

Minutes of the
Special Meeting of the Thirty-Sixth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
October 3, 2016
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
3. Special business of the day
4. Adjournment*

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

Presiding Officer: J. Malanson
Parliamentarian: M. Coussement
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen
Secretary: J. Petersen (for Sarah Mettert)

Senate Members Present:

T. Adkins, A. Bales, A. Argast, S. Beckman, V. Carwein, C. Chen, D. Chen, B. Dattilo,
Y. Deng, A. DeVenanzi, S. Ding, A. Dircksen, Q. Dixie, A. Downs, C. Drummond, B. Fife,
J. Hersberger, R. Hile, D. Kaiser, S. LaVere, E. Link, H. Luo, M. Masters, G. McClellan,
D. Miller, Z. Nazarov, J. Niser, J. Nowak, A. Obergfell, W. Peters, G. Petruska, K. Pollock,
M. Qasim, N. Reimer, S. Rumsey, G. Schmidt, A. Schwab, R. Sutter, A. Ushenko,
B. Valliere, R. Vandell, L. Vartanian, N. Virtue, G. Wang, D. Wesse, M. Wolf,
L. Wright-Bower

Senate Members Absent:

P. Bingi, S. Carr, Q. Hao, G. Hickey, M. Jordan, J. Leatherman (sabbatical), B. Redman,
M. Zoghi

Faculty Members Present: S. Batagiannis, S. Betz, J. Burg, H. Di, C. Elsby, K. Fineran, M. Fritz,
J. Hrehov, P. Iadicola, J. Khamalah, J. Kim, B. Kingsbury, L. Link, N. Mann, A. Marshall,
J. Mattmuller, J. Papiernik, P. Reese, H. Samavati, C. Stumph, R. Weiner

Visitors Present: S. Anderson, J. Bauman, S. Byers, S. Miracle, M. Tulley

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Malanson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. Acceptance of the agenda:

K. Pollock moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

3. Special business of the day:

J. Malanson: By way of introducing the special business of the day, a group of us just got back from a conference on shared governance in Washington, DC (2016 AAUP Shared Governance Conference and Workshops), so you will be hearing a lot more about shared governance in the coming weeks and months; hopefully some initiatives to try to improve shared governance on this campus. I think today's special Senate meeting is an example of an effort at shared governance, a process that is being overseen by the administration but is now being given significant faculty input in how it is going to move forward. I think it is a good thing. I am going to turn things over to Vice Chancellor Drummond in just a minute.

I will remind everyone on the Senate who has speaking privileges that our goal for today is not to use this as an opportunity to advocate for a particular outcome for any particular program or department. Instead, we will find this to be a much better use of our time if we engage in serious conversation of how the process has gotten to this point and how the process should continue from this point. I hope, in his opening remarks, Vice Chancellor Drummond might address how he expects the process to play out from here, what the lines of communication might be, how involved he expects to be in the conversations with individual departments moving forward, etc. as we move toward November 15.

C. Drummond: Thank you all. In terms of process, in my mind the most important and most direct line of response to this set of recommendations is through the structure of the academic organization: the faculty, the chairs, the deans, and then to me. I find that to be the most useful because it comes from the departments and programs that are listed in this document.

The role of the senate as the representative body of the faculty is important and cannot be ignored. But, I think that, as Jeff has said, the opportunity here is to talk about the larger structural issues that are being addressed rather than the details of particular programs or a specific recommendation. Of course, if it is the will of this body to go in that direction, I will go with you, but I think that the work of this group is better spent on those larger issues and specific responses from the units through the academic organization. In terms of timeline, what we have is an expectation that responses will be received by November 15, and that a final set of decisions – final in the sense of this round of conversations – will be made in early December.

Now from there, where do we go? There are a couple of things in play. One, which impacts both our capacity to deliver academic programs and our organizational structure, is the currently ongoing early retirement process. So, one of the things that we have to factor into this is what impacts that process has on the recommendations that are contained herein, and what aspects of position filling will or will not likely take place in response to personnel changes from the process. That is an added layer that is not accounted for in the recommendations as they are written right now. It may be that we find that we are afforded opportunities that are not discussed in my document, and we may find that there are things that are discussed in the document which

are then not practical given the outcomes of the retirements. At any rate, we will have to see how that plays out.

It is a goal of the university to achieve, through the early retirement process and through some application of this process, financial savings in this fiscal year. How much we achieve is dependent on how many people retire and in what positions, and what changes to the academic organizational structure can, in fact, be achieved during this academic year. It is hard to change an academic organizational structure in the middle of an academic year; but, if there are changes that we can make that result in savings that would accrue this fiscal year, then we need to do that. If there are things that we can only get accomplished by July 1, then those are savings that will be present in the next fiscal year. I think that there is no way in which we can make changes to the academic programs in the middle of this academic year. There may be things that we can get planned and begin to implement with the start of the next academic year. There are, in fact, some changes to academic programming that have been put in place already for this academic year that are included in this document. We have taken some steps, and there is much more to do. Those are the two primary goals.

J. Malanson: I will remind everyone that only senators and people with speaking privileges, who I believe are the five rows in the front here, will be allowed to ask questions and contribute to the conversations. We are going to abide by the rule we normally follow of everyone getting to speak once or ask questions once before someone gets to speak twice. Since this is our first meeting, and there are many new faces here, I will just ask everyone who is speaking to quickly introduce yourself by your name and department.

A. Argast: How many people do you expect will be laid off come January in the clerical and service staff?

C. Drummond: I do not know. It is probably somewhere between zero and some relatively small number. It will probably be a relatively small number depending upon if we make organizational changes that would be reflected in a loss of need of that support. I do not know until we decide what we are going to do; it is impossible to say.

L. Vartanian: Understanding that it is difficult to anticipate the savings moving forward, have you considered looking back to see what the savings would have been with this structure in place, say for the last few years?

C. Drummond: No. I have not done it in terms of a calculation. If you implement the recommendations fully as described, no, I have not done that.

L. Vartanian: Do you have any sense of what range it might be?

C. Drummond: One of the challenges that you have in trying to estimate the savings is that there are two things: 1) there is administrative overhead, so there would be some reduction in staff, some reduction in chair positions, director-type positions, so we could calculate what the direct cost savings are for the clerical and support staff. When you transition a faculty member from a 12-month appointment to a 9-month appointment, there is some savings there that is calculable. 2) Then there is potentially some increased production of credit hours as the administrative FTE release is reduced. How that is translated into savings is a complicated issue. Does an effectively

.25 reduction in administrative burden result in the savings of two limited-term lecturers over the course of the academic year? Can it be compounded in some way? As you go deeper into it, it becomes increasingly complex to figure out how to do that.

In terms of the academic program savings, one of the things that I have been in conversation with the departments that I have suggested reduce their range of offerings, is how much duplication of curricula exists in those multiple-degree programs or majors versus how much curricular independence and what savings could be achieved by redirecting faculty effort away from low-enrolled programs or majors into the more popular ones, reducing the number of small, upper-division sections. Again, how that calculates into direct savings is a challenge. Reasonable numbers would be in the order of (depending upon the fidelity of the transfer credit-hour production) several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

A. Dirksen: Could we get an update on the number of people that are opting for the early retirement, the savings on that?

D. Wesse: Hello, everyone. Welcome back. It is a little bit wrong to project how many individuals right now, but so far we have 31 individuals who indicated that they will be taking the early retirement incentive. Obviously, they have until the end of the month, so that will change significantly. There is no particular incentive to sign up early, so we anticipate that will change. We have projected around 55, so that is the range we are looking at right now. There are 31 as of Friday. That is combined faculty and staff, not just faculty.

A. Livschiz: I wanted to follow up on Senator Vartanian's question to Vice Chancellor Drummond just to get clarification. I will preface it by saying that I am not an economist or accountant, and I am not on any of the budgetary committees; so, as a result, I do not feel that I have a very clear understanding of how the process works.

For somebody just looking on, the situation really does not make sense because we have, on the one hand, the desire to start implementing the goals, even though it is hard to do things in a year. We are going to be careful not to disrupt programs; if there is money to be saved, we need to do this immediately. What is strange to me is that we do not actually know how much money is going to be saved, and it does not seem to be a priority to find out how much money is actually going to be saved because, as I was listening to the description, it sounds like some chairs will no longer be chairs and are going to start teaching more classes. Given the fact that the schedule for the next semester has already been posted, it would be unlikely that brand-new sections would just spontaneously be added, so presumably that means that some limited-term lecturers are going to get fired at the last minute so that chairs can teach those sections. This, then, would result not in savings, but would be much more expensive than it would be to have a limited-term lecturer. It just seems that, in light of the destruction and how bad for morale this is, how bad for continuity in programs, how bad for student services, and without a clear indication of how much money is actually going to be saved, why is there such a rush to do so unless the goal is just to check a box and for somebody to be able to brag that he implemented savings without actually caring how much was saved and how much potential damage could come from these alleged savings?

C. Drummond: Is there a question there?

A. Livschiz: Yes. Why isn't the priority finding out how much savings there is going to be before we rush into making these decisions, whether midyear or at the start of next year?

C. Drummond: That is part of the process that we are following. What I can tell you is that, over the last several budget cycles, I have had responsibility in the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs budget has stayed static at \$41.5 million. We have been able to reallocate resources from central services and other kinds of central administrative functions into the departments to cover the increase in costs associated with those several years of inflation. That, I think, has been a positive thing, but we have not seen a reduction in the Office of Academic Affairs budget over those budget cycles. They have been held constant.

While revenue continues to drop, and other units on campus have had to scale back their operations significantly, so, unfortunately, we have gotten to the place, if you will, where some savings need to be achieved. Everything we can do is of benefit. The way in which we go about it is important, and I would say that the way in which we have done it is not ideal because it was not anticipated that we would have as large a revenue shortfall this academic year as we have. For that reason, primarily, we are seeing a change in our approach to this to include potential savings in this fiscal year. That is why we implemented the early retirement process as well.

N. Virtue: I realize that you, when you went through to make these recommendations, did a sweep of all of the departments and academic units on campus; but some of the recommendations that you made actually do not result in any savings at all. I am wondering why the departments that are involved in the recommendations that do not involve savings are seen on the timeline, particularly since some of the recommendations will be turned on their head depending on the Legislative Services Agency decision. It will result in a lot of work that might be moot at the end of the LSA process.

C. Drummond: Let me deconstruct that question. 1) Not all the recommendations are on the same timeline, and that is important. So there are, maybe, some small sets of things that may be a little bit larger than a small set of things that can be accomplished yet this fiscal year. There are other things that cannot get completed until we begin the next fiscal year or next academic year. There are some things that, frankly, will probably take multiple years to fully implement. So, there is no one single timeline. Every recommendation will have to be judged on how practical it is and what the appropriate timeline is for that and associated recommendations. That is the first part.

2) I think I did, to the best of my ability, address the fact that that is a major issue for a number of programs, and those programs are subject to reorganization through a changing governance. I tried to address that in the document; but, until we know what that is, it will be hard to adjust. What I did in working through this was start with the working assumption that we continue to be what we are now, then this is what we would do. If there is significant change in the academic programs and academic/administrative units that are part of whatever we would be called after a change in governance, then we may need to rethink the overall organizational structure of the academic enterprise, but really at the beginning of the college level. So, rather than get to a bunch of "what ifs" I thought that it was important to build a set of recommendations that were at the lowest level, the program level, and at the academic department level. Then, if there is a change in governance and a restructure is

necessary for the remaining university, we can start with this work and place it in the context of a larger academic reorganization.

R. Hile: I have one request. I reread the recommendations this morning, and I think we should use the word "management" when we are talking about our relationship with Purdue. It is a management agreement, not a governance agreement. What we are doing in this room is governance. It is coupled with a concern that the more we talk about Purdue University and Indiana University governing us, the more we lose track of the ideal of academic governance at the university.

C. Drummond: That point is well taken.

R. Hile: When we talk about this I know it is very clear that this is all very preliminary when talking about the cuts. I think we should nail down what we are going to be asking of people who are currently chairs who will not be chairs in the future. If some chairs are being asked to become subsidiary to another department/ program, and then have no course release and do the exact same job they are doing right now for free, we might save money. I know the chairs are very nice people, but I do not know if anyone is *that* nice. How can we save money? How can we make that happen?

C. Drummond: If all we do is change the title and expect the same amount of work and pay, and take a person who is in a chair position and give him some kind of title of director of "whatever" as a sub-chair, that is something we have not done. The organizational change recommendations need to be responded to by the academic organizations so that the current department chairs and the deans can respond in ways in which they can see us achieving any financial savings this academic year. So that is what I am waiting to hear from the departments and the deans.

A. Ushenko: I am just a little bit confused about this. I thought only full-timers, rather than chairs or regular faculty members, have a fixed salary. Therefore, if, instead of having two chairs, you decide to just have one, and the other chair then takes the full load of courses, relieving the position of an outside contractor, I am going to assume you would not be spending any more money since the ex-chairs are already being paid, and the outside contractors' fees, however miserable, would not be paid, so at least we would be saving that money. Am I confused?

C. Drummond. No, but I think that is a not complete description of the situation. If you want to understand our policies about the way in which chairs are compensated, that is codified in the Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum on the emoluments of chairs (OAA Memo 98-1) that was first drafted by Fenwick English who was VCAA long ago. Within that document there is a description of how, depending on the scale and scope of duties associated with that academic department, chairs are compensated through some combination of course releases and durations of appointment. So the potential savings come both in the form of the reduction from a 12- to a 9-month contract, but also in a reduction in the administrative assignment.

A. Ushenko: Thank you.

D. Kaiser: This kind of follows up with what Senator Virtue was asking. She was asking what is in the immediate future. This is more of a statement than a question, but it makes it tough because we do not really know what is going to be done. We have until the end of October to provide a response about these plans, but it is hard to provide a response to something that we do not really understand: what is going to happen in the near future? This is kind of a broader issue, in my own opinion, where we are supposed to be allowed to provide our input because, of course, our input is valued, but it is not valued enough to really give us time to understand what exactly is going on and how to respond to that. My question is, "How do we respond to something that we do not really understand?"

C. Drummond: Do you mean the Management Agreement?

D. Kaiser: It is the immediate things that are going to happen. What is going to happen by January 1?

C. Drummond: Some set of the recommendations in this document, plus any other good ideas that come forward, either through the faculty senate or through the administrative channels of the university.

D. Kaiser: It is just somewhat ambiguous.

C. Drummond: There are 12,000 words of specificity here, so I am not sure what else you are looking for.

A. Downs: I know that the faculty leadership received some items, and I know that other items have gone straight to Action Plan 41. What is the plan for either sharing those, considering those, and dealing with those? You said some of the things are in this plan; some of the things are good ideas that have been, or are being, submitted by departments. Where do those fall in the November 15 deadline and consideration by the early December finalization?

C. Drummond: I believe the suggestions for response to Action Plan 41 ended last Friday. That does not mean that we would ignore anything that comes forward, particularly about this issue for which I have set a different deadline. The responses to the Action Plan 41 have been digested in a series of aggregated documents by Vice Chancellor McClellan, and we have not had a conversation about if we would share those broadly or respond to them. There have been a couple of responses that have dealt with administrative organization and one was at least as complicated and altering to the academic organizational structure as what I have proposed here. So we do not have a specific plan right now on how to release a summary of those recommendations, but they will be considered.

A. Downs: It seems to me that some departments may change what they submit to you if they know what suggestions were submitted to you. I do think that it is important that those ideas that have been submitted are sent out to the rest of us.

C. Drummond: If a department, through its dean, responds to this document and another idea that is valid and useful has come in that they don't know about...

A. Downs: Right.

C. Drummond: I think that is a good point.

J. Badia: I want to ask Vice Chancellor Drummond for a clarification on the budget question. You said there has been no reduction in the \$41.5 million Office of Academic Affairs budget?

C. Drummond: Not during the last two budget cycles.

J. Badia: So, when we had the sweeps of all the tenure-track/tenured positions about four or five years ago...?

C. Drummond: That would have been the year Steve Sarratore was interim VCAA.

J. Badia: Did we ever recoup that money? When you say our budget is \$41.5 million, is that post sweeps?

C. Drummond: Yes.

J. Badia: OK. So we did do a giant sweep of money out of the Office of Academic Affairs prior to other units cutting?

C. Drummond: Well, not prior to. Those units were being cut at that time also.

J. Badia: You suggested that other units, not the Office of Academic Affairs, have reduced their operations significantly. Do we know what cost savings those reductions were?

C. Drummond: I do not have the change in their expense budgets in my head, but I know that Vice Chancellor McClellan's operation, for instance, is substantially smaller than it was at the time of the initiation of the recession. I think we all know that the physical plant staff has been significantly reduced. They would have to answer to the specifics of the change in their expense budgets, but they have been substantial.

J. Badia: But do we have an amount? Do we know what all those added up to? Does anybody know?

G. McClellan: I can tell you that the current S&E budget for the entire Office of Student Affairs division is \$300,000+ across the entire division.

C. Drummond: The short answer to your question is "Yes." Any of us can go to the Institutional Research website. In the Institutional Research data, it is the first set of annual reports. There is, in one of the 137 tables in that document, a table that lists the general fund budget for the university, and you can see that change from year to year. But the absolute total of that change from, say, 2008-2009 to today, I do not have that number in my head.

M. Wolf: I think it is good it is stable. We just gained a 1.5 percent increase. Health care costs have gone up. We have had a lot of acceleration of people being promoted. That is actually probably a success to you and to us.

When we are evaluating this, the one thing we are not quite asking, and we cannot, is the primary mission here of what we are providing students. We know, and we have said repeatedly in response, that some of these combinations of programs will hurt students, and I am not just talking about their education. There are institutional evaluations for law schools, and Dr. Fife can speak to this as well. Their success at getting into those schools will be ravaged if we start to have a department of milk toast social science. They will be downgraded. We have now just started putting students in Georgetown, George Washington, Michigan, Minnesota, William and Mary, doing the things we are supposed to be doing. These students are going to think they are doing what they are supposed to be doing, and this will hurt them. We know it will hurt them. You cannot put a cost on that. If we are that cost conscious, and Dean Link's report shows us there are no savings there, what is the outcome of this? I understand we have to save money. We are saving money. At what point do we circle back and ask what is best for the students in how we consider this? Because we know this will injure students, and that is why some of us are reacting very strongly to it.

C. Drummond: I think that is a good point, and that is the primary reason for the extended period of response through the academic organization.

There are impacts like that I cannot know for every department, and so this is the opportunity for the faculty to make those cases of where there is real substantive value in an independent identity. I think we would all like to have independent identity of every academic program as completely as possible. There may even be advantages to having a department of actuarial science independent of the current math department, right? There are things that would be nice that we currently do not have. What I need is, between now and the 15th of November, those responses that describe "this is a change that would be very detrimental for the following reasons" or "this is a change that we would have to consider the impact on our students or on some aspect of the way in which we fulfill our mission that goes beyond just simply the dollars of potential savings." That is why we have this extended period for that kind of formal, official response. Those will be taken very seriously.

The other thing is that, at some point – and your example is a good one – you have to decide how impactful that is to the overall mission of the potentially affected department. It is fabulous when a student has an opportunity to go to Georgetown; but, if it is only once in a decade, is that worth it? That is hard. It is easy to say "yes," and that would be the immediate reaction from many of us. That is something we have to work out, and only the departments can make those cases.

J. Hersberger: I have a comment about the general process. With regard to Senator Argast's comment in the beginning, the idea of a rush, we cannot really qualify what we would project some of these savings would be. One of the initial strategies that I see here is to suspend admissions to programs. If we cannot say what the savings would be by suspending admissions to those programs, it seems like an exercise in futility to rush this.

Another example, and I have no vested interest in these programs, is we have two-year programs in the Department of Biology. It is recommended that they be suspended because they are detrimental to IPFW's metrics. What are the detriments to the metrics, and how much does it cost, because any student who does not enroll in one of those classes is a loss of revenue? Talking about the once-in-whenever, any student who starts in one of those programs and decides to switch into another program at IPFW is an even more substantial loss to us, if we do not have that opportunity for them.

C. Drummond: That gets to a really complicated issue which is “what is this university's role in relation to Purdue West Lafayette and Indiana University Bloomington?” And those programs that you speak of within biology are pre-pharmacy, pre-vet, pre-vet tech, ag, and forestry. We had, for many, many years, a journalism program that was structured in the same way, on the IU side. I do not think that it does our students a service if we admit them to a program in which very few, if any, students ever then matriculate to the main campus in order to complete those programs.

One of the things that I ask is that we take a good look at that and see if those things are effective. My impression, from being dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, is that in biology, they are not. Yes, we are capturing some credit hours, but we are not advancing students towards those degrees. I am sure the biology faculty make a concerted effort to convert them over to biology majors; and, in fact, we can point to one specific case of a Chapman Scholar who came with the intention, initially, of being a veterinarian, and did not pursue that but stayed in the biology department. So that happens, but I am not sure that it is in our institutional best interest. Yes, these pathways exist, but historically we know that they are not pursued. The example that I would give is journalism and communication where that concept of journalism has been, I think, appropriately subsumed into the current communications bachelor's degree.

S. LaVere: As you were writing this report, did you put thought into, beyond the cost savings, the ideas of how restructuring might affect recruitment, retention, and enrollment in general? Is that something that you can speak to?

C. Drummond: Sure, that is on everybody's mind all the time. One of the things, in terms of recruiting and retaining students, we know that there is a coming teacher shortage at the secondary level in Indiana. What we have now is a bunch of disparate secondary education programs that are scattered across the departments. In some places we have faculty who are designated as specialists in their field primarily in mathematics and in the arts. In other places we have sort of complex paths for students to achieve secondary certification.

One of the goals that I have, particularly with the teacher preparation programs, is to use this opportunity to have some conversations about how to coordinate what we are doing with the Educational Studies Department and the College of Education and Public Policy. How do we present the opportunities for students in a more clear and coherent way so that they can find their ways to those professions, and we can market and recruit to those educational opportunities more effectively? So that is just one example of the thought that I hopefully could convey that has been put into this. It is the same with the recommendations around the pre-professional programs that exist in the sciences: why we have those, do we need one of

each in each department, are the curricula significantly different to make them useful to students? I would say a tremendous amount of thought and effort went into those issues.

J. Malanson: I am going to use the chair's prerogative just to add something on the budgetary question you were talking about earlier. When looking at budgetary change over time, you cannot just look at the individual areas and look at cost reductions because there are some costs that go up that have to be dealt with. Health care costs go up, and you get a huge increase in utility costs this year, I believe, from what was projected for last year. There have been some increasing salaries in administration and athletics and other parts of the university as well that have added to increases. Our operating budget, according to the statistical report Vice Chancellor Drummond pointed to, has only gone down about a million dollars over the course of the past four years. The changes have to do with how the funds are restricted but also how the unavoidable costs rise over time in ways that necessitate changes in the rest of the budget. So our operating budget might be the same, but our actual available money to do things with has declined within that generally static operating budget.

B. Fife: Is there any evidence to suggest that the Metropolitan University designation will result in a non-incremental increase in state funding for IPFW?

C. Drummond: By non-incremental you mean substantial one-time jump?

B. Fife: Well, we were hoping for about \$8 million, something in that ballpark.

V. Carwein: The \$8 million was not attached as much to the Metropolitan University designation as it was to account for the significant increase in bachelor's degree production over the last decade. We were up about 16 percent in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded, and we have not been funded over a decade for that, so that really was what that \$8 million was.

In terms of the Metropolitan University status relative to legislative request, there was never any anticipation they would honor that, or we would get something, as a result of being designated as a Metropolitan Institution. Hopefully we could put together a proposal that would reflect the mission of the Metropolitan Institution; but, more importantly, at least in terms of that particular dollar figure, was to compensate for the baccalaureate degree education.

A. Obergfell: I know that the LSA is really separate from this discussion of recommendations today, but I have two questions: 1) Do we know anything more on the LSA? Have you heard anything? 2) I understand the trustees are meeting the first two weeks in December, I believe, and should be making their decision on that. Will the final decision on these recommendations come post-board meetings or prior to that?

C. Drummond: What has been going on since the summer is a series of occasional formal conversations/negotiations between representatives of IU and Purdue University. Those negotiations are being led by the general counsel of each university with support from various executive members of each university. Throughout that time, from July or August, until Thursday, Vice Chancellor Wesse and I have been in near-constant communication

with the folks from West Lafayette: sometimes daily, sometimes multiple times per day, sometimes they give us a couple days' break. But we have been providing them with information, raising concerns that we have been answering questions to the best of our ability, and trying to understand where the process is going. But of course we are not actually part of the negotiating team. I think it is maybe unfair to say that they are negotiating; they are conversing at this point. That process is ongoing with the next formal meeting being scheduled for October 21. Right now I think it is fair to say that the two sides are relatively far apart on core issues.

The last real conversation that took place was at a level below the general counsel teams that involved Vice Chancellor Wesse, Patrick McLaughlin, and me along with Jim Almond from West Lafayette, and members of the folks down in Indianapolis that have to do with system-level student information systems kinds of issues: so their sort-of super registrar for the IU system. That was a long, convoluted conversation about how the student information system would work in a divided management structure for those students that would go to IU-degree programs, how they would enroll for, and be billed for, courses that the remaining institution, whatever it might be called, would provide in support of those degree programs. So, say, anatomy and physiology for the health sciences students: how would they enroll in that course, how would that course be delivered to them, how would they be billed? The same goes for their other general education and distribution requirements. There are a couple of real important tenets to that, which is the vast majority of those students under some kind of financial aid that requires them to be full-time, degree-seeking students. You cannot be a full-time, degree-seeking student in two different universities. One of the key terms, if you will, of the term sheet from the Purdue University side of this conversation is it would not be in the remaining institution's interest to have those 350-400 freshman a year start in this remaining entity and then transfer to IU. That would not be in our interest because they would then count in our first-time, full-time denominator for a large number of metrics. That would not be a good thing. So, they would need to be IU students from the start; but the way those curricula are structured, they primarily take service courses in their first three semesters, preparatory and service courses. They would, in that sense, be an IU student but enrolled exclusively in Purdue University courses, which is awkward at best.

Of course IU and Purdue University, being two different entities, use completely different student information systems. Student information systems are designed to provide services to students in a seamless way. People saw our system do that reasonably well. What they do not do is "talk" to each other, and it is very hard to set up a system where you say, "We are going to use the IU system to admit students, and then we are going to transmit that information up here, and you need to put it in your Banner system and register them in your classes, and then send it back to us." So these systems do not talk to each other well. We basically left that conversation with, "That is not going to work." It could work if we had unlimited time, resources, and money, to make the two systems talk to each other, but that is just silly. IU is not interested in pursuing that, and we certainly are not interested in pursuing that, so our position has been, with respect to these student information system issues, that, if there is a change that is to be made, we do not want to do anything that, for us, is harder than what we are already doing. It is essentially impossible to have the student resident in both systems simultaneously. It may be that, in the end, IU effectively pays us to run that system and those students in our SIS up until a point where they are ready to graduate.

The way the student information system works at IUPUI, the two major programs of Purdue at IUPUI: the Purdue School of Science and the Purdue School of Engineering, those students are IU students from the moment they apply until the moment they graduate. They are resident in the IU student information system, and that system does all the work. Once the degree is conferred, they are in a batch, sent off to Purdue West Lafayette, and the degrees are processed in the Purdue system. They are not in both systems simultaneously. We would need something like that to make this work and, it is actually a recommendation that dates back pre-2014 that was not implemented, largely because of the confusion created by a report which recommended that the university transition entirely to IU. So, we left that phone call with a common understanding that a joint merger of these two systems is not practical, and somebody is going to have to figure out a way to make it work entirely within one or the other system.

That is a long answer, but it is a very complicated set of conversations because we have gotten away from the general redistribution of academic programs between the two universities to conversations about how the details of that process would play out.

D. Wesse: The assumption we are getting from Purdue, particularly, is that it is going to happen. I have told the senate leadership that. We are getting the indications that it is going to happen. But then we have the phone call, and, at the end of the call, we are no closer to resolution than we were at the beginning of the call. The feeling we get is that it is going to happen, but then we have these calls, and it does not seem to be coming any closer.

V. Carwein: They are starting to get into some details, so we are fixated in this particular detail at the moment. The other thing that is happening is the number crunching relative to the cost, and what it would mean to IPFW and what we would lose if this many students would transition over to IU. Those are the kinds of things they are looking at, also contracts, and the endowments: all those things that are connected to health sciences. Those are being gone through one by one. Sets of numbers are being produced as a result of that.

The other thing I would say is that, from the Purdue standpoint, what Purdue had put on the table was that IPFW would need to be made whole. What would be left of IPFW would need to be made whole for a period of seven years in order to allow us to invest in new programmatic areas, expansion of existing areas, etc. It is not that IU is not necessarily in favor of that seven-year period.

They are also talking about an initial agreement by the two systems that they would jointly go to the legislature to ask for this amount of money, whatever it ends up being, to be built into our base budget. Purdue crunched some numbers; it actually was getting close to \$8 million again, but what the difference would be if we lost those programs. Then IU came back and said that they want each university system to make its own request to the legislature for what it thinks it needs. I believe they are back to the idea of making a joint request. As you might expect, they are trying to negotiate the number down to the smallest as possible. So that is part of the discussion.

J. Niser: Maybe this has already been done, but is anything being done to inform the students who are currently in the institution? Are we going to grandfather them in? I am just worried about the uncertainty that is brewing underneath this that could affect our retention.

C. Drummond: There has been no further sort of official communication to students about this issue since last January when it broke. The student body president at the time was part of the LSA team, and the student government participated in the joint meeting a couple of weeks ago. Vice Chancellor McClellan has done a great job of keeping the students well informed about what is going on, but we have not issued another sort of proclamation that says, if this and this happens, this is what will happen with the students.

We know that we have students who sometimes have complex enrollment histories with the university. They come for a semester or two, leave and then come back, or they stay at partial enrollment for a long period of time. At some point, if these changes from one university system to the other are made, we are only going to be able to extend that grandfather opportunity for a limited amount of time. So you can imagine a situation in where you would say, "After this date, all students who are admitted are in either all Purdue programs or they are in the IU health sciences programs." Those students who are currently enrolled must complete their degrees, within some period of time, if they want to have the degree in the historical designated university system. The specifics of that have not been worked out. I think, when the provost and Vice Chancellor Applegate made those statements, they were operating under the general assumption that students complete their degree in four or five years; and we know that that is just not the reality for many of our students. So, how long do you extend that; and do you, at some point (if they are first-year students) go ahead and get them transferred over right now? Those are things that we have to have a conversation about; but, in any given year, between 35 and 40 percent of our students have fewer than 30 credit hours. There would be a lot of change rapidly, and then we would have this period of dragging the rest of the students through the previous curricular structure.

S. Betz: Given your comment just a minute ago that the two universities, IU and Purdue, are still quite a ways away in their thinking, is there any thought that what we do internally in response to USAP might change their decision of what they are thinking? Is that in any way linked to sort of a faster timeline to how we go about making changes?

C. Drummond: I think it is certainly fair to say that both boards of trustees have linked the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP) to the Management Agreement. The USAP document is referenced four or five times in the current version of the Management Agreement. Never did it, of course, occur in previous versions of the Management Agreement. I think, from the standpoint of the governing boards of universities, the organizational structure and universities' responses to the declining revenue is an integral part of the conversations. How their timeline would be impacted by changes that we make locally is really hard to know. But they are certainly fully aware of the USAP recommendations, and there is a clear expectation that this institution, no matter what it is, addresses the concerns of declining revenue. Is that fair, Vice Chancellor Wesse and Chancellor Carwein?

Senator: I would like to shift the discussion back again to your recommendations, and my question or comment has to do with process and leadership on campus. If you look at your recommendations, and I hear what you are saying about the need to make those recommendations in the current financial situation, for some of the restructuring and merging of departments, there seems to be no apparent academic rationale for the mergers

that were suggested. The way I interpreted the recommendations was that you did not want to be too top-down heavy dictating what those mergers should look like. I imagine that was what was behind it. A consequence that you might not have anticipated in that approach, which is not your fault, is that some of the departments that are being asked to merge with other departments have kind of created a sort of group of academic “refugees” running around looking for a home in departments that are deemed more safe and not as at risk. So, this seems like a very bad thing, especially given the accelerated timeline, that decisions are going to be made almost randomly and for wrong reasons, and then they will not be able to be undone if it turns out that things are not as bad financially as they look. So, what I am wondering, is there something that you can do as the academic leader on this campus to help facilitate the process in a way that is more sound, that does not just leave it to the mercy of larger departments to take in, sort of more at-risk departments?

C. Drummond: First, I am going to strongly disagree that all of the academic organizational change recommendations have no foundation in the curriculum. The merger of Visual Communication and Design and Fine Arts is a curricular one. It is one that was recommended by their accrediting body; it is one where the conversation was ongoing pre recommendations.

The other is within the technologies. Now, we have a bit of a delicate situation because we are coming up on the site visits for the technology departments’ Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). It would not be in the accreditation processes' best interest to have a formal, official university document saying that we may radically change the structure of our technology degrees just at the moment that visitors are coming for the accreditation visit. So that one is not as fully described in the document as I might have wished, but that is one that is aligned with national trends and technology programs and one that we actually have right now, thanks to Gary Steffen's hard work. He is actually interim chair of both academic departments right now. So, those are things that do have a strong curricular and academic basis.

Now, the question of “refugees,” if you will, is a challenging problem because, what we find when we look at the academic organizational structure in the College of Arts and Sciences, is that we have a wide range of program and department sizes with relatively comparable levels of administrative overhead investment. So, for those smallest programs, where some efficiencies could be imagined by an administrative restructuring, it turns out, perhaps by happenstance, that those are not naturally combinable based on the nature of those academic disciplines. In a most absurd example, some Department of Geology, Philosophy, and Women's Studies is a non starter; that makes no sense. But those of our units that are challenged by relatively high overhead relative to the scale of the programs, we have to ask how we are going to achieve any efficiencies. It is hard because, if there were natural homes for these places, they would have already migrated to them. At the same time, we do not want to force fit some ridiculous combination that makes no curricular sense and provides no potential value to the students or the faculty in those programs. I gave the university my best shot in this document, and I am really interested if there are better alternatives out there.

Senator: I am suggesting that, just as the recommendations were topped out and you are asking for bottom-up feedback, there might need to be a sort of top-down facilitation because, without that...

C. Drummond: I believe that is the role of the deans when we are talking about any college conversations. My expectation is that those conversations will be ongoing between now and November 15. Your point is well taken.

D. Miller: Over the course of several years, I feel like every fall I sit in this body, and we have a \$2 million shortfall. There is a rush to come up with a way to save money, and it seems as if we are on really short deadlines to look things over and money is swept away, and the next year the same thing happens. What I am asking is, given the small amount of savings that will happen from this plan and possible declining enrollment trends in the future, what is the next contingency plan? Can we have that released to us in a quicker fashion so that we can see it instead of this kind of stuff happening over breaks...?

C. Drummond: Your question is pretty prescient because, immediately following this meeting, the chancellor and vice chancellors are going to spend some amount of time from 2:00 until whenever setting a budget structure for next year. That is exactly what we are going to be doing for the next several hours, flushing out that plan, so we do not get caught short again.

A. Schwab: This is a follow-up to Senator Miller's remarks. One of the problems I have with the plan we have in place for evaluating the viability of programs and departments is the structure by which they are evaluated according to majors. As capricious as I think that is, I am not going to argue about that point. Instead, I want to argue about if these are going to solve the economic problems because it is currently organized... Let's say the philosophy program wants to continue despite the fact that the department itself is on the chopping block. We are going to need more majors; and, in order to get more majors, we have to get them from somewhere, and it is unlikely that we are going to get them off the street. So, instead, we are going to have to get them from other programs; and, so then, in order for us to become viable, we have to get them from other programs, but that does not actually solve the economic problem.

In the same way, geosciences, which is something that is being considered as well, is going to need more majors, and they are going to have to get them from somewhere as well; but, again, where they are getting their majors in terms of demonstrating their viability is unlikely to be from somewhere else. It is more likely to just be recutting up the pie that exists here. So then we have this viability system that we are using to evaluate what programs we should invest in, but it does not actually solve what produced the problem to begin with; that is, the economic problem in the background remains while we basically compete with each other to cut up the pie in different ways. I guess I am concerned about using this as a strategy to solve an economic problem because it does not actually solve the economic problem.

C. Drummond: That holds true in a condition of static stop-out rates. But, what we have seen over the last ten years or so is a decline in our institutional stop-out rate, which is a very good thing. That has been reported even by the commission which has been pleased to document our significant improvements in that area. One of the ways in which we have become institutionally more viable, if you will, at the individual department or program level, is by improved retention. It costs thousands of dollars to recruit a student to IPFW. That initial investment is lost if 40 percent of them leave after the first year. We need to

continue to work there to grow our enrollment, not exclusively by new students, but by even better retention of our current situation. We have, as an institution, done a great job given the nature of the students, challenges that they have in their lives, etc., all the things that we know lead to a lack of student success as defined by ongoing enrollment. There is still much more work to do there.

At the same time, we need to be more effective in our recruiting processes. I would say that, if we take it as a given that we are not going to get more students, then we will not get more students. But, if we take it as a given that we are going to try very hard to set reasonable, but aggressive, admissions and matriculation targets and put a tremendous amount of effort into that process, then we may, in fact, benefit from that. We got in this situation of declining enrollment because of two factors, one of which is very positive and one of which is negative. One is we got really good at graduating students; and, when they graduate, they leave and they stop paying tuition. That is the desired outcome. But, at the same time, post-recession, we were not successful in bringing in students at a rate that accelerated. In fact, it declined. So, the reservoir of students has declined over time. The only way, long-term, to fix that is to grow the students who are coming in or, if that is not possible, then to make sure that we have our resources allocated across the institution to serve the smaller number of students that we then have as the study stated.

J. Malanson: We have run out of time. Thank you, Vice Chancellor Drummond.

4. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.



Jacqueline J. Petersen (for Sarah Mettert)
Secretary of the Faculty