

Minutes of the
Third Regular Meeting of the Twentieth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
November 13, 2000
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of October 16, 2000
3. Acceptance of the agenda - M. Downs
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - J. Silver
 - b. Indiana University - B. Fife
5. Report of the Presiding Officer - L. Wright-Bower
6. Committee reports requiring action
7. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 00-4)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only"
 Agenda Committee (SR NO. 00-5) - M. Downs
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: L. Wright-Bower (absent)

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Njock Libii

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, H. Abu-Mulaweh, P. Bingi, E. Blakemore, F. Borelli, W. Branson, J. Brennan, H. Broberg, C. Champion, V. Coufoudakis, S. Davis, L. DeFonso, M. Downs, C. Erickson, B. Fife, L. Fox, T. Grove, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, B. Harwood, M. Kimble, D. Marshall, N. McCroskey, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, K. O'Connell, A. Pugh, B. Salmon, R. Sedlmeyer, Z. Shipchandler, J. Silver, M. H. Thuente, J. Tok, M. Wartell, Y. Zubovic

Senate Members Absent:

G. Campbell-Whatley, M. Codispoti, W. DeMott, C. Drummond, J. Grant, L. Hite, B. Hume, J. Nichols, D. Ross, W. Skoog, K. Squadrito, J. Tankel
IPSGA Representative: J. Mailand
Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, J. Clausen, D. Legg, D. McCants
Visitors Present: K. Browne, J. Dahl, R. Gallagher, S. Jessup, R. Kostrubanic, P. Ladewig

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Silver called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 16, 2000: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

M. Downs moved to approve the agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Purdue University: J. Silver asked P. Hamburger to give a report regarding the InterCampus Faculty Council.

P. Hamburger: The chair of the West Lafayette Senate informed us about the process by which the president was selected. He basically confirmed what Lowell Beineke has told us via email.

The chair also informed us that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education formed a task force and asked it to investigate the mechanism for mandatory easy transfer of credits from amongst the seven Indiana institutions. They informed us that this committee formed a list and sent it to the VCAA. Basically all 300-level and introductory-level courses are supposed to be included in this list.

IUPUI and Calumet are down in credit hours this semester, Lafayette is way up this year, and we are just slightly up in credit hours.

- b. Indiana University:

B. Fife: I attended the annual meeting of the Indiana Chapter of the AAUP on November 4. Mr. Cedric Dempsey, President of the NCAA, and Professor Murray Sperber of IU-Bloomington had a joint discussion of the effect college athletics have on the educational missions of colleges and universities. As many of you know, Professor Sperber has been a critic of the professionalization of college athletics for a number of years. The discussion between the two was quite informative because there was a good deal of common ground between the two representatives. Both agreed that college sports are plagued by corruption today.

Mr. Dempsey indicated that in recent years a number of schools have gone Division I mainly because of the perception that the increased visibility of athletic programs would enhance the academic programs. He stated explicitly that in his experience this rarely, if ever, occurs. He used IUPUI as a specific illustration of the cost of Division I. He said that right now 0.4% of IUPUI's institutional budget goes to intercollegiate athletics. He urged higher education advocates to examine the figure in 5-10 years, as IUPUI will have to spend much more to compete with other programs.

5. Report of the Acting Presiding Officer - J. Silver:

J. Silver: I would just like to note that we are currently in the midst of the visit for our application for reaccreditation. We have two guests here who are part of the visiting team. Will you please introduce yourselves and tell us what campus you're from?

S. Jessup: I am Suzanne Jessup from Southern Arkansas University in Magnolia and I am Professor of Education.

P. Ladewig: I am Pat Ladewig. I am Dean of the School for Health Care Professions at Regis University in Denver, Colorado.

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

7. Question time (Senate Reference No. 00-4):

Do we receive any revenue from "away" games in intercollegiate athletics? If so, do such revenues typically cover the costs of travel?

As a Division II school in many cases we received some financial support for non-conference away games. This was rarely if ever enough to cover all of the expenses associated with traveling to those events. As a Division I school, in addition to these smaller amounts, we are able to command far greater financial support for some away events. The most notable example is men's basketball where non-conference away games can generate substantially more revenue than the cost of the travel.

During the meeting of the Fort Wayne Senate on October 16, 2000, the following questions were addressed by Vice Chancellor Walter Branson:

a. Using the most recent year of available data, what proportion of total scholarships/ fellowships expenditures were used for academic scholarships and what proportion were used for athletic scholarships? Is this ratio expected to change with full implementation of the Division I plan? If so, how?

b. What are auxiliary enterprises? Are these expenditures self-supporting endeavors? Explain.

In responding to Question 2.a., Vice Chancellor Branson indicated that last year (presumably 1999-2000), \$1.25 million was spent on academic and athletic scholarships and 76 percent was allocated for academic scholarships and 24 percent for athletic scholarships. According to data reported to the U.S. Department of Education via the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) finance survey, \$3,926,368 was allocated in the scholarships/fellowships category in 1998/99 (the most recent year of data). Why is there a considerable discrepancy between the two figures? Using IPEDS data, does the ratio of academic to athletic scholarships change? If so, how?

In responding to Question 2.b., Vice Chancellor Branson indicated that \$4.6 million was allocated for auxiliary enterprises in 1999-2000 and that these were largely self-supporting costs. According to the 1998/99 IPEDS finance and revenue surveys, \$3,206,018 was allocated for auxiliary enterprises and \$1,765,346 was collected by way of revenues for auxiliary enterprises. This results in more than \$1.4 million in expenditures over revenues. Why is there a gap between the two? Explain.

Since we don't complete the IPEDS survey on this campus, I don't have specific answers for the differences between the IPEDS data and what I reported at the last Senate meeting. IPEDS is created using a set of definitions that is specific to that report. Those definitions are different than those we use for tracking operations.

Regarding the scholarship portion of the question, I reported on the scholarships that IPFW directly awards from University resources. The IPEDS survey form shows the \$3.9 million referenced in the question to be the total of \$3.3 million in Pell Grants, \$500,000 from private sources (pass-throughs), and \$120,000 from institutional sources. In theory, the \$120,000 reported on IPEDS should be close to the \$1.25 million that I reported in the last Senate meeting. I have to assure that the difference is due to the definitions used to generate the IPEDS data. If the total of \$3.9 million was used in the calculation, the percentage of scholarships awarded to athletics would drop to about 8%. However, given the very different nature of Pell Grants, I am not sure that this calculation is meaningful.

There is not a clear explanation for the differences between auxiliary income and expense in the IPEDS report. Once again, IPFW does not provide data directly to IPEDS. I am aware that there are several financial reporting adjustments made to the accounting records before the IPEDS report is created. These adjustments would make the auxiliary financial information look very different when compared to the accounting records that we use. In spite of how the information is reported on IPEDS, on an operational basis, the auxiliary operations are independent and break even financially.

B. Fife: Would it be plausible to be more actively involved in the submission of the IPEDS annual report?

W. Branson: We could look into that. I am not sure that would do us much good. It is my understanding that some of these accounting adjustments are done to meet generally

accepted accounting standards which we really don't have any influence over. But I would be happy to check into it.

M. Downs: The problem, it seems to me, is that there is no basis for making any comparison when data is furnished to us by the local administration with data from other places. There is a discrepancy between the definition that is used by the people that keep the data for everybody and the definition we use for the data collected and kept here. How can decisions be made regarding allocations and direction of policy on this campus when there is no real basis for comparison--no uniformity of definition. I can keep statistics on my own teaching and my own research, but they don't fit the definitions used by this faculty. They are self-serving and, perhaps, meaningless. Why haven't efforts been made to establish some kind of congruence or coincidence between the figures that we keep and those that are collected by other agencies?

J. Silver: Would anyone care to comment about our accounting methods?

W. Branson: As we talked to folks who try to use IPEDS (and, in fact, in a former job I used to do a lot of this kind of work), it really is very difficult no matter what you use for a source of data to try to do comparisons from one campus to the next. In particular, IPEDS generally is a good starting point for comparison, but everybody recognizes that it has a number of faults because of the way that different states do different things. There are just inherent procedural differences. It is not that anybody is doing anything wrong, it is just that things are accounted for differently.

B. Fife: I agree with the Vice Chancellor that IPEDS is a starting point. It is an important starting point, however. The Indiana Commission and the state legislature looks at IPEDS very closely as a good cross-institutional measure of policy commitment. As such, because Hoosier policy makers use IPEDS as a starting point, I think we ought to be, as an institution, more in tune with the definitions and use it far more extensively than we do at the present time.

M. Wartell: Is it possible to have Jack (Dahl) speak?

J. Dahl: The IPEDS data, as it has been described, include the reporting of a variety of numbers for both basic operations and auxiliary enterprises. It is my understanding that the current interest is in further refining the data beyond what IPEDS includes, specifically, to split scholarships between athletic and non-athletic scholarships. It is simply not possible to go beyond the defined set of data elements that are included in the current survey. That's not to say the survey shouldn't include twice as many numbers, but that is not what is there today. There are data policy boards that talk about explaining these kinds of things. The federal government, in fact, abandoned a couple of surveys this year because of limited funding for IPEDS data collection.

M. Wartell: My discussion with the folks at the Indiana Commission for Higher Education indicate that, yes, they do use IPEDS data when determining policy issues, but they use the demographic data that comes from IPEDS, not the financial data, because the

financial reporting systems are so different--even within the state--from one institution to another. So, the comparisons are very difficult to make.

J. Silver: I assume our financial reporting is determined primarily by West Lafayette?

M. Wartell: West Lafayette **does** our financial report.

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only": Agenda Committee (SR No. 00-5) - M. Downs:

SR No. 00-5 (Items under Consideration by Senate Committees and Subcommittees)
was presented for
information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University: There was nothing mentioned under this item.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Barbara L. Blauvelt

Secretary of the Faculty