions arise, IPFW should have prompt access to the governing bodies that define the rules and procedures under which the campus operates.

## Students

Subcommittee S administered a questionnaire to 272 students. The respondents reflected IPFW's general population in the ratio of men to women; however, they differed from the general population in several respects that may have affected the results of the survey: 26% of the respondents were married (vs. 39% of the population); 68% were Indiana University students (vs. 51% of the population); 67% had graduated from high school within the past 5 years (vs. an average student age for the campus of 27).

### Reasons for Attending IPFW

The low cost of education and the location were most often mentioned as reasons for attending IPFW; however, these two reasons were closely followed by affiliation with Indiana and Purdue universities. When asked if they would have attended IPFW if the campus were not affiliated with Indiana or Purdue University, slightly more than half (52%) said they would have chosen IPFW. (One suspects that the relatively greater mobility of the respondents may have skewed this answer. One also suspects that in many cases it may reflect wishful thinking.)

### Utilization of System Services

A substantial number of the respondents (29%) take advantage of services on other campuses, such as the library and computers. The frequency or depth of this utilization was unspecified, and most respondents reported little knowledge of facilities at the larger campuses. For this reason, views of the intercampus relationships are largely based on anecdotes reflecting isolated experiences. During the Committee's deliberations, for example, a faculty member reported the case of an IPFW student who attempted to use the PUWL placement service and was rebuffed, with the explanation that it was a service designed for PUWL students only. Because IPFW students seldom make such requests, it is difficult to determine the extent to which other services at the large campuses would be denied them.

## Comparison of Programs

A small number of students (31) were asked to compare IPFW faculty and programs with those at IUB and PUWL. This group tended to believe IPFW comparable to IUB and PUWL, although a substantial number reported no knowledge on which to make the comparisons. Only in respect to campus facilities was there a strong perception that IPFW was inferior or very inferior to IUB and PUWL.

Of the 175 respondents who felt they had knowledge on which to base their judgment, half (87) indicated that local employers evaluate IPFW degrees less favorably than IUB or PUWL degrees. A slightly smaller number indicated that local employers treated the degrees equally, while a small number (11) indicated that local employers treated IPFW degrees as superior to those given at the larger campuses. Of the 116 students who ventured an opinion on the subject, a large majority (85) indicated that graduate or professional-school admissions officers distinguish between degrees granted at IPFW and degrees granted at IUB or PUWL. (It was not clear whether this operates to the favor or disadvantage of IPFW students.)

Generally, a significant number of students (in most instances, 1/3 to 1/2 of the respondents) expressed uncertainty or ignorance of the effects of the system relationships on IPFW, and there is little evidence that student opinion is based on much more than hearsay and speculation. While more than half of those responding to the question (127 out of 242) indicated that they would still attend IPFW if it were unaffiliated with Indiana or Purdue University, a strong majority (191 out of 248) were not in favor of independence for IPFW. However, without an explanatory context, the significance of the question, and therefore the answers to it, remains unclear.

## Community

Subcommittee C surveyed various groups familiar with the university, including alumni, parents of students, members of all IPFW advisory groups, and area employers. Approximately 400 questionnaires were distributed to names randomly selected from university mailing lists; 131 usable responses were received. Of the respondents, 72% had 5 or more years of familiarity and 92% had at least some direct experience with the university.

### General Perceptions

Overall evaluations of IPFW teaching quality were good, but not outstanding. The respondents clearly felt that while undergraduate programming was adequate, graduate-level programs were not. Undergraduate programming received a good rating; graduate programs, a slightly negative rating. This does not indicate that graduate degrees currently offered are inadequate, but rather that the respondents felt that not enough graduate programming is being offered at IPFW. Respondents felt strongly that Continuing Education programs were adequate in the area of personal development,



but much less strongly that programs were adequate in business- and industry-oriented areas and in development of professional and technical skills.

Perceptions of the knowledge, skill, and employability of IPFW graduates were good. On the other hand, respondents gave a weak positive evaluation of IPFW faculty contributions to community business and industry and to area civic and professional organizations. Purdue policies, that require advance permission for faculty to hold office in nonprofit organizations, may have discouraged some faculty from taking an active role in the community. It would appear that faculty who are involved with the community are not highly visible. Unlike many private corporations, IPFW may not adequately award faculty for community service.

### **System Affiliations**

General perceptions of IPFW's continued affiliation with IUB and PUWL were strongly positive, with predominantly negative responses to the notion of campus independence. Respondents believed that the institution would be negatively affected by disaffiliation and indicated that they did not believe that resources and programs would be more responsive to local needs if IPFW were independent.

On the other hand, most respondents would prefer to contribute directly to IPFW rather than to or through the parent institutions. That many alumni stressed this distinction suggests that IPFW alumni activities—in particular, fund raising—are not adequately differentiated from those of the two university systems. With respect to alumni, differences between the needs of IPFW and those of PUWL are not always recognized. PUWL policies, based on West Lafayette circumstances, have made it difficult for IPFW to encourage alumni to use its athletic facilities. This may seem a small matter, but for a campus engaged in building a sense of alumni esprit—the spirit that has long existed among PUWL and IUB alumni—small matters may be consequential.

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Two factors seriously qualify the information gathered in this report: the biases of the persons providing data or opinions and the general ambiguity of many of the questions put to them. Open forums and invitations to provide the ad hoc committee with information tended to attract persons with strong opinions for or against the status quo. Undefined terms in questionnaires resulted in responses that are difficult to evaluate. The questions about "independence" illustrate both points. Any change in the affiliation of the IPFW would require a legislative act entailing fiscal appropriations and prescriptions for interaction with other state university campuses. Without specifying these factors, the question "Should IPFW sever its links with PUWL and IUB?" means different things to different persons. Those with a bias toward independence will imagine it in the best

terms possible; those against independence will imagine it in the worst.

For this reason, any serious rethinking of IPFW's relationships to Indiana University and Purdue University should propose a range of models for the future, and ask faculty, students, administrators, staff, and other members of the community to weigh their relative advantages and disadvantages. Too often long-range planning at IPFW has been little more than composing wishlists of new programs and new facilities, rather than defining a set of qualitative goals.

In addition, an unbiased third party might be able to evaluate aspects of IPFW's current relationships with IUB and PUWL more objectively than persons affiliated either with IPFW or with the two university systems. (Even representatives from the community, who might be expected to judge the campus without bias, may be influenced by their experience as alumni of or parents of students enrolled at IUB or PUWL.) The Coopers & Lybrand Phase I report to Fort Wayne Future and the resultant Fort Wayne Future study of IPFW ("A Challenge for Excellence") address these issues broadly; it would be useful to have a similar study of the effects of the relationships with IUB and PUWL on the day-to-day workings of IPFW, particularly in regard to the finances of the campus.

While constituents of the university differ in their judgment of the status quo and even faculty, the only group which has shown an inclination for radical change, remain divided in their view of independence, there is agreement that IPFW should work toward increased autonomy within the two university systems. Desirable changes might include:

- Increased local responsibility for fiscal and academic record-keeping and reporting
- Increased local responsibility for academic and fiscal planning and decision-making
- Clarified faculty prerogatives and governance responsibilities
- Faculty representation to the Boards of Trustees of Indiana University and Purdue University
- Academic autonomy of graduate programs or increased participation of IPFW faculty in graduate programs at PUWL and IUB
- Stronger differentiation of IPFW alumni from Indiana University and Purdue University alumni, particularly in regard to development activities
- Stronger differentiation of IPFW from IUB and PUWL to allow IPFW to be treated as an independent entity for grants and other funding activities
- A defined role for IPFW in interacting with regional and other state legislators
- A method of statistical reporting by Indiana University and Purdue University that gives an accurate portrait of the campus

- Increased communication among all campuses of Indiana University and Purdue University with regard to curricular and program development
- Massive effort to bring IPFW salaries and research support up to the level of IUB and PUWL salaries and research support.
- Increased visibility of IPFW faculty in the cultural, business, and political life of northeastern Indiana
- A program regularly reviewing the relationships between IPFW and Indiana University and Purdue University.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Membership in these subcommittees is listed in Appendix A.
- <sup>2</sup> This view may be encouraged by IPFW's habit of listing "Transfer Programs" in its bulletin. In effect,

these "programs" simply list general education courses and prerequisites for programs that can be completed elsewhere.

- <sup>3</sup> In contrast, the ratio of those who believe the current relationship discourages development of undergraduate programs to those who believe it encourages them was 2:1.
- <sup>4</sup> It should be noted that a comparable program, the Master of Liberal Studies, has now been approved by the Graduate Council—but only against strong opposition.
- <sup>5</sup> At a 4 October 1988 meeting with IPFW faculty.
- <sup>6</sup> This figure does not seem to be altered by years of experience. Eighty-eight percent of the faculty who have been at IPFW more than 10 years and eighty-nine percent of the faculty who have been at IPFW more than 5 years had the same perception of IUB or PUWL attitudes.

## Appendix A. Subcommittee Membership

**Subcommittee C:** Robert Barrett, Arthur Friedel, Margaret Hile, Jeff Pieper (student), Ann Rudig, David Swinehart (chair), Kathy Trier

**Subcommittee F:** Jeanette Clausen, Barbara Hill (chair), Solomon Isiorho, Bangalore Lingaraj, David McCants, David Onwood, Allen Pugh, Sushil Usman

**Subcommittee M:** Kenneth Balthaser (chair), Dianne Bezdon, Robert Bishop (student), Gregory Clements, Constance Edwards, Richard Hill, Steven Hollander, Daniel Matthews, Susan Skekloff

**Subcommittee P:** Harold Broberg, Mark Crouch, Norman Greenberg, Elvis Holt, Frederick Kirchhoff, Joanne Lantz (chair), Josue Njock-Libii, Kris Maly (student), David Oberstar, Shirley Rickert, Marthe Rosenfeld

**Subcommittee S:** Marian Adair (chair), James Cawthon, Margit Codispeti, Jack Dahl, Mark Franke, Carol Hildebrand (student), Betty Ogles-Grubb, Deborah Pope, Richard Ramsey, Wayne Unsell, Terri Worman

## Appendix B. State Appropriations Received and FTE Students Served By Publicly Supported Institutions in Indiana, 1986-87

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Total Appropriation*</u>	<u>% of State Appropriation</u>	<u>% of FTE Students</u>	<u>Total FTE Students</u>	<u>Appropriation Per FTE Student</u>
Purdue U—Lafayette	\$ 124,575,779	21.4	21.6	30,960	\$4,024
Indiana U—Bloomington	116,387,502	20.0	19.5	27,981	4,160
Indiana U—Indianapolis					
Health	49,383,480				
Nonhealth	40,692,101	15.5	9.8	14,110	6,384
Ball State U	74,111,848	12.7	10.9	15,674	4,728
Indiana State U	51,165,383	8.8	6.4	9,203	5,560
Indiana Voc-Tech College	39,004,678	6.7	10.6	15,258	2,556
<b>IPFW</b>	<b>16,209,894</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>5,591</b>	<b>2,899</b>
Vincennes U	15,439,141	2.7	3.9	5,658	2,729
Purdue U—Calumet	13,526,117	2.3	2.9	4,175	3,240
Indiana U—Northwest	9,295,577	1.6	1.8	2,646	3,513
Indiana U—South Bend	8,355,878	1.4	2.0	2,809	2,975
U of Southern Indiana	7,878,379	1.4	2.1	3,028	2,602
Indiana U—Southeast	5,995,314	1.0	1.9	2,731	2,195
Purdue U—North Central	3,866,341	0.7	1.0	1,395	2,772
Indiana U—Kokomo	3,735,918	0.6	1.0	1,374	2,719
Indiana U—East	1,705,926	0.3	0.5	682	2,501
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 581,329,256</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>143,275</b>	<b>\$4,057 (avg)</b>

\*Excludes Fee Replacement, Line Items, Knox County Match, etc.

Source: Appropriation figures provided by Purdue University Office of Fiscal Planning; FTE student figures derived from the *Report of Enrollment in Indiana Colleges and Universities* prepared for the Indiana Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Office of the Registrar, Purdue University.