

Minutes of the  
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Thirty-Seventh Senate  
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne  
December 11, 2017  
12:00 P.M., KT G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 11
3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Indiana University – A. Downs
  - b. Purdue University – A. Schwab
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – J. Malanson
6. Special business of the day
  - a. Senate procedure
  - b. Peer institutions
7. Committee reports requiring action
8. Question Time
  - a. (Senate Reference No. 17-14) – J. Badia
  - b. (Senate Reference No. 17-15) – A. Livschiz
  - c. (Senate Reference No. 17-16) – A. Livschiz
9. New business
10. Committee reports “for information only”
  - a. (Senate Reference No. 17-13) – J. Malanson
11. The general good and welfare of the University
12. Adjournment\*

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

---

Presiding Officer: J. Malanson  
Parliamentarian: W. Sirk  
Sergeant-at-arms: G. Steffen  
Secretary: J. Bacon

Attachments:

“Report on Administrative Staffing and Budgeting” (SR No. 17-13)

“Question Time – re: Boiler Affordability Grant” (SR No. 17-14)

“Question Time – re: Unregistered Student Phone Calls” (SR No. 17-15)

“Question Time – re: Two Models for Peer Institutions” (SR No. 17-16)

Senate Members Present:

A. Argast, A. Bales, A. Benito, P. Bingi, B. Boatright, A. Boehm, B. Buldt, J. Burg, S. Carr, D. Chen, K. Dehr, S. Ding, A. Downs, C. Drummond, R. Elsenbaumer, B. Fife, M. Gruys, G. Hickey, R. Hile, D. Holland, M. Jordan, D. Kaiser, B. Kim, S. King, L. Kuznar, J. Leatherman, E. Link, A. Livschiz, H. Luo, D. Miller, Z. Nazarov, J. Niser, E. Norman, J. Nowak, G. Petruska, K. Pollock, M., Qasim, P. Reese, N. Reimer, G. Schmidt, A. Schwab, S. Stevenson, A. Ushenko, R. Vandell, L. Vartanian, G. Wang, D. Weese, M. Wolf, L. Wright-Bower, N. Younis, M. Zoghi

Senate Members Absent:

S. Bischoff, D. Cochran, Y. Deng, A. Kreager, A. Macklin, J. Marshall, L. McAllister, P. Nachappa, A. Obergfell, J. O’Connell, B. Redman, S. Rumsey, B. Salmon, R. Sutter, B. Valliere

Guests Present:

S. Betz, N. Borbieva, C. Elsby, A. Fincannon, L. Goodson, C. Gurgur, B. Kingsbury, J. Reese, C. Springer

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Malanson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 13: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:  
 K. Pollock moved to accept the agenda.  
 Agenda approved by voice vote.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

a. Indiana University:

A. Downs: Welcome to finals week. I hope that your semesters have gone well and that the papers, performances, exhibits, and tests you see this week are evidence of the good work that you and your students have done this semester. I also hope that your time between submitting grades and duty week is what you want it to be.

The Human Resources Working Group that was formed as part of the realignment is continuing to make progress. Representatives from IUPUI were on campus on Wednesday (12/6) to meet with faculty and staff who are

transitioning to IUPUI employees. As we get closer to July 1, 2018, keep an eye out for additional communication and information about the transition.

Earlier this semester the faculty leaders held a series of public meetings regarding interdisciplinary teaching, research, and creative endeavor. Those meetings were not particularly well attended, but there was some good input that came from that. We are going to put a hold on doing anything else with this information until we are ready to have broader discussions about our next strategic plan. The work that has been done already can help inform what happens during the strategic planning process. In the interim, if you have ideas about interdisciplinary projects, do not let this hold stop you from pursuing that work.

The last 5+ years have been filled with frustration and disappointment. It has worn on me, and over that time, I have taken a tone with some of you that I should not have. I have apologized personally to a number of you. Today I am offering an apology to anyone I have missed. I will do my best to minimize these events in the future.

An ongoing concern in any organization or community is having an environment where everyone can express themselves. Recently I was told that there are people in the Senate specifically, and the faculty generally, who are afraid to express themselves. Last week a faculty member told me that she didn't want to post on the AAUP Listserv because she didn't want to "become a target for the discontent."

The last 5+ years have proven that we are not going to agree with each other on every issue and that is OK. We should expect each other to defend positions and opinions, but we also should expect everyone to treat others with dignity and respect. The end result can be a free exchange of ideas that serves our region well.

Please do not be afraid to express yourself. If you have questions, comments, and concerns please come to see me. I will be holding office hours on Thursday afternoons from 4:30 to 5:30 and by appointment during the spring semester. I will keep identities confidential as best I can. You will hear similar announcements about office hours from the Purdue Speaker.

This is the last year of my term as IU Speaker and that is convenient because it also is the last year for IU Speakers and IPFW. Beginning in the fall of 2018, Purdue Fort Wayne will have a presiding officer and two speakers. I do not have any intentions to seek any of those positions. Good luck to those who come after me.

Finally, while I might be the IU Speaker I want to take a moment to express my personal gratitude to a member of the Purdue faculty. Art Friedel is

retiring....again. Art has given 50 years to IPFW and is a reminder of how admirable our profession is and the meaningful contribution that we can make. Thank you Art. He is giving his final, final exam at 10:30 on Thursday in SB 185. If you happen to be in that area, or if you happen to see him somewhere else, wish him well.

b. Purdue University:

A. Schwab: Let me start by thanking Speaker Downs for his comments. They leave very little ground for me to cover. What I can say is that I appreciate in sharing the enthusiasm many faculty, staff, and administrators have in making, or remaking, our institution, and our coming two institutions, something to be proud of. Over this past summer and this fall semester I have exercised my judgement to the best of my ability to represent faculty interests in my meetings with IPFW administration, on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and on the Intercampus Faculty Council. I do not feel, however, that I have a clear enough picture of the faculty concerns and interests that I endeavor to represent. Accordingly, during the spring semester, I will hold office hours on Wednesdays from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. and by appointment. Please help me make this opportunity to ask, express, and discuss issues of faculty concern known to your colleagues. Finally, I do hope that your finals week and holiday season are better than you hope they will be.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

J. Malanson: I hope that everyone's semester is wrapping up smoothly, and that everyone has a good finals week and a restful winter break. I will not be seeking reelection as Presiding Officer of the Senate. I am taking a sabbatical in the fall to work on a book, and I look forward to turning things over to someone new. I tell all of you this now to encourage each of you to consider running to be the next Presiding Officer or to consider recruiting someone that has good ideas and a desire to work for the betterment of the university and for the improvement of shared governance on this campus.

Given the lack of action items on today's agenda, the Executive Committee decided to do something a little different. In a few minutes, I will make a few suggestions about the Senate as a deliberative body, prompted by some of the emails that were shared on the AAUP listserv a few weeks ago. After that, we will have a conversation about peer institutions. The Executive Committee has voted to do something similar next month as well, taking time in the Senate meeting to discuss an issue of importance to the faculty and the campus community, athletics. You are well aware that athletics has been a contentious issue on campus for many years. When the decision was first made in 2000-2001 to move to NCAA Division I from Division II, this Senate withheld its approval because it felt the administration had failed to share adequate information regarding the move, its costs, and its benefits. While Senate attention to athletics has waxed and waned over the years, the Senate has generally had problems with how multiple administrations

have or have not communicated about athletics or rationalized the costs of Division I athletics.

Last year, in cooperation with the central administration, the Senate approved the establishment of the Athletics Working Group, which was charged with answering: (1) If there is a role for athletics at IPFW? (2) What the goals of participation in Division I athletics are? (3) How the university should measure if we are achieving those goals? (4) And what the appropriate financial investment should be to achieve those goals?

The hope was that the Working Group could provide something of a final answer to the athletics question by establishing clear goals and clear measures that would justify an ongoing investment. The Working Group offered an emphatic yes to the question of if there is a role for athletics, and endorsed maintaining a Division I program at current funding levels. The Working Group did not adequately answer the questions of the goals of participation or the measures of success. At the beginning of this semester, this Senate approved Senate Document SD 17-02, which tasked URPC and SAC with the development of those measures. Both committees have invested significant time in this task, but have encountered difficulties completing it. In no small part because there is no common understanding about what IPFW's goals for participation in Division I athletics are. It is hard to develop measures of success when there is no clear understanding of what you should be trying to measure. In part to help the committees in their task and in part because despite how much time and energy many people have spent talking about athletics, there has not been a broad based discussion of athletics on this campus since we started experiencing significant enrollment declines six years ago. The Executive Committee has decided to have such a discussion in January. The Senate has representatives from virtually every department on campus as the official representative body of the faculty, and so is the ideal location for such a discussion to take place.

I am announcing this discussion in such detail now for four reasons. First, while the discussion is open ended, meaning that we are not debating a document for passage, it will still take place using the Senate's normal rules of order, and will broadly focus on the two questions that the Athletics Working Group did not answer: (1) What are the goals of ongoing participation in Division I athletics? (2) And how should we measure or not that IPFW has been achieving those goals? The Executive Committee has invited several representatives from athletics and advancement to participate in this discussion. Second, one of the goals of having this conversation in the Senate, rather than as a separate forum, is so that we can hear from all corners of the faculty on this issue. Some faculty on both sides of the athletics question regularly make their voices heard, and I am positive that we will hear from them in January. But, we also want to hear from the many others who may not normally weigh-in, so that we may have a more comprehensive understanding of faculty viewpoints. Third, the Executive Committee wants this to be a meaningful collegial conversation, which requires that we all spend some time thinking about these questions before we meet in January. It also requires us to recognize that the question of: (1) What are the goals of participating in Division I athletics? (2) And what should IPFW spend to participate in Division I athletics? are two distinct questions. Engaging in meaningful conversation on the first question does not mean dismissing the

second question. It actually prepares us to have a more meaningful conversation about the second question. Finally, each of you represent someone. You represent departments. You represent colleges. You represent colleagues and constituencies. Please talk to them about athletics. Their thoughts, their ideas, their questions, their concerns. And bring those insights with you to the January meeting. With that, let's talk about the Senate as a deliberative body.

6. Special business of the day:

a. Senate procedures

J. Malanson: So, if you are still subscribed to the AAUP listserv you probably saw a couple of emails from Bernd Buldt, and one from Lesa Vartanian, last month trying to start a conversation about the Senate as a deliberative body. Some of you have served in the Senate for a long time, others are new, and I am sure that everyone came into the body with different expectations of what the meetings and work would be like. Senate rules require the distribution of each agenda a week before the monthly meeting, so as to allow time for Senators to review all of the items, discuss them with their constituents, consider potential questions and amendments, etc. And so in this way, much of the deliberation that would go into the discussions at a particular meeting should be taking place in the lead up to said meeting. Of course, it is possible the Senate will amend a document, or someone will make a statement or ask a question that significantly alters the way you or your constituents understand them, in a way that you might feel requires additional time for deliberation and consultation.

There are few ways to create additional time within our existing rules. First, someone can move to postpone consideration of an item to the next month's Senate meeting, which would move the item on to the next month's agenda, and with a motion that "I hope to postpone this item to next month's Senate meeting." At that point, the debate would ensue on the timing of the postponement and whether or not to postpone it. The second strategy is that someone can move to postpone consideration of an item to the following Monday. At the beginning of each year, you receive a Senate calendar and it asks you to reserve two consecutive Mondays each month, other than December, so no one try to do this today. Very rarely do we make use of the second Monday. But, postponing an item for a week would enable those who feel the need for more deliberation to get that time without pushing things back an entire month. The primary benefit of this approach is that most of us will be much more likely to remember whatever discussion has already occurred on the item in question, such that we can essentially pick back up where we left off rather than having to start anew a month later. In such a postponement we would proceed with our normal agenda through new business, and before we officially close new business we would accept a motion to adjourn and resume the following Monday with the postponed item, and then with the rest of the agenda. So, in this case the motion would be that "I move specifically to postpone the discussion of this item until next Monday." It would be the beginning of next Monday's meeting. It is already scheduled and so it is allowed to happen. Questions? This is not a broader philosophical conversation about that it is

a deliberative body. I am just trying to make it clear that under our current rules we have the ability to create more space.

A. Downs: I have either been a presiding officer, parliamentarian, or speaker for some time now and it is not very common that people need extra time, but there have been some moments where people would have liked a little extra time. This is a decent way to avoid pushing things for another month. I think the reason the motions to postpone occasionally failed in the past is because it would have put things off for another month, and nobody wants to slow our rather slow process down even more than need be. So, this is a decent way to get that little extra deliberation. Once again, keeping in mind that everybody has spoken with all of their constituents before the meeting, and something during the meeting caused them to change their mind.

G. Hickey: Would you speak to the difference between postponing a discussion and tabling a motion?

J. Malanson: So, when we have used table in the past we have actually been using it incorrectly. Tabling officially requires a vote to remove from the table at a future date. You don't table to a certain time. You put it on the table and then it stays on the table until someone officially moves to remove it from the table later on. Postponing to a specific time means that it gets put on the later agenda, gets delayed until the next week, or whatever else. If you move to postpone something indefinitely it is essentially asking that the item be forgotten forever. So, it is a way of not having a Senate vote on some things. It is essentially a way of voting something down without taking a no vote on it. So, moving forward what we are going to be talking about is postponing, unless the intention really is just to put something on the table to be picked back up later on.

S. Carr: I was wondering, to your earlier point, is there any document or has there been an attempt to draft any document that would talk about best practices for Senators? I know in the past we have talked about the importance of people going back to the department but I don't know if there is a document for beginning Senators that says "these are the things that we should be doing."

J. Malanson: I am not aware of any training document for Senators. Essentially the "Introduction to Senate" or "Senate for Dummies" document wouldn't be a bad idea. But, one does not exist as far as I know.

A. Downs: Traditionally, the "Senate for Dummies" has just been limited to Robert's Rules because there has been this assumption that people understand that the representative part of what they are doing is understood by most folks. It is Robert's Rules where people have had a problem, not in "I should go ask my constituents what they think."

J. Malanson: We used to have a Robert's Rules primer, but in the past two years the parliamentarian has been new, and has not been as familiar with Robert's Rules to deliver that presentation.

A. Downs: And the handout we used to have, probably all of those laminated cards, have been given away. We had a cheat sheet of Robert's Rules that people used to be able to pick up from the secretary when they walked in. It was laminated and everything. Then they gave it back when they walked out or walked out with it in some cases.

L. Vartanian: Just a comment, I guess. I think effective deliberation on this floor requires that people understand the issues at hand. I understand you to be saying to try to get the voices of those I represent in the week that passes. As a COAS at-large Senator it is very hard for me to broadly seek that input. I do try, but I would not say that I do so with regularity as effectively as I think the business we do here warrants. Furthermore, as you already recognize, but I think this is a super important point, the discussions that happen on this floor often do add to the issues at hand. And so, I understand that we already have a system of operation that would allow for us to postpone. But, that would be a motion somebody would make and then it would be voted on. So, it is possible that by a very slim margin that such a motion might not pass and yet a good proportion of the body here feel that they don't yet have the understanding they would like in order to be able to vote on an issue. I guess the question is, do all faculty governance bodies like what we have here operate in this fashion? Are there no other models for how discussion and deliberation and eventual voting take place? Perhaps a more systematically thoughtful way that allows for more time, as well as exposure to other viewpoints on issues.

J. Malanson: I am going to let Andy speak on this in a second. There are different models. This is the model that, as far as I know, IPFW has always utilized. And while you are speaking very repeatedly and persuasively about the need for greater deliberation and everything else, and Bernd has raised similar questions, at this point this has not been a broadly raised concern. And so, if there are others that feel this concern, the Executive Committee can certainly consider this more broadly. But, to this point, it has been a fairly limited concern.

A. Downs: One of the formats that other deliberative bodies use is to actually consider something in one meeting and then vote the next. You would never vote in the same meeting in which you discussed it. So, the benefit there, theoretically, is that you would come to that meeting for discussion prepared, but if you hear something during that that helps you gain a different understanding that caused you to want to get further input you would then talk with your constituents before the meeting where the vote happens. For us, traditionally, that would have meant discussing one month and then voting the next, which would delay a lot of what we do by a month. So, there would be the need for us to adjust our timing. But, that is one method that is used very commonly in deliberative bodies. With, by the way, the ability to wave your own rule so that you can vote in the meeting where you discuss.



B. Buldt: Thank you. First off, thank you for putting this on the agenda. If everyone feels this is a moot point just make yourself heard. Just because two of us raised the concern does not mean that everyone else feels the same. So, when I came here I served on the Purdue Senate, as you know I mentioned Purdue to both of you. I served on the Purdue Senate in West Lafayette and they followed this model that every item on the agenda was flagged for either “for information” or “for discussion” or “for vote.” And there was the rule that you cannot put something unless you waive rules. There was this rule that you cannot have something on the agenda for a vote that was not in a previous meeting on a previous agenda for discussion. So, I believe it helped because sometimes we have to vote on things that we have no knowledge about because universities are a very complex business. And even within Faculty Affairs I am sometimes surprised that I learn new things from different schools, from different departments, from different cultures. And so, sometimes I would appreciate if agenda items would be introduced more fully so that I feel more comfortable that I actually know what we are talking about and what we are going to be voting on. Second, most departments meet on a monthly basis. So, if we were to adopt this practice that West Lafayette had and I did not feel that it delayed our business voting for weeks later. This really allows all of us to actually raise these issues. I mean everyone is crazy busy, and if I send out an email saying, what is your take on it? Usually the chair responds. If, however, I talk to someone in the hallway I get much more of a response. So, it would delay it by this rule. This would allow all of us to bring these things to our faculty meetings and raise it in the air, and get our feedback. Maybe get all the other questions that we as Senators missed because we are all limited in what we do, and then hopefully we make better informed discussion and decisions here. Going back to Lesa’s questions, I don’t know and I don’t want to offend anyone because I do not know everyone. But, from my circle of acquaintances, the former Vice Chancellor Jeff Anderson is probably the person with the most broadest illustrative experience, not only because of his service previously, but also because he is very active. He goes to a lot of institutions. So, I asked him, what are the deliberative practices of other campuses? According to him, there is a wide spectrum. But there are no best practices, according to him. Thank you.

D. Kaiser: I was going to bring up exactly what you said. It would be great to just go in and figure out what everyone thinks. I think it would be nice. I think it would be nice to have in writing exactly what we are voting for. There have been times that I found out later that I wasn’t voting for what I thought I was. And I think that would be less likely to occur if we had in writing, “okay, we are voting on this, and this is what that vote means.” And I don’t think we should be rushed.

J. Malanson: I feel awkward saying we should rush this conversation. We are kind of running out of time. We need time to do the other things we have planned for the meeting. So, let’s kind of do this quickly.

A. Livschiz: As I was listening to the comments, the thing that came to mind, and I am actually surprised that I as a historian am bringing this up and not a political

scientist, isn't this the problem of representative democracy? I mean, we have convocations, and assemblies, and Senate, and committees. The whole point is to break up responsibilities between different bodies because we can't make all decisions in totality. So, the point of having this is so we can get things done without having to poll every single issue for every single person on campus. So, in a sense, the question is really about, is representative democracy a good idea or not?

J. Niser: I would like to speak in favor of the West Lafayette system. I lived it for a long time. I really think it makes a lot of sense to have voting separately. And then with the click of a button you can vote, which makes it really quick. So, when you go to vote on something it is very quickly done because there is a session when you are voting and you are just voting on it. With the click of a button it is done. It really separates time for reflection, which I think is very important.

M. Wolf: I have a question on athletics. Will you be putting out reports? The consultant report. Could Josh post them? Can those be put into the minutes?

J. Malanson: I have been told the consultant report cannot be distributed. It has to be behind a firewall. So, that can't be shared, unless the administration changes its decision on it. The Athletics Working Group report is on the website.

#### b. Peer institutions

J. Malanson: So, there are questions raised about the peer institution list on the AAUP listserv that both the Executive Committee and the administration wanted to take some time and talk about here. So, I am going to provide a very quick overview of the process we used to come up with the list and the specific purposes we saw that list serving. And then, I don't think Irah is here, so we will move on. I will super quickly walk through what the peer list looks like.

Earlier this semester the faculty leaders were invited to a meeting with the former Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, and other administrators for conversations about the development of a peer institution list or lists. Our Director of Institutional Research, Irah Modry-Caron, has developed a tool that allows us to easily create customizable data to form peer lists based on twenty-three potential variables related primarily to student population. I left this first big meeting with three expectations.

First, a subgroup composed of myself, Andy Downs, Cynthia Springer, Kirk Tolliver, and Irah Modry-Caron would develop a list of IPFW's literal peers. Those institutions that are most like how IPFW is right now, and what we expect PFW will be next year. I will talk more about how we went about doing this in a moment, but our expectation was that this would be a short term list used for limited purposes. That it would be supplemented with an aspirational list, and replaced when IPFW begins a new round of strategic planning in the next one to three years.

Second, is that while we are creating a literal peer list for the university, that departments, college, and other units on campus would be given access to Irah's tool so that they could develop customized peer lists more useful for their own self-study strategic planning, accreditation, and other purposes. The institutional list is not intended to be a one-size fits all must be used for everything list the way the previous peer institution lists potentially were.

Third, there will be a second process run to develop an aspirational peer list for the university. That process will require broad based input regarding institutional values and priorities.

So, due to the data gathered by the tool, the subgroup that gathered to develop the literal peer list decided as a primary criteria in defining our peers for the purposes of this list would be those public institutions with student populations most similar to IPFW's, and as I said what we would expect PFW's student population to be. The peer list from a decade ago compared IPFW to much larger institutions. And because for many years we included dual-credit students in our enrollment counts, we have grown accustomed to thinking of IPFW as a much larger institution than it is quickly becoming. We thought that there would be value in developing a new peer list that compares us to schools with similar populations so that we could see what these kind of institutions look like in terms of budget, staffing levels, student success measures, and other factors.

Without getting too much into the nitty gritty, we used the tool to produce a list of twenty-four potential peers. The twenty-four schools that had student populations most similar to IPFW's, based on the data that is available in the tool. Three of those twenty-four institutions were Indiana universities, and the group decided to put those three on our final peer list so that we would have some local, as well as national, peers.

The group then used additional data points to further narrow down the list. For example, we eliminated rural institutions. We put a cap on the percentage of health sciences degrees conferred, given that we won't have health sciences programs as of next year. We put a cap on the percentage of students living on campus. We did a couple of other things as well. The goal of all of this was to further refine the national peers to find those institutions that were closest to our student population. In the end, we produced a list of nine peers.

The announcement that went out to campus clearly laid out the specific selection criteria we utilized, but did not do a good enough job of explaining the rationale we used to choose those criteria or the goals of producing a list of this nature. Andy and I take responsibility for this. We had the opportunity to weigh in on the announcement, but failed to think about the legitimate confusion that could surround a list like this. I am not saying that a more complete announcement would have addressed everyone's legitimate concerns, but would have at least clarified what everyone was and was not looking at.

So, this is the peer list and I just want to show you the volume of data points that went in to trying to define who is most like us. There are all these different variables that were utilized by this tool, comparing us to a database of over 600 public institutions in the United States. Irah, at some point next semester, will make the tool available to the campus community. At that point, I am sure he would be happy to walk everyone through it and answer whatever questions you have. Chancellor Elsenbaumer wants to talk to us about an aspirational peer institution list.

R. Elsenbaumer: Thank you so much. I am going to apologize right off the bat. I am a little less formal than what you guys are familiar with here in the Faculty Senate, but I do want to thank you and appreciate you for allowing me to have a few minutes to talk to you about aspirational peers, and really about something that is more broad than just this particular exercise. In fact, I found out about the peer institutional exercise maybe two weeks after I came. I have to tell you, I am very impressed with what I learned about what went in to doing this. I was very impressed with the thoughtful input that Abe, Andy, and Jeff put into this from the faculty perspective. They were asking about the metrics and why they are important, and what will really represent our institution. I appreciate very much the thoughtfulness that went into this. But, it got me to thinking about the other exercises and activities that we as an institution will be going through in the not too distant future, and I want to come in front of you today to make you aware of these, as well as engaging you in discussion. Not necessarily today, but discussions in this body about how we can best approach these kind of activities that are going to be so important for our institution. And just let me highlight a few of these.

We all know that HLC reaccreditation is coming up in 2020. That is our next 10 year reaccreditation. There is an activity that has to occur on this campus to get us prepared for that, and I know that Kent Johnson and a variety of committees have already been put together to help with that process. Everyone in this room, I hope, knows I have done this twice in the previous institution. It is critical to get every corner of the institution in some way involved and engaged in this process. It doesn't have to mean every meeting. But, there has to be some input, and that has to be evident through the committees and the committee structure. So, I want to make everyone aware of that.

There are other activities that will be occurring that lead up to and are important in feeding this reaccreditation process. One, of course, is the strategic plan. I think our strategic plan right now goes to 2020. Well, that is exactly in line, and it is supposed to be in line, with the reaccreditation process. But, we are going to need a new plan for 2020 and 2030. That process will be taking place in the not too distant future. The other one is identifying aspirational peers. A process that was used much like this process, but with a slightly different twist. And that is looking at who we want to become. What are the important parameters that will define us? That is when you require input from a lot of people. There will be a lot of debate about that process and what those parameters are going to be. You are the ones that we are going to be looking to, you and your colleagues in the academic environment here, to help us

shape what those parameters will be to identify our aspirational peers. And then most eminent is going to be branding of our institution as Purdue Fort Wayne. Now, I don't think it has escaped anyone in this room, all of these activities are interrelated. What we have learned throughout each one of these processes is going to be incredibly important for shaping thought for the next process. So, the branding process, which will be taking place very soon, it will engage everyone across campus that wants to get involved in that process. And you will start hearing about the other elements that will come out about what are we and what do we want to be, and what do we want people to know about what we will become. And that is what the aspirational peer list will decide as well. And then all that comes together and that starts to formulate our strategic plan. And then how that strategic plan is rolled out will help us with our next years of activity in continuing improvement for 2020 and 2030, and through that next accreditation cycle. So, I have already taken more time than I was allotted, but I did want to have this opportunity just to start this discussion. What I am asking for is your input on how we best approach all of these activities, and I would like that to come through the Senate and I would like to get recommendations from our faculty leaders about how we might best do this on our campus.

L. Wright-Bower: Our present strategic plan was developed for IPFW. Is it not appropriate to have an interim plan for Purdue Fort Wayne? Can we adjust it in some way? Because it doesn't seem like it would be applicable.

R. Elsenbaumer: I think we are required to have a strategic plan for the next 10 years. 2020. 2030. That is for you to dispute. You need to have those discussions. Good point.

L. Wright-Bower: Thank you. But, it seems necessary.

R. Elsenbaumer: Well, that is a good point for discussion.

J. Malanson: Before we move on with the agenda, I wanted to quickly see if anyone had any questions about my comments earlier about the development of this list.

A. Livschiz: I just wanted to make sure I understood. So, one of the things that we are encouraged to do as departments is to use this data to come up with our own list. Might this be a little chaotic if every department comes up with their own list of peers and tries to use that information to try to advocate for resources? I mean, why else would you do it, except to advocate for resources?

J. Malanson: We are not advocating that every department just go out and create a list for their own purposes. For example, if a department is engaged in program review and they find that the university list is not applicable, then in that circumstance it would make sense to use the tool to make a more appropriate list for your department. So, we are not saying that every single person needs their own individualized peer list, but the idea is that if this peer list is not going to suit your needs for one reason or another, then we want to make the tool available for you to do that.

A. Argast: Just to be sure. So, we developed our peer list without any consideration of the mission statement of the university?

A. Downs: We started with 644 universities and looked at the available variables and began tweaking them. So, there is no discussion about the mission in part because we didn't know the mission of all 644 that were including.

J. Malanson: This was a different kind of peer list than the process that was engaged in before. The goal here was to be data informed, and the effort here was to create a list that closely fit what the student population was. And to a certain extent to better understand what schools that have similar student populations to what we have, what do those schools look like?

B. Buldt: I appreciate all of the work. I do. I asked Irah to send me the tool. I played with it. Great. So, there is a lot of potential. I have one question at this point though. This list was developed for a specific purpose, to study the question of whether we suffer from administrative bloat or not.

J. Malanson: This list was developed for the purposes of creating the peer institution list and faculty leaders used the peer institution list that was developed as the foundation for that step. This list wasn't developed for the purposes of doing the administrative study. If you recall, we started the process with a different peer list, and that was the list we were going to use. I was actually hoping to get that process done before this list was created. So, that we wouldn't have to do redo all of the analysis. But, that we finished this list in enough time that it made sense to use this list as the foundation.

B. Buldt: I still have a question though. So, I am a smoker and I want to study the health effects of smoking, and I look at peers and they all smoke. This is not a representative sample, right? So, we have assembled a list of colleges that are very, very similar to us in terms of student population. What is the argument that this is representative when it comes to administrative bloat?

A. Downs: Part of the issue is that whenever we have had discussions about administrative bloat we have only looked internally, and we have chosen years at random to say that is the year to which we will compare ourselves, with no acknowledgement about if that year was a good year or bad year. This is a way to look externally, which is part of what the administrative and faculty leadership thought would be a good idea. To take a look at what other institutions were doing. We could have chosen to look at rural institutions. We could have done a sample of universities. But, then there would have been variables that there would have been a rebuttal of. It is not perfect. In fact, the list that Jeff was given as a first comparison list did not include these schools. They are not included in this list. So, we can slice and dice it in many ways. This one is one of the more comprehensive and a better representation of IPFW than other lists we have basically ever used in IPFW's history in terms of student population.

J. Malanson: I would also argue that if the goal is to understand what academic structures and administrative structures we need to support student populations of different sizes then starting with finding the institutions with similar student populations becomes a useful way of understanding if we have more administration than we need or less administration than we need to effectively administer the student population we are serving. But, what you are really asking about is the administrative bloat, which is later on the agenda. You are not asking about the actual peer institution list. So, I am happy to answer more questions about the administrative study later in the agenda.

B. Boatright: What allocations do you see this list being used for? And how often is such a list typically revised?

J. Malanson: So, I would say, I know HR is potentially interested in using a list like this in terms of evaluating salary structures on campus. I can't immediately speak to whatever administrative units might use it for. I know for my department we have not done anything with a peer list since we did a program review back in 2012. But, what I would say is that at a minimum it will be supplemented with an aspirational list whenever such a list is created, or potentially replaced with more official lists when administration updates it. There is no reason you could not run a similar process every year when the data is annually updated.

L. Vartanian: In order to have significant variation for year to year, wouldn't that imply that in any particular year that comparisons are of somewhat questionable utility?

J. Malanson: The data is a three-year rolling average. So, you would expect less year to year volatility. But, yeah, this is the first practice, and we don't know what the peer list will look like next year. But, what we need to keep in mind is that if our enrollment continues to drop, or if our enrollment goes up significantly, the way we would need to define our peers would also. So, part of it is that it is a peer list relevant to what IPFW is at that point in time. So, as IPFW changes so too will the list.

L. Vartanian: Sure. But, if I understand correctly, the way that this will be used is to direct those changes. So, while that process takes place, and then the changes are implemented based on these comparisons, that could be shifting as well. So, I guess what Andy said, you know, what we have historically done is work inward, I think that is the way to answer the question about whether our structures have expanded in one building or not. It is an example of how this is thought to be deployed, and it sounds to me a little bit like modeling a data set. If we consider ourselves a data set, essentially. And there are a lot of data points and a lot of variables, and my concern is that it is an over specified model. I appreciate the effort that goes into it and I like it being data driven.

A. Schwab: My understanding of the use of this is that it is not fully defined directives coming out of the list. But, that instead, the list provides context with which we can then make valued judgements about other particular circumstances. And so it doesn't provide us with the obvious directives, but instead provides us with some background, with which we should then make particular judgements based upon our particular situation and what is unique about us. And so in that way I agree that it is a modeling of data, but it is just a starting point, not an ending point. That is how I understood it to be used, and I think that is important to keep in mind.

D. Kaiser: Were things like overall graduation rate included?

J. Malanson: So, the way the tool works, it takes IPFW and compares IPFW's data to other school's data in the list. So, with our 24% graduation rate we said do that and then it would bring in schools as close as possible to IPFW's graduation rate. Actually, if the goal is to understand student population, you don't want to compare to performance, you want to see what the student population is. So, the graduation rate and retention rate are in the database. They were not used as initial points for comparison.

D. Kaiser: It seems like it would be better to choose success rate. I think if we are making comparisons between two institutions it would be better to use success rate.

J. Malanson: We have to start moving this forward.

A. Ushenko: I only ask to be informed. Has the tool only been used so far to consider the issue of administrative bloat?

J. Malanson: The only thing I have been involved in so far is the administrative bloat study.

A.Ushenko: Thank you.

7. Committee reports requiring action: There were no committee reports requiring action.

8. Question Time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 17-14) – J. Badia

On Friday, November 24, the JG reported that Purdue would begin a new program (called the Boiler Affordability Grant) that will cover "last dollar" tuition needs for families earning up to \$70,000 per year. The paper also reported that the grant would only be available to West Lafayette students. Is it true that students at Fort Wayne are excluded, and if so, does our administration intend to advocate for their inclusion in the grant?



C. Drummond: So the answers are yes. Fort Wayne is excluded. This is a West Lafayette program. Do we intend to advocate for our inclusion? No, but we are in the process of developing our own grants, and finding a way to fund them. So, this is a topic of great concern here. Our students occasionally find themselves, due to a variety of circumstances, sometimes running out of aid as they near the end of their academic career. And so our ability to bridge that is a key plan for financial aid strategy.

A. Downs: Did we not have a program a few years ago?

C. Drummond: We had twice repeated one-time offers.

b. (Senate Reference No. 17-15) – A. Livschiz

In recent years, a pattern has emerged: there comes a point when enrollments are deemed to be not high enough for the next semester. Lists of unregistered students are generated, and then university employees are made to call unregistered students to get them to register. Because these calls are done centrally, this approach fails to take into account the work departments do in student outreach, including paying attention to the specific situations for some of the students, who may be in a situation where such calls are counterproductive. Is there any evidence that this is an effective strategy? Is there any way that departments can put their students on a “do not call” list?

C. Drummond: Okay. So, thank you for the question, and hopefully it is not perceived as oppressive. Our goal is to make sure that we communicate with students in semesters where they are currently enrolled, but not registered for the following semester in order to identify if there are barriers to their registration. So, we have done that in a variety of ways, but there is no central calling function. These are all at the college or department level to undergo those kinds of communications. I guess the silly answer is the best way to stop all of this is to register, and then you will not be on the list. But, for those students that find this troublesome, I apologize. But, we are trying to help them and identify those things that are central barriers. If a student requests that they not be contacted again I would certainly hope that whatever advising unit or department that is making those calls would no longer do it.

A. Livschiz: The reason that I ask this question is because I know for a fact that there are times when the calls are made not at the department level, not at the college level, but coming out of Kettler. Student Transitions and so on. And there is no effort made to check with departments to see if they know of circumstances.

c. (Senate Reference No. 17-16) – A. Livschiz

In one of the emails about the selection of “peer institutions” and the fact that Athletics was asked to select its own peers, it was stated that “many institutions use

two models—one for the university and one for Athletics.” How common is this, i.e. can “many” be quantified?

D. Wesse: This question, with quotes from an email on the AAUP list-serve, does not seem to fully consider how this listing is being used. Athletics’ peer group listing is a benchmarking listing used to compare how our Athletic program is performing relative to similar programs that are classified as Division I. Many schools, that are of similar size, fielding similar sports and geographic locations use their Conference members as benchmarks. The Big Ten and SEC are examples of this.

This type of conference comparison is difficult within the Summit League given the varying size, geographic location, and other characteristics of the Universities in the league. In addition, there are many schools in the Summit League that participate in football, which drastically impacts the ability for comparable benchmarks.

There was no intent to imply that this benchmark was an equivalent tool to any institutional list at the campus level, but believe that two (or more) benchmark lists, measuring different objectives, can co-exist on campus. The Athletics’ listing was in existence prior to the peer institution project this summer, not in response to, or concurrent with, that effort. In addition, Athletics, using this benchmark and/or other tools, can assist Senate members in helping to establish or improve the requirements of SD 17-2.

#### Senate Document 17-2

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Senate delegates the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) and the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) to formally evaluate the Athletics Working Group report and to develop specific measures in response to question 2; specifically, SAC shall develop measures related to student performance, and URPC shall develop measures related to financial performance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the measures developed by SAC and URPC shall be submitted to the Senate no later than the November Senate meeting.

9. New business: There was no new business.
10. Committee reports “for information only”:
  - a. Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Senate Reference No. 17-13) – J. Malanson  
Senate Reference No. 17-13 (Report on Administrative Staffing and Budgeting) was presented for information only.
11. The general good and welfare of the University: There was no general good and welfare.

12. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

Joshua S. Bacon  
Secretary of the Faculty

Question Time

On Friday, November 24, the JG reported that Purdue would begin a new program (called the Boiler Affordability Grant) that will cover "last dollar" tuition needs for families earning up to \$70,000 per year. The paper also reported that the grant would only be available to West Lafayette students. Is it true that students at Fort Wayne are excluded, and if so, does our administration intend to advocate for their inclusion in the grant?

J. Badia

Question Time

In recent years, a pattern has emerged: there comes a point when enrollments are deemed to be not high enough for the next semester. Lists of unregistered students are generated, and then university employees are made to call unregistered students to get them to register. Because these calls are done centrally, this approach fails to take into account the work departments do in student outreach, including paying attention to the specific situations for some of the students, who may be in a situation where such calls are counterproductive. Is there any evidence that this is an effective strategy? Is there any way that departments can put their students on a “do not call” list?

A. Livschiz

Question Time

In one of the emails about the selection of “peer institutions” and the fact that Athletics was asked to select its own peers, it was stated that “many institutions use two models—one for the university and one for Athletics.” How common is this, i.e. can “many” be quantified?

A. Livschiz

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Jeffrey Malanson, Presiding Officer, Fort Wayne Senate  
Andrew Downs, Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty  
Abe Schwab, Speaker of the Purdue University Faculty

DATE: December 1, 2017

SUBJ: Report on Administrative Staffing and Budgeting

---

WHEREAS, The faculty leaders conducted a study of administrative staffing and budgeting; and

WHEREAS, The faculty leaders provided faculty with several opportunities to provide feedback and ask questions about the data used and the conclusions recommended in the report, and much of this feedback was incorporated into the final report; and

WHEREAS, The central administration provided the faculty leaders with access to relevant data, and were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the final report in order to ensure the accuracy of its information and to comment on its final recommendations;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the faculty leaders hereby submit the Report on Administrative Staffing and Budgeting, as well as the supporting data, to the Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the faculty leaders will also submit the Report and data to the central administration, with the sincere hope and expectation that the administration will take seriously its recommendations and will act upon them; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the faculty leaders thank all members of the faculty and administration who helped in the preparation of the report and provided feedback on the data and preliminary report.

## **Report on Administrative Staffing and Budgeting**

Prepared by Jeffrey Malanson (Presiding Officer, Fort Wayne Senate), Andrew Downs (Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty), and Abe Schwab (Speaker of the Purdue University Faculty)

This report is divided into four sections:

Background	1
Data Overview	2
Analysis	7
Conclusions and Recommendations	14

### **Background**

For many years, there has been a discourse on campus that IPFW suffers from administrative bloat—that IPFW is over-invested in administration and under-invested in academics.<sup>1</sup> Many attempts to investigate this discourse have focused on changing staffing levels over time, however, these comparisons presume that IPFW was optimally staffed and/or budgeted at some particular point in its history; it assumes that at some point in the past IPFW’s budget and employee distribution was rationally determined. There is no evidence that this has ever been the case. This historical data also fails to fully consider how IPFW’s student population has changed over time, what administrative and student support services have been added or subtracted, or how individual employees’ job responsibilities and titles have evolved.<sup>2</sup> Thus, while the historical data can reveal the rates of growth and decline in administrative and faculty ranks, the data is not automatically meaningful, especially when trying to develop recommendations for how to move forward.

This study has taken a two-pronged approach to understanding administrative staffing and budgeting. The first prong was to develop a comprehensive view of IPFW’s current administrative structure, investment, and staffing levels. A dataset based on IPFW’s fiscal year 2018 (the 2017-18 academic year, hereafter referred to as FY18) budget, as well as the Salary Distribution Report for FY18, upon which the budget was constructed, were combined to create a single dataset documenting all General Fund expenses and all IPFW employees, regardless of source of funding.<sup>3</sup>

The second prong was to develop data that would enable us to contextualize IPFW’s staffing and budgeting relative to a group of peer institutions. In order to accomplish this contextualization based upon a consistent dataset, we utilized data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The great benefit of IPEDS data is that all institutions report the same data and follow standard reporting practices in doing so. While there are undoubtedly going to be some inconsistencies between institutions in how data is reported, IPEDS provides data that can reliably be compared across institutions. The primary drawback of IPEDS data is that it is one to three years old. Given how quickly and significantly our student and employee populations have

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this study, “administration” includes all university functions outside of academic departments and colleges/schools.

<sup>2</sup> When assessing changes in the student population, it is important to consider not just the size of the student population, but also demographics, preparation levels, and other factors.

<sup>3</sup> This study focuses on the General Fund budget because it is generally only General Fund dollars that can easily be reallocated to support various university activities. Restricted and Auxiliary funds are limited in their uses, and generally cannot be reallocated to support General Fund activities.



changed in recent years, some of the IPEDS data does not necessarily accurately reflect IPFW as it exists in Fall 2017. At the same time, contextualized data from our recent past still enables us to better understand our current data.

### **Data Overview**

This section explains the primary data sources and terminology used in those sources to allow for a more streamlined discussion in the remainder of the report. It also seeks to clarify IPEDS data that is aggregated and reported in ways that does not necessarily accurately reflect IPFW's situation.

This report consists of two primary datasets: (1) FY18 Expenses and Headcount, and (2) the IPEDS Data Comparison. In both datasets, information about faculty, instructional costs, and academic units are included, even though the primary focus of this report is administration.

#### FY18 Expenses and Headcount<sup>4</sup>

As indicated, the FY18 Expenses and Headcount dataset is a combination of data from the FY18 Budget and the FY18 Salary Distribution Report. The Salary Distribution Report was prepared in Spring 2017, so does not reflect promotions, raises, new hires, or staffing changes that took place during Summer 2017 or after. Using Spring 2017 data in the Salary Distribution Report aligns perfectly with the Budget, though, greatly enhancing our ability to accurately align employees and their salaries with the appropriate cost centers in the Budget.

The Expenses and Headcount dataset utilizes the expense categories included in the Budget (with all expenses beyond Salaries and Wages and Fringe Benefits being aggregated as "All Other Expenses") and the employee categories included in the Salary Distribution Report (with Continuing Lecturers being split out from the original "A/P & Cont Lect" category [Administrative/Professional & Continuing Lecturers]). This dataset also utilizes employee Full Time Equivalency (FTE) rather than a strict headcount in order to track both full-time and part-time employees in a manner that more accurately reflects actual staffing levels.<sup>5</sup>

A few things to note about how the Salary Distribution Report is organized:

- Academic Deans are counted as faculty even though 100% of their workload is generally administration.
- Generally speaking, all Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs are counted as Professors, even if they actually hold the rank of Associate or Assistant Professor.
- Some employees appear multiple times. There are two primary causes for this:
  - Due to specific job responsibilities, funding sources in the case of endowed chairs, and other administrative or organizational considerations, some employees

---

<sup>4</sup> The data referred to in this section can be found in the accompanying "Administration Study – Expenses and Headcount" Excel workbook.

<sup>5</sup> It is important to note that employee FTE and faculty workload FTE are two distinct measures, only the former of which is reflected in the Expenses and Headcount data. Most tenure-line faculty at IPFW have a workload of 0.75 FTE teaching and 0.25 FTE research. Department Chairs and others receive administrative release time that further changes their FTE mix. Regardless of workload measures, in all cases faculty are reflected as being 1.00 FTE faculty.

are paid out of two or more cost centers, and/or have their employee FTE recorded in two or more units.

- Continuing Lecturers paid by the Division of Continuing Studies have their employee FTE recorded in their home academic departments, but their salaries are recorded in the DCS budget.
- In many cases, reported Salaries and Wages for part-time instruction include an employee FTE in the “Not Assigned” category. These FTE entries are required placeholders for the budget development process, and do not necessarily reflect an accurate representation of how those funds will be utilized.<sup>6</sup>
- In general, Graduate and Student Salaries and Wages data is not accompanied by employee FTE information.
- At this time, four employees totaling 2.93 FTE appearing in the Salary Distribution Report do not appear in the main body of the Headcount and Expenses dataset because their Salaries and Wages information could not be aligned with a particular cost center in the budget.

The Salary Distribution Report includes information on all IPFW employees, regardless of if they are paid through the General Fund, non-General Fund cost centers, or through external grants or fundraising. All employees included in the Salary Distribution Report are reflected in the Headcount and Expenses dataset, but only those employees paid through the General Fund have associated Salaries and Wages, Fringe Benefits, and All Other Expenses reflected.

Finally, the FY18 Budget data used in this study was from the beginning of the fiscal year and does not reflect any adjustments that have been made based on reduced enrollments and revenues.

#### IPEDS Data Comparison<sup>7</sup>

The goal of the data comparison is to benchmark IPFW’s data against a set of peer institutions in order to better understand what IPFW’s data actually means. In Fall 2017, a new set of peer institutions was established for IPFW/PFW utilizing a tool developed by Irah Modry-Caron, IPFW’s Director of Institutional Research. The peer group used in this study is as follows:

1. Colorado State University-Pueblo (Pueblo, Colorado)
2. Columbus State University (Columbus, Georgia)
3. Dixie State University (Saint George, Utah)
4. Farmingdale State College (Farmingdale, New York)
5. Indiana University-South Bend (South Bend, Indiana)
6. Purdue University-Calumet/Purdue University Northwest (Hammond, Indiana)<sup>8</sup>
7. University of Colorado Colorado Springs (Colorado Springs, Colorado)

---

<sup>6</sup> At least in part, this approach is necessary because Limited Term Lecturers work on semester contracts, and are thus not under contract for the next fiscal year when the budget is developed.

<sup>7</sup> The data referred to in this section can be found in the accompanying “Administration Study – IPEDS Data Comparison” Excel workbook.

<sup>8</sup> The IPEDS data utilized to develop the peer institution list still reflects two separate Purdue campuses at Calumet and North Central; when IPEDS merges the institutions to reflect Purdue University Northwest, the peer list will also be updated.

8. University of Southern Indiana (Evansville, Indiana)
9. University of Southern Maine (Portland, Maine)

For each of these institutions, as well as for IPFW, the following IPEDS reports were utilized (with data year in parentheses—in all cases this was the most recently available data):

- Fall Enrollment (2015)
- Graduation Rate (Fall 2010 Cohort of students who graduated within 150% of normal time, or six years, by Summer 2016)
- Human Resources (2015-16)
- Finance (2014-15)

For each IPEDS report, information potentially relevant to this study was recorded for each university, with summary and focused analysis undertaken from there.

While a great deal of the discussion of specific data can be found in the Analysis section below, there are three important clarifying points that should be fully considered here.

*FTE, % of Total, Per FTE, FTE Per*

Looking at a student, faculty, or staff headcount in isolation, or comparing raw expenses across universities, can provide a misleading picture of staffing and budgeting levels. To control for this, much of the IPEDS data is reported in two or three ways:

- Original, or raw, reported numbers;
- As a percent of the total expense budget or employee count;
- As an expense per FTE student;<sup>9</sup>
- As a headcount of FTE students per employee.

In all cases, the goal is to make the data more easily comparable across institutions. For example:

Uni. A: \$100 million budget—\$50 million on Instruction (50%)—10,000 students (\$5,000/FTE)  
 Uni. B: \$200 million budget—\$70 million on Instruction (35%)—15,000 students (\$4,667/FTE)

University B spends more on Instruction than University A, but University A spends a higher percentage of its overall budget and more per FTE student on Instruction than does University B.

*Expenses by Functional and Natural Classification*

The IPEDS Finance report separates university expenses into twelve categories by function—with brief definitions adapted from the IPEDS glossary:

- **Instruction**—A functional expense category that includes expenses of the colleges, schools, departments, and other instructional divisions of the institution and expenses for departmental research and public service that are not separately budgeted. Includes general academic instruction, occupational and vocational instruction, community education, preparatory and adult basic education, and regular, special, and

---

<sup>9</sup> IPEDS calculates a 12-month FTE student population that considers the number of full-time and part-time undergraduate and graduate students, as well as instructional activity that takes place over the course of the year. This calculation thus controls for different student population mixes, as well as universities that operate on different calendars (semester, trimesters, quarters, etc.).

extension sessions. Also includes expenses for both credit and non-credit activities. Excludes expenses for academic administration where the primary function is administration (e.g., academic deans).

- **Research**—A functional expense category that includes expenses for activities specifically organized to produce research outcomes and commissioned by an agency either external to the institution or separately budgeted by an organizational unit within the institution. The category includes institutes and research centers, and individual and project research. This function does not include nonresearch sponsored programs (e.g., training programs).
- **Public Service**—A functional expense category that includes expenses for activities established primarily to provide noninstructional services beneficial to individuals and groups external to the institution. Examples are conferences, institutes, general advisory service, reference bureaus, and similar services provided to particular sectors of the community. This function includes expenses for community services, cooperative extension services, and public broadcasting services.
- **Academic Support**—Includes expenses of activities and services that support the institution's primary missions of instruction, research, and public service, including organized activities that provide support services to the academic functions of the institution (such as a demonstration school associated with a college of education or veterinary and dental clinics if their primary purpose is to support the instructional program); academic administration (including academic deans but not department chairpersons); and formally organized and separately budgeted academic personnel development and course and curriculum development expenses; among other things.
- **Student Services**—A functional expense category that includes expenses for admissions, registrar activities, and activities whose primary purpose is to contribute to students emotional and physical well-being and to their intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. Examples include student activities, cultural events, student newspapers, intramural athletics, student organizations, supplemental instruction outside the normal administration, and student records. Intercollegiate athletics and student health services may also be included except when operated as self-supporting auxiliary enterprises.
- **Institutional Support**—A functional expense category that includes expenses for the day-to-day operational support of the institution. Includes expenses for general administrative services, central executive-level activities concerned with management and long range planning, legal and fiscal operations, space management, employee personnel and records, logistical services such as purchasing and printing, and public relations and development.
- **Operation and Maintenance of Plant**—An expense category that includes expenses for operations established to provide service and maintenance related to campus grounds and facilities used for educational and general purposes. Specific expenses include utilities, fire protection, property insurance, and similar items. This expense does include amounts charged to auxiliary enterprises, hospitals, and independent operations.
- **Scholarships and fellowships expenses, excluding discounts and allowances**—That portion of scholarships and fellowships granted that exceeds the amount applied to institutional charges such as tuition and fees or room and board. The amount reported as expense excludes allowances and discounts.
- **Auxiliary Enterprises**—Expenses for essentially self-supporting operations of the institution that exist to furnish a service to students, faculty, or staff, and that charge a fee that is directly related to, although not necessarily equal to, the cost of the service. Examples are residence halls, food services, student health services, intercollegiate athletics (only if essentially self-supporting), college unions, college stores, faculty and staff parking, and faculty housing.
- **Hospital Services**—Expenses associated with a hospital operated by the postsecondary institution (but not as a component unit) and reported as a part of the institution.
- **Independent Operations**—Expenses associated with operations that are independent of or unrelated to the primary missions of the institution (i.e., instruction, research, public service) although they may contribute indirectly to the enhancement of these programs. This category is generally limited to expenses of a major federally funded research and development center.
- **Other Expenses and Deductions**

These functional categories provide a high-level overview of how an institution allocates its resources.

Each of these categories is also divided into six sub-categories, referred to as natural classifications in the IPEDS data:

- **Salaries and wages**—Amounts paid as compensation for services to all employees - faculty, staff, part-time, full-time, regular employees, and student employees. This includes regular or periodic payment to a person for the regular or periodic performance of work or a service and payment to a person for more sporadic performance of work or a service (overtime, extra compensation, summer compensation, bonuses, sick or annual leave, etc.).
- **Employee fringe benefits**—Cash contributions in the form of supplementary or deferred compensation other than salary. Excludes the employee's contribution. Employee fringe benefits include retirement plans, social security taxes, medical/dental plans, guaranteed disability income protection plans, tuition plans, housing plans, unemployment compensation plans, group life insurance plans, worker's compensation plans, and other benefits in-kind with cash options.
- **Operation and maintenance of plant**—The actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant connected to each expense category.
- **Depreciation**—The allocation or distribution of the cost of capital assets, less any salvage value, to expenses over the estimated useful life of the asset in a systematic and rational manner. Depreciation for the year is the amount of the allocation or distribution for the year involved.
- **Interest**—The price paid (or received) for the use of money over a period of time. Interest income is one component of investment income. Interest paid by the institution is interest expense.
- **All other**<sup>10</sup>

Seeing the broad functional expense categories broken down in this manner provides a better understanding of how an institution allocates its resources, and the degree to which plant, depreciation, and interest expenses potentially constrain institutional budgets.

#### *Instructional vs. Non-Instructional Staff*

IPEDS uses the term Instructional Staff rather than faculty, because not all people with faculty status are primarily engaged in instruction, and not all Instructional Staff have faculty status. In IPFW's Full-Time Instructional Staff numbers, those Not on Tenure Track are primarily visiting faculty, and those Without Faculty Status are primarily Continuing Lecturers.

Non-Instructional Staff can include employees who have faculty status because they spend a significant portion of their time engaged in non-instructional activities. Compared to the peer group used in this analysis, IPFW has a large number of Non-Instructional Staff with faculty status, with the result that IPEDS functionally under-reports our Instructional Staff. For example:

- IPEDS defines Public Service Staff as being Non-Instructional Staff, but in IPFW's case, a large percentage of our Clinical Faculty are classified as Public Service Staff.
- IPEDS uses a definition of Management Occupations that includes the following groups of employees at IPFW: central administration (the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Associate/Assistant Vice Chancellors), Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs. Other than central administration, everyone else in this list has

---

<sup>10</sup> "All Other" is not defined in the IPEDS glossary. In the context of IPFW's budget, All Other is primarily, though not exclusively, Supplies and Expenses.

faculty status, with the vast majority of Associate/Assistant Deans and Department Chairs continuing to teach 1-2 courses per semester.<sup>11</sup>

In order to get a more accurate picture of the mix between Instructional and Non-Instructional Staff, we can reallocate Public Service Staff, Management Occupations, and other Non-Instructional Staff with faculty status from Non-Instructional to Instructional.

### **Analysis**

This section will begin with a discussion of the IPEDS Data Comparison, as the conclusions drawn from this analysis will inform our discussion of the FY18 Headcount and Expenses.

#### IPEDS Data Comparison

In order to identify appropriate avenues for further investigation and analysis, we calculated the standard deviation for a variety of data points and decided to dig deeper into any data point with a standard deviation of +/- 1.00. It is important to note that these calculations are heavily influenced by the specific set of peer institutions against which IPFW is being compared; a different set of peer institutions would potentially result in different data points being identified for analysis, or the analysis producing different conclusions.

An important big-picture takeaway from this exercise is the degree to which each institution varies in its allocation of financial resources and the composition of its workforce.

#### *Expenses by Functional and Natural Classification*<sup>12</sup>

Standard deviations were calculated for the Percent of Total Expenses (“% of Total”) for each category, on a Per FTE Student (“Per FTE”) basis, and on a Per Full-Time Staff Member (“Per Full-Time Staff”) basis. The following discussion will focus on the % of Total calculations.<sup>13</sup>

#### **Instruction**

- Employee Fringe Benefits (-1.26 standard deviations). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group. This means that IPFW spent the smallest percentage of its total budget of any institution in the peer group on Employee Fringe Benefits in the area of Instruction. For more discussion of Employee Fringe Benefits, see Institutional Support.
- Depreciation (1.71). IPFW had the highest % of Total of the peer group. IPFW also had the largest raw dollar expenditure of the peer group.

#### **Public Service**

- All Other (1.66). IPFW had the highest % of Total of the peer group. Public Service expenses vary significantly across the peer group, ranging from \$0 to \$20,991,000.

---

<sup>11</sup> As indicated elsewhere, IPFW’s internal employee categories count Deans as faculty. Interestingly, in the functional expense classifications, IPEDS counts Deans’ salaries in the Academic Support category, and Department Chair salaries in the Instruction category.

<sup>12</sup> This data was primarily derived from the IPEDS Finance report (2014-15).

<sup>13</sup> There are 72 meaningful data points for each of the three sets of calculations. IPFW was +/- 1.00 standard deviations off on 14, 13, and 12 calculations, respectively, with the 13 and 12 being subsets of the 14 highlighted in the % of Total calculations.

IPFW's total of \$9,316,321 was the second largest raw total, but this was less than half of the largest.

### Student Services<sup>14</sup>

- All calculations were below the peer group mean. Only Depreciation (-0.57) and Interest (-0.38) were less than -1.00 standard deviations below the mean.
- Total Amount (-1.55). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group. IPFW spent 5.6% of its total expenses on Student Services; the mean Student Services expense of the peer group was 9.3%.
- Salaries and Wages (-1.31). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group.
- Employee Fringe Benefits (-1.04). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group. For more discussion of Employee Fringe Benefits, see Institutional Support.
- Operation and Maintenance of Plant (-1.32). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group.
- All Other (-1.12). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the Peer Group.

### Institutional Support

- All calculations (other than Interest [-0.44]) were above the peer group mean: Salaries and Wages (0.76), Operation and Maintenance of Plant (0.67), and All Other (0.95) were less than 1.00 standard deviations above the mean.
- Total Amount (1.70). IPFW had the highest % of Total of the peer group. IPFW also had the largest raw dollar expenditure of the peer group.
- Employee Fringe Benefits (2.07). IPFW had the highest % of Total of the peer group. IPFW also had the largest raw dollar expenditure of the peer group.
  - IPFW exhibited an odd pattern with regard to Employee Fringe Benefits that significantly contributes to how far above the peer group mean IPFW was in overall Institutional Support expenditures. In most functional expense categories, IPFW was below the peer group mean in Employee Fringe Benefits, but in the Institutional Support category, IPFW spent almost as much on Employee Fringe Benefits (\$7,983,696) as it did on Salaries and Wages (\$8,354,671). IPFW spent 95.6% as much on Employee Fringe Benefits as it did on Salaries and Wages. To put this in perspective, the average ratio for IPFW's peers (excluding IPFW from the calculation) was 50.9%, ranging from 28.9% to 82.7%. This pattern was replicated in prior years of IPEDS data, with IPFW consistently reporting Employee Fringe Benefits expenditures in the Institutional Support category that nearly matched (and in some years, exceed) Salaries and Wages expenditures.
  - The primary cause of this discrepancy appears to be how IPFW's Fee Remissions were historically counted in the IPEDS data, as a substantial portion of the Employee Fringe Benefits recorded in Institutional Support is actually Fee Remissions. Fee Remissions in the [2014-15 budget summary document](#) were \$5.7 million. Approximately \$4.5 million of the Fee Remissions was actually student scholarships, which thus greatly overstates the Employee Fringe Benefit total in

---

<sup>14</sup> Dixie State University (NCAA Division II) and the University of Southern Maine (NCAA Division III) budget their Intercollegiate Athletics programs in Student Services. All other institutions in the peer group, including IPFW, budget Athletics as an Auxiliary Enterprise.

Institutional Support. Removing the scholarships from the totals in the IPEDS data, IPFW's ratio of Employee Fringe Benefits to Salaries and Wages becomes 41.7%. The standard deviation for Employee Fringe Benefits also drops from 2.07 to 0.13; for Total Amount in Institutional Support, the standard deviation drops from 1.70 to 1.03.

- Depreciation (2.15). IPFW had the highest % of Total of the peer group. IPFW also had the largest raw dollar expenditure of the peer group.
- The large Employee Fringe Benefits and Depreciation expenses contribute significantly to how far above the peer group mean IPFW is in Institutional Support expenses.

### **Operation and Maintenance of Plant**

- All Other (-1.11). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group.
- Operation and Maintenance of Plant (0.81). While a positive standard deviation, this is because this category is reflected as a negative number in the finance report. IPFW spent 6.6% of its expenses on Operation and Maintenance of Plant, which was the third lowest % of Total of the peer group.

### **Auxiliary Enterprises<sup>15</sup>**

- All calculations other than Interest (see below) were below the peer group mean.
- Employee Fringe Benefits (-1.00). IPFW had the lowest % of Total of the peer group.
- Interest (2.34). IPFW had the highest % of Total of the peer group. On a raw dollar basis, IPFW's Interest in Auxiliary Enterprises (\$3,247,890) is almost 2.5x larger than our next closest peer. Interest in this category is largely attributable to construction on Student Housing, the Gates Sports Center, and the Athletics Center Fieldhouse. Interest in this functional expense category represents 63.8% of IPFW's total Interest expense.

### **Other Items of Note**

- Research. While none of the calculations met the +/- 1.00 standard deviation threshold, all calculations were below the peer group mean, ranging from -0.55 to -0.75 standard deviations below the mean.
- Academic Support. While none of the calculations met the +/- 1.00 threshold, all calculations (other than All Other [0.42]) were below the peer group mean, ranging from -0.48 to -0.85 standard deviations below the mean.
- Total Expenses and Deductions. While individual categories as discussed above exceeded the +/- 1.00 threshold, none of the Total calculations met the threshold. In Salaries and Wages (0.51), Depreciation (0.88), and Interest (0.35) IPFW was above the peer group mean; in Employee Fringe Benefits (-0.62) and All Other (-0.20) IPFW was below the peer group mean. Operation and Maintenance of Plant is reported both as a functional expense category and a natural expense category, meaning that expenses are distributed out to the other functional expense categories. As a result, in the reported Totals, Operation and Maintenance of Plant is \$0 and 0% of overall expenses.

---

<sup>15</sup> IPFW (NCAA Division I), Colorado State University-Pueblo (NCAA Division II), Columbus State University (NCAA Division II), Farmingdale State College (NCAA Division III), Indiana University-South Bend (NAIA), Purdue University-Calumet (NAIA), University of Colorado Colorado Springs (NCAA Division II), and the University of Southern Indiana (NCAA Division II) budget their Intercollegiate Athletics programs as Auxiliary Enterprises. Dixie State University and the University of Southern Maine budget Athletics in Student Services.



### *Full-Time Staff*<sup>16</sup>

As stated previously, the IPEDS Human Resources report divides staff into Instructional and Non-Instructional categories, based on job responsibilities. Standard deviations were calculated on the percent of total Instructional/Non-Instructional Staff within each category (% of I.S. and % of N.I.S.), on the percent of total staff (% of Total Staff), and on FTE student per Instructional Staff/Non-Instructional Staff (FTE per I.S. and FTE per N.I.S.). The following discussion will focus on the % of I.S. and % of N.I.S. calculations.<sup>17</sup>

This analysis only considers full-time staff.<sup>18</sup>

#### **Instructional Staff**

- Instructional Staff are reported in four categories: Tenured, On Tenure Track, Not on Tenure Track, and Without Faculty Status. While the first two categories are self-explanatory, at IPFW, Not on Tenure Track is generally visiting faculty, and Without Faculty Status is generally Continuing Lecturers. Usage of these categories varies by institution within IPFW's peer group, although IPFW was the only institution with more Instructional Staff Without Faculty Status than Not on Tenure Track. Six of IPFW's peers reported no Full-Time Instructional Staff Without Faculty Status.
- Not on Tenure Track (-1.68) and Without Faculty Status (2.24). The categorization of IPFW's Continuing Lecturers as Without Faculty Status skews these calculations, as Full-Time Instructional Staff who play a similar role at other institutions generally have faculty status. If these two categories are combined, IPFW was in line with its peer group.

#### **Non-Instructional Staff**

- Non-Instructional Staff are broken down into thirteen categories based on job responsibilities.<sup>19</sup> For eight of the categories, IPEDS distinguishes between Staff with faculty status and without faculty status. IPFW had the second highest percentage of Non-Instructional Staff with faculty status within the peer group.<sup>20</sup>
- As a general observation, the data reveals that there are significant variations in workforce allocation across institutions. In some cases, this is due to the distribution of administrative responsibilities within a university system, in others it can be influenced by the degree to which an institution provides services to the public, and in others it can be shaped by the core mission of the university.
- Public Service Staff (2.01). Many of IPFW's Clinical Faculty are counted as Public Service Staff in the IPEDS data, which accounts for why IPFW is so far above the peer

<sup>16</sup> This data was primarily derived from the IPEDS Human Resources report (2015-16).

<sup>17</sup> There are 21 meaningful data points for each of the three sets of calculations. IPFW was +/- 1.00 standard deviations off on 5, 5, and 4 calculations, respectively, with the two sets of 5 being consistent and the 4 being a subset of the 5 highlighted in the other two sets.

<sup>18</sup> Data on part-time staff is included in the "Administration Study – IPEDS Data Comparison" workbook.

<sup>19</sup> Occupational categories are defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics using their [Standard Occupational Classification](#).

<sup>20</sup> Excluding archivists, librarians, and library technicians from the calculations, 11.1% of IPFW's Non-Instructional Staff had faculty status. 11.6% of Columbus State University's Non-Instructional Staff had faculty status; other institutions ranged from 0% to 8.8%. IPFW had the largest raw number of Non-Instructional Staff with faculty status.

group mean. Also contributing to this result is the fact that six peer institutions report 0 Public Service Staff.

- Library and Student and Academic Affairs and Other Education Services Occupations (-1.31). IPFW has the lowest % of N.I.S. and the lowest raw number of N.I.S. in this category of the peer group. This generally aligns with the financial data previously discussed in this report.
- Management Occupations (-0.42). While this calculation does not meet the +/- 1.00 threshold, given the purpose of this study it does merit attention and contextualization. IPFW is below the peer group mean for Non-Instructional Staff in Management Occupations. The Management Occupations category in the IPEDS Human Resources report does not align with the Institutional Support category from the IPEDS Finance report. As the most obvious example of this, Department Chairs are counted as Management Occupations in the Human Resources report, but are counted in the Instruction category in the Finance report.
- Business and Financial Operations Occupations (1.59). IPFW had the second highest % of N.I.S. of the peer group, but the highest raw number of staff in this category of the peer group. As a % of N.I.S., IPFW was twice as large as the next institution on the list.
- IPFW was above the peer group mean for Computer, Engineering, and Science Occupations (0.51) and Production, Transportation, and Material Moving Occupations (0.91), but was below the peer group mean in the remaining seven categories.

### **Total Full-Time Staff**

- In addition to tracking staff in individual categories, IPEDS also provides totals for Instructional and Non-Instructional Staff. Using the data as IPEDS reports it, IPFW was below the peer group mean in Total Full-Time Instructional Staff (-0.76) and above the peer group mean in Total Full-Time Non-Instructional Staff (0.76).
- If Non-Instructional Staff with faculty status (excluding archivists, librarians, and library technicians) are reallocated from Non-Instructional Staff to Instructional Staff for all institutions, the restated calculations show IPFW to be slightly above the peer group mean in Total Full-Time Instructional Staff (0.11) and slightly below the peer group mean in Total Full-Time Non-Instructional Staff (-0.11).

### *IPEDS Data Comparison Conclusions*

Using the IPEDS data as stated, IPFW appears to be over-invested in Non-Instructional (hereinafter, administrative) expenses and personnel. While the restated Full-Time Instructional Staff vs. Full-Time Non-Instructional Staff data suggest that IPFW is in line with its peers in the distribution of resources between instruction and administration, the fact that IPFW expects such significant administrative contributions from faculty must be recognized.

It is also important to recognize the distribution of administrative personnel and expenses across university operations. Both the Finance and Human Resources data suggest that IPFW is over-invested in some administrative areas (especially Business and Financial Operations Occupations), while other university operations, especially Student Services and Support, are understaffed and under-resourced compared to our peers.

The relative under-investment in Student Services and Support is especially notable when considered in the context of the makeup of IPFW's student population. The Fall 2015 IPEDS Enrollment report indicates that 43.3% of IPFW's undergraduate student population was part-time. This was the largest percentage of part-time students in IPFW's peer group, and was 1.51 standard deviations above the mean. The expense per Student FTE calculations utilized in this report consider the full-time equivalent student population rather than raw headcount. While this is the most logical way of conducting the analysis (and the method that IPEDS uses to normalize comparisons across different kinds of institutions), in the area of Student Services and Support it is also important to consider the total number of students that are being served.<sup>21</sup>

### FY18 Expenses and Headcount

Much the same way the IPEDS Finance and Human Resources reports categorized people and expenses in different ways, IPFW's administrative structure does not align with either IPEDS report. For example, an academic Dean's salary and benefits are reflected in the Academic Support category of the IPEDS Finance report, in the Management Occupations category in the IPEDS Human Resources report, and as a faculty member of their college/school in the FY18 Expenses and Headcount data (hereinafter referred to as the FY18 Data). This requires us to be careful in the conclusions we draw about the FY18 Data based on what we have learned from the IPEDS data comparison.

Likewise, it is also important to remember that the IPEDS data is 2-3 years older than the FY18 Data and is generally compiled without regard to an institution's administrative structure. For example, Student Success and Transitions is located within Academic Affairs at IPFW, yet performs at least some tasks that would generally fall under Student Services and Support in the IPEDS reports. On a broader level, the IPEDS reports distinguish between Instructional activities and expenses and Non-Instructional activities and expenses, whereas the FY18 Data combines instructional and administrative activities and expenses within the college/school and department-level data.

### *Employee Fringe Benefits*

One of the more perplexing data points in the IPEDS data was Employee Fringe Benefits. As discussed previously, within the Institutional Support category, Employee Fringe Benefits were reported to be 95.6% of Salaries and Wages. This misalignment of Fringe Benefits does not appear in the FY18 Data. The ratio of Fringe Benefits to Salaries and Wages was calculated for each administrative and academic area, and the results range from 27.6% to 40.6%.<sup>22</sup>

### *Student Services and Support*

One of the major takeaways from the IPEDS data was the understaffing and resourcing of Student Services and Support relative to IPFW's peers. The FY18 Data supports this conclusion.

---

<sup>21</sup> Redoing the calculations on a per student, rather than a per FTE basis, IPFW spent less per student (\$613) than any other institution in the peer group (ranging from \$799 to \$2,200), with an average expenditure of \$1,267 per student.

<sup>22</sup> A variety of factors lead to the different Fringe Benefit-to-Salaries and Wages ratios for each academic and administrative area, including specific benefits selections, mix of employees at different salary levels, the number of benefitted part-time employees (who receive part-time salaries/wages but full-time benefits), etc. The Reserve and Other administrative area, which has no actual employees but instead contains two unfilled position reserves and a variety of reserve resources, had a Fringe Benefits-to-Salaries and Wages ratio of 91.5%.

Student Affairs comprises just 1.9% of IPFW’s headcount and 1.9% of IPFW’s expense budget for FY18. Even when one considers that some employees who provide student support services are accounted for in other parts of IPFW’s administrative structure, the fact remains that IPFW makes a comparably small investment in Student Services and Support relative to our peer group.

*Business and Financial Operations Occupations/Institutional Support*

The IPEDS data suggested that IPFW is overstaffed in Business and Financial Operations Occupations and overinvested in Institutional Support relative to our peers. The IPEDS data also suggested that IPFW was understaffed and underinvested in most other Non-Instructional areas. The FY18 Data confirms the second suggestion, but is less definitive on the first.

Functionally, employees in the Business and Financial Operations Occupations category work throughout the institution in a variety of administrative units performing a variety of jobs. The FY18 Data does not point to a particular unit that features an abundance of staff performing redundant duties.

A careful review of the FY18 Data reveals that IPFW features a large number of lightly-staffed and modestly-funded administrative units; there are no glaring examples of “administrative bloat” in the FY18 Data. The largest administrative units in terms of headcount are Continuing Studies (71.75 FTE, some of whom are actually instructional staff), Information Technology Services (49.4 FTE), Building Services (41 FTE), and Athletics (36.35 FTE). A relatively small number of high-level administrators potentially make disproportionately large salaries relative to the average IPFW employee and IPFW’s funding base, but realistically IPFW should be striving to make salaries for employees in other areas (including academics) more competitive rather than attempting to reduce salaries for any particular employee.

*Instructional Expenses and Headcount vs. Administrative Expenses and Headcount*

There are a variety of reasonable ways to calculate Instructional and Administrative expenses and headcount in the FY18 Data, based on what one actually wants to measure. The simplest measure is to add up the expenses and headcount for the academic units (all academic departments and support units, minus college/school-level administration)<sup>23</sup>:

	<b>S&amp;W</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Expenses<sup>24</sup></b>	<b>%</b>
Instruction	\$31,083,533	57.5%	550.28	48.7%	\$42,423,110	43.6%
Administration	\$23,003,961	42.5%	580.48	51.3%	\$54,861,060	56.4%

A variation on this measure is to allocate college/school-level administration to the Instruction category, as these administrative functions directly support the instructional activities of the departments they administer:

<sup>23</sup> Please note that these calculations do not align with any reported data in the IPEDS Finance report. The IPEDS calculations distribute ITS and Physical Plant costs out to each of the functional areas, while the FY18 Data calculations treat all such expenses as administrative expenses. Please also note that while the headcount for non-General Fund positions is included in these numbers, the costs associated with those positions are not. For example, the data includes a total headcount of 36.35 employees for Athletics, but includes no university expenses associated with those positions because Athletics is an Auxiliary Enterprise.

<sup>24</sup> Total Expenses includes Supplies and Expenses for most units, but also includes the Purdue Central Service Fee, debt service, utilities expenses, etc.

	<b>S&amp;W</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>%</b>
Instruction (inc. College admin.)	\$33,351,327	61.7%	579.98	51.3%	\$45,511,593	46.8%
Administration	\$20,736,167	38.3%	550.78	48.7%	\$51,772,576	53.2%

Another variation is to also allocate the costs of all academic administration for the university (Academic Affairs) to the Instruction category, as the vast majority of the units falling within Academic Affairs directly support the instructional mission of the university:

	<b>S&amp;W</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>%</b>
Instruction (inc. Academic Affairs)	\$39,128,024	72.3%	690.59	61.1%	\$56,334,716	57.9%
Administration	\$14,959,471	27.7%	440.17	38.9%	\$40,949,454	42.1%

A final variation is to also allocate all student-facing/student-impacting units (Academic Affairs and Student Affairs) to the Instruction category as being the most important expenses and services that directly support the academic and student success missions of the university:

	<b>S&amp;W</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>%</b>
Instruction (inc. Student Affairs)	\$40,178,625	74.3%	712.39	63.0%	\$58,215,499	59.8%
Administration	\$13,908,869	25.7%	418.37	37.0%	\$39,068,670	40.2%

A different way of assessing expenses and headcount is to measure at the employee category level rather than the administrative unit level. Adding up Salaries and Wages and headcount for all Faculty and Non-Faculty, IPFW's distribution of resources looks like this<sup>25</sup>:

	<b>S&amp;W</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Faculty</b> <sup>26</sup>	\$30,026,563	55.5%	380.06	33.6%
<b>Non-Faculty</b>	\$24,060,931	44.5%	750.70	66.4%

Faculty make up 55.5% of the Salaries and Wages expense and 33.6% of the total headcount.

While the meaning of these distributions—the degree to which they do or do not constitute an “appropriate” distribution of resources—will vary based upon the focus of the analysis and the perspective of the person doing the analysis, it is important to remember that the IPEDS data comparison suggests that IPFW is generally in line with its peer group in terms of the overall distribution of headcount and resources.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on the peer group analysis, IPFW does not appear to suffer from administrative bloat in the traditional sense of the term, at least relative to how other universities operate at this point in the history of U.S. higher education. With that being said, the distribution of IPFW's administrative expenses and headcount does appear to be misaligned relative to IPFW's peer group, with larger than standard investments in Business and Financial Operations Occupations and Institutional Support, and smaller than standard investments in Student Services and Support.

<sup>25</sup> The FY18 Data does not break Fringe Benefit or Other Expenses out per employee, so it is not possible to calculate Total Expenses by employee group.

<sup>26</sup> Academic Deans, as well as Associate/Assistant Deans, are counted as faculty in the FY18 Data and are included in these numbers.

In light of IPFW's recent enrollment and revenue declines (trends that are not likely to be meaningfully reversed for the foreseeable future), the FY18 Data suggests that IPFW might be better served by reducing its overall number of administrative units, and reallocating those resources to increase the investment in Student Services and Support.<sup>27</sup>

An essential next step in this process—one that must be carried out by the administration rather than by the faculty leaders—is to undertake a careful assessment of the role and performance of each administrative unit on campus (remembering that administration in this context includes everything outside of colleges/schools and academic departments) that takes into consideration IPFW's actual student enrollment (and not historically larger enrollment numbers) and actual budget situation, with an eye toward what IPFW's size will be after Realignment. In a significantly smaller university than IPFW was five-to-seven years ago, does every administrative function that IPFW currently features warrant the investment that is made in it? If an administrative unit is staffed and funded at a level to serve IPFW at its peak rather than IPFW at its present, perhaps reductions will be in order. If an administrative unit is marginally staffed and funded such that it cannot reasonably serve the function it is supposed to, careful thought needs to be given to whether efforts should be made to increase investment or to eliminate the unit and reallocate its resources. These questions are especially relevant after multiple years of early retirement buyouts, hiring freezes, and declining revenues.

In carrying out this work, the administration should also seek to assess non-General Fund expenses and units more fully than was possible in this study. This includes the ongoing discussions of Athletics and recent efforts to undertake self-operation of Student Housing, but should extend beyond these obvious areas.

Three overriding principles must be kept at the center of this work:

1. **Performance.** This study measures the degree to which IPFW's expenses and headcount are or are not in line with its peer group. The most important limitation of this study is that it provides no direct evidence of the actual performance of IPFW's administrative units. Under-staffed units might be over-delivering relative to our peers; over-staffed units might be under-delivering. In carrying out the next stage of analysis, it is essential that the administration consider not just relative size and investment, but also how well our current administrative units (including, for the purposes of ongoing evaluation, academic administration at the college/school and department levels) perform the duties IPFW expects of them.<sup>28</sup> This performance evaluation should be conducted with an eye

---

<sup>27</sup> This is not the first recommendation that has been made in recent years about increasing the institutional investment in certain administrative operations. This past year alone has seen consultants recommend increasing marketing, branding, website, and enrollment management budgets, among others. While the merits and feasibility of any particular recommendation need to be considered on their own terms, collectively they reinforce the idea that perhaps IPFW's administrative investments are spread too thin.

<sup>28</sup> The University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP) established rigorous performance metrics for academic units, but did not establish comparable performance metrics for administrative units. USAP metrics and additional academic performance metrics were used as part of the decision-making process that led to the elimination of twenty-four academic programs and two academic departments in Fall 2016. Similar performance metrics continue to be part of the annual reporting process for academic units. IPFW should strive to subject its administrative units

toward understanding IPFW's performance relative to its peer institutions. IPEDS data on graduation rates and retention rates (in part, measures of university performance) reveals that IPFW is underperforming relative to its peer group in these areas, making the underinvestment in Student Services and Support all the more significant.<sup>29</sup>

2. **Student Services and Support.** Every effort should be made to increase investments and staffing in Student Services and Support areas. The IPEDS data is clear that IPFW lags behind all of its peers in these areas. Careful thought should certainly be given to what the most impactful investments might be, but it is clear that investment is needed.
3. **Preserve the current Instruction-to-Administration expense and headcount ratios.** Depending on how Non-Instructional Staff with faculty status are counted in the IPEDS data, IPFW is either below its peers or right in line with its peers in the distribution of headcount and expenses on Instruction compared to Administration. Ideally, IPFW would be in a position to increase investments across the university in response to this data, but given current economic realities, an essential operating principle behind an ongoing administrative study should be that financial resources cannot be taken from the Instructional realm to support Non-Instructional activities.

Finally, there will be great value in periodically updating this study when new IPEDS data is released, and when a new set of peer institutions is identified. This will enable IPFW to develop a more sophisticated understanding of how its administrative budget and headcount—and the distribution of resources between Instructional and Non-Instructional activities—have changed relative to our peers as a result of policy changes, staffing changes, revenue declines, Realignment, and other factors. Updated data and analysis should be shared with the campus community in order to facilitate an ongoing dialogue about university priorities and performance.

---

to a similar level of scrutiny. This is not to suggest that administrative units have not experienced cuts, but rather to say that IPFW should strive to establish a culture of accountability that touches all aspects of university operations.  
<sup>29</sup> Data on first-time, full-time retention rates and 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates were derived from the IPEDS Fall Enrollments (2015) and Graduation Rate (2016) reports.

	IPFW	Pueblo	Col. St.	Dixie St.	Farm. St.	IU-SB	PCal	UCCS	USI	USM
<b>First-time, full-time Retention Rate</b>	64.0%	64.0%	71.0%	58.0%	79.0%	66.0%	70.0%	68.0%	71.0%	64.0%
<b>4-year graduation rate</b>	7.4%	18.6%	11.5%	8.3%	31.0%	7.2%	10.7%	25.3%	18.7%	13.6%
<b>5-year graduation rate</b>	18.3%	29.4%	24.2%	14.8%	46.6%	20.8%	24.1%	41.1%	33.7%	29.0%
<b>6-year graduation rate</b>	23.8%	32.4%	30.3%	17.7%	53.4%	29.8%	31.6%	46.5%	37.5%	33.7%