

TO: The Fort Wayne Senate
FROM: The Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee
DATE: February 23, 1983
SUBJECT: Subcommittee Report on Continuing Education
DISPOSITION: For information only

The following report addresses important questions facing the Continuing Education (CE) program at IPFW, and results from extensive discussions within the Subcommittee and consultation with Drs. Nicholson and Bickley.

1. Should CE be held accountable for payments to the general fund? Should the primary role of CE be to contribute to the general fund or to perform public service?

The primary role of CE should be public service.

Our understanding is that CE costs are divided into direct and indirect components.

Direct costs include such items as instructor salaries, salaries for full-time CE employees, and costs associated with individual CE programs (classroom materials, supplies and expenses, advertising, etc.). At present the expectation is that these direct costs will be reimbursed from CE income, resulting in programs which are, individually, generally self-supporting. (Income exceeding direct costs from noncredit offerings is used to provide incentive monies for departmental sponsorship of CE offerings, to build a CE reserve fund, and to make an annual contribution of \$10,000 to the general fund. Income exceeding direct costs from credit offerings is placed in the general fund; these amounts have been negligible in the recent past.)

Indirect costs are paid from the general fund and include such items as utilities and administrative support (from the business office, administrators, the LRC and UR, and janitorial, security, and maintenance workers, etc.). The \$10,000 contribution from the CE reserve does not cover indirect costs, and an additional \$40,000 of general-fund monies must annually go to CE, as these indirect costs probably exceed \$50,000 annually.

2. What is the current financial status of CE?

The current financial condition of continuing education is not very good. Figures available, some of which are estimated rather than actual due to past accounting practices, show that 1978-79 was the last year that income from noncredit courses met all direct costs. For noncredit courses, project costs have risen much faster than net income. In the last two years this has been a consequence of rising cancellation rates, lower average class size, and attempts to market the courses more extensively. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) has noted that IPFW experience in this regard reflects national trends.

Although the Subcommittee was not provided with closing balances for the CE reserve fund for the past three years, it seems that declines in the fund balance of up to \$30,000 have occurred in each of the last three years, and that a deficit is likely for the current year.

Additional steps have been taken to ensure fiscal prudence while at the same time maintaining a viable CE operation that is prepared to meet what appears to be the beginning of an upturn in demand. Identified steps are restrictions on out-of-the-region travel, more control of long-distance telephone calls, and careful supervision of project budgets. The VCAA has taken and is taking an active personal interest in CE, devoting some 15% of his time to that operation.

The Subcommittee has examined CE policies and concludes that they stress the self-support of individual projects' direct costs.

The Subcommittee finds that some of the reasons for the draw on CE reserves may be various management concerns such as market conditions, personnel, and problems with policies and procedures. The impact of any one of these concerns, or of all of them together, is difficult to estimate.

The Subcommittee finds that longitudinal or current information on the numbers of CE courses offered, the numbers of students taking CE courses, and other such substantive information is unavailable.

3. When considering offerings, how is the sponsoring department determined, and how are conflicts resolved?

The VCAA notes that in the past two and one-half years, only four disputes over sponsorship have arisen, and that three of these were resolved without appeal to the Subcommittee. He has recommended that the parties in the fourth instance seek the Subcommittee's recommendation to him for a settlement.

The Executive Director of Community Outreach has agreed to submit a draft policy on sponsorship determination to the Subcommittee for its consideration.

Subcommittee attention to sponsorship should be limited to:

- (a) cases in which the sponsorship of an academic department has not, as required, been secured; and
 - (b) cases in which a dispute over sponsorship arises between two or more departments (in which cases the Subcommittee's role will be to make a recommendation to the VCAA).
4. What authority and responsibility has the Executive Director of CE?

Broad-based and specific duties are held by the Executive Director, as is reflective of duties inherent in any university administrative office. With community outreach as a primary emphasis, this officer must accurately assess regional CE needs and translate them into an effective and efficient set of CE offerings. CE policies give the Executive Director authority and responsibility adequate to carry out an effective CE mission.

5. What authority and involvement are exercised by the Continuing Education Advisory Subcommittee?

The Bylaws mandate that the Subcommittee:

- (a) chart the general direction of CE at the university (5.3.3.3.3.1);
- (b) ensure that the university offers CE programs which fall within its broad mission areas as defined by the boards of trustees and the Commission for Higher Education (5.3.3.3.3.2);
- (c) ensure that each CE program is sponsored by the appropriate academic department (5.3.3.3.3.3.); and
- (d) assess the effectiveness with which the CE program fulfills its objectives (5.3.3.3.3.4).

The changing nature of CE programs necessitates daily authority and involvement by university administration. Subcommittee authority and involvement, presently small, should be increased at the advisory level. Subcommittee actions should, within the boundaries set by its charge, be proactive rather than reactive. The VCAA has supplied the Subcommittee with a list illustrating the types of issues the Subcommittee might address.

Approving

K. Balthaser
S. Hollander
P. Jonas
L. Madden, chair
M. Miller

Absent

D. Burrows
J. Huberman