BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED TO
CHANCELLOR VICKY CARWEIN
BY THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE

April 20, 2015
Members of the University Budget Committee (2014-2015)

Kristina Creager, Student Affairs
Patricia Eber, Health and Human Services
Brian Fife, Education and Public Policy
Dan Gebhart, Advancement
Cigdem Gurgur, University Resources Policy Committee/Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee
John Hrehov, Visual and Performing Arts
Mark Masters, Arts and Sciences
Don Mueller, Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science
Jennifer Oxtoby, Office of Chancellor
Alison Rynearson, Administrative and Professional Staff Advisory Council
Sue Skekloff, Library
Michael Slaubaugh, Doermer School of Business
Wade Smith, Student Government
Walter Soptelean, Budget and Planning (Chair) [The chair chose to abstain from voting].
Marcus Tulley, Clerical and Service Staff Advisory Committee

Please Note: The members of the University Budget Committee are making judgments based on an assumption of a relatively flat budget going into the next fiscal year and also upon the administrative presentations that were provided. At this time, the state budget has not been passed by the Indiana General Assembly and we do not know the fate of the Metropolitan University proposal. Committee members determined to make two sets of budgetary recommendations at this time: one for the 2015-16 fiscal year and long term recommendations which could be considered beyond the next fiscal year. A vote was taken on each recommendation and the breakdown of each vote is recorded.
Part I: Recommendations for the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year

1. All IPFW employees should receive a maximum allowable raise in terms of the parameters established by the Purdue University Board of Trustees. In subsequent years, a systematic analysis should be conducted to determine how future salary increases can be maintained and issues of salary compression and equity can be addressed for all designated University employees in a proactive manner. At the present time, due largely to the reality that most University employees have not received a salary increase for the last three fiscal years, the members of the Committee believe that this is the paramount budgetary and human issue confronting the University in the context of our assumptions delineated above. Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.
   Recommendation Accepted
   For FY 2016, administration approved a 1.5% merit increase to eligible employees. Also approved was a service recognition one-time payment to eligible employees to be made in July 2015. Each benefitted, full-time IPFW employee will receive a one-time service recognition payment of $1000 (Amount will be prorated for benefitted, part-time employees). This will come as an additional payment generated for faculty in July. Staff will have this added to their regular pay.

2. The recommendations for the 2015-16 fiscal year presented by the University Budget Committee should be promulgated to the public. Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.
   Recommendation Accepted
   Recommendations presented by the University Budget Committee will be posted on the Budget Section of the USAP website on or prior to May 13, 2015.

If more funding is available, for this fiscal year or at a later time, we recommend the following priorities, which are presented in no particular order:

1. Allocate no more than $97,000 ($95,000 in salary and wages and $2,000 in supply and equipment) in recurring funds in the Office of Advancement for new positions. Failed: 4 votes in favor, 10 votes opposed.
   Recommendation Accepted
   The recommendation not to approve this request was accepted. This item may be re-reviewed once new leadership is in place for the Office of Advancement.
2. Allocate no more than $10,300 in additional recurring funds to the Chancellor’s Office designated for supply and equipment only. **Passed: 12 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed.**
   
   Results: **Recommendation Amended**
   
   In light of the significant reductions that have occurred in this account in recent years, this recommendation was amended to restore the additionally requested $48,000 in recurring funds. This will bring the level of S & E funding to the demonstrated current need of this area.

3. Allocate no more than $550,000 in recurring funds to the Office of Advancement to enhance IPFW’s brand awareness. **Failed: 0 votes in favor, 14 votes opposed.**
   
   Results: **Recommendation Accepted**
   
   The recommendation not to approve this request was accepted. Administration felt that there was a need for a review of marketing efforts before any funding could be considered. (See Recommendation 8)

4. Create a new position in Student Information Systems for the purpose of enrollment management using recurring funds (salary and wages and supply and equipment) and determine which budget will be affected accordingly. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**
   
   Results: **Recommendation Accepted**
   
   The position will reside in and be funded by the office of the VCAA.

5. Fully fund the additional increase levied in the Purdue University Central Service Fee Request ($35,885). **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**
   
   Results: **Recommendation Accepted**
   
   Prior to and independent of this recommendation, Purdue WL already removed this increase from FY 2016.

6. Allocate no more than $10,465 in recurring funds to the Chancellor’s Office for the operating expenses associated with the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP). **Passed: 12 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed.**
   
   Results: **Recommendation Accepted**
   
   These funds are for the software utilized by USAP.

7. Allocate no more than $225,000 in non-recurring funds to enhance the web technology capabilities of the University’s website. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**
   
   Results: **Recommendation deferred pending review of additional information.**
   
   Information is being requested from the areas requesting and providing this service, including specifics of requested enhancements and benefits provided to the students of the university and the public.
8. Allocate no more than $75,000 in non-recurring funds to hire an external firm to conduct an analysis of IPFW’s marketing efforts and how they may be enhanced. **Passed: 11 votes in favor, 3 votes opposed.**

   *Results: Recommendation Accepted pending further review of internal options.*

   The need in this area is acknowledged. However, viable “in-house” options should be considered first before utilizing an outside firm to provide this service.

9. Conduct a comprehensive review of the Athletics budget to fully understand all costs and revenues associated with the program. The review should incorporate any studies already conducted and should provide a clear understanding of the amount of institutional support needed to sustain current programming. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

   *Results: Recommendation Accepted*

   A long-term, multi-faceted, comprehensive review of the Athletic operations and budget has been conducted utilizing both in-house analyses and an outside firm.

10. Provide a transparent analysis and decision making process regarding program closures, such as the recent elimination of the men and women’s tennis programs and involve key stakeholders, including but not limited to, the University Budget Committee (UBC), the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP), the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee (BAS), the Subcommittee on Athletics (SCOA), and the Indiana-Purdue Student Government Association (IPSGA). **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

   *Results: Recommendation Accepted*

   The analysis and decision making process utilized to reduce the Department of Athletics budget was the same process utilized during the past three years to reduce and reallocate funds within and across the Divisions of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Administrative and Financial Affairs, and the Chancellor’s Office. The most recent reduction of the Athletics budget resulted from both internal and external reviews and analyses.

11. Provide the cost-benefit analysis of the elimination of the men and women’s tennis programs in order to reconcile conflicting information regarding the true savings of the policy decision. The outcome of the analysis should be communicated in advance of the implementation of any budgetary reallocation decisions. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

   *Results: Recommendation Accepted*

   A comprehensive review of Department of Athletics operations and budget was conducted utilizing both in-house analyses and an outside firm. A separate, faculty led, independent, university-wide survey of IPFW Athletics was also conducted. The report of the outside firm was posted online for university review and comment before a decision was made concerning the tennis programs.
Part II: Long Term Recommendations Beyond the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year

(The recommendations are presented in no particular order)

*These Recommendations are beyond the scope of the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year.*

_They were reviewed but not acted upon._

1. The Helmke Library budget must continue to be strategically increased over time. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

2. Create a reasonable formula for allocating supply and equipment funds to academic units based on faculty size, enrollments, and special needs. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

3. Commission a comprehensive review of day-to-day executive administration with the objective that institutional support meets the tangible needs of the IPFW campus. **Passed: 13 votes in favor, 1 vote opposed.**

4. Conduct a systematic review of the clerical and service staff pay scale and policy to implement a more competitive and effective procedure for wage advancement. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

5. On an annual basis, post “A Citizen’s Guide to the Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) Budget” on the IPFW website. Present a user-friendly explanation of revenues and expenditures at IPFW. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**

6. The long term recommendations presented by the University Budget Committee should be promulgated to the public. **Passed: 14 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed.**