

**Indiana University South Bend Academic Senate meeting
April 22, 2016, Wiekamp 1011, 1:30 pm.**

Attending:

T. Allison, Bennion Turba, Bindroo, Bloom, Borshuk, Bushnell, Chaney, L. Chen, T. Clark, N. Colborn, J. Colborn, Collins, Cress, Curtis, Dunn, Fisher, Froyland, Gallagher, Hinnefeld, Hottois, Jones, J. Joseph, Kahan, Karakatsanis, Kwong, Lambert, Y. Lee, Lidinsky, Lucal, Luppess, Lynn, Marr, Massat, McIntosh, McMillen, Mettetal, Nair, Nilsen, Opasik, Ortiz, Pant, Reza, Roth, Rusnock, Saksena, Schult, Shlapentokh, K. Smith, J. Smith, Sofhauser, Song, Souther, Stankrauff, Takanashi, Tetzlaff, Thomas, Tourtillotte, Vollrath, Weiss, Wells, Wright, Zynda.

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by President Scott Opasik.

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes of the March 25th, 2016 meeting were approved.

Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

3. Committee Reports

A. Budget Committee

Jerry Hinnefeld reported on the Budget Committee's work during the semester. Members of the committee attended Budget Hearing meetings and then met twice to make their recommendations. The committee report will be posted to the Senate website. The PowerPoint presentation is attached to this document.

The Committee based their recommendations on their own calculations of funds available for new spending. They estimated net new revenue at \$1 million. After various reductions in areas such as Utilities and clarification of Distance Learning budget, they have calculated a budget of \$1.884 million as available for new spending.

The Committee endorsed the 2.5% increase in the salary pool as the highest priority and endorsed the EVCAA proposal for new minimums for assistant professors and lecturers.

The Committee set new funding requests into two priority areas with total spending amounts of \$461K (1st priority) and \$338.5K (2nd priority).

The Committee identified general fund reserve spending priorities and identified some one-time funding candidates.

The Committee found no requests for new spending to be without merit.

In terms of new and replacement faculty positions, the Committee was uncomfortable making recommendations. The Committee instead recommends that Academic Affairs work with the Academic Personnel Committee on a timeline and process to formalize how academic positions are discussed. A discussion about this has taken place with the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

Anurag Pant asked if there was a place for comments.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that he has already received a response from the Chancellor and there are handouts at the back of the room (and attached to this document) that highlight the details of the budget as it currently stands.

Pant asked what 1.5% of the salary pool is designated to be used for.

Hinnefeld noted that \$120,000 is for raising minimum salaries, including for existing employees.

Pant asked how that will work for those that are above the cap.

Hinnefeld responded that the Budget Committee recommended that the remaining \$900,000 be distributed to the units in proportion to their existing salary lines.

Hinnefeld noted that the Committee's estimation of money available for spending neglected to consider the structural deficit of \$400k that had to be taken off the top.

Elaine Roth expressed concern about the budget process this year. She noted that last year's process included a wider announcement of the budget hearings and a sense of welcoming. She feels like that this didn't happen this year.

Hinnefeld noted that faculty were welcome at the Hearings and these were advertised in the Daily Titan. However, the process was late and the timeline was compressed because VC Bill O'Donnell left. Going forward the process should not be so compressed and could be more productive if there was more than one pass on the information so that the process is more of a conversation.

Ken Smith asked Jerry had an opinion about healthy high and low range for the campus reserve fund.

Hinnefeld responded that a simple answer would be maybe twice what the state requires (3% which is about 2 million dollars). However, it is more complicated than that because you need planned use of the reserves.

Betsy Lucal commented regarding the salary minimums. She understands the issue and is supportive of the plan to support colleagues but notes that the compression issue is real. She wonders when compression will be addressed. Hinnefeld noted that some of the salary pool within colleges and schools may be used to address some of these inequities.

Doug McMillen noted that he would be happy to talk to anyone in CLAS about this issue.

Pant asked if Hinnefeld could elaborate on any of the one-time spending suggestions.

Hinnefeld noted that planned use for using Reserves in the case of this year involved expected offsets. For example, spending on new athletic programs would likely be offset by increased enrollments, and proposed tuition offsets for out of state students would also likely result in new enrollments. Chancellor Allison and Hinnefeld explained that the MHEC – Midwest Higher Education Consortium agreement provides tuition assistance for out of state students. Seven states are included in the consortium. Students pay 150% of in-state tuition.

PN Saksena asked if the guiding principle espoused on budget planning documents of “using resources efficiently” was considered by the Budget Committee.

Hinnefeld noted that the Committee honestly didn’t address that because of the limited time frame and the one-pass over the materials. He repeated that hopefully next year will include more time for conversation.

Andrea Rusnock added that next year it would be nice to have more of an opportunity for a faculty forum.

B. Athletics Committee (Action Item)

Sharon Jones, Alison Stankrauff, and Coach Steve Bruce reported the proposed additions to Athletics teams for 2017-18. These would include:

- Men’s and Women’s Tennis
- Women’s Golf
- Men’s and Women’s Bowling
- Competitive Cheer
- Competitive Dance

Benefits noted were that these are all low-cost programs, they will increase enrollment, and they will allow student-athletes to continue to participate in their sport that want to stay in the Michiana area. Student athletes tend to do well in school, be retained, and graduate. Utilization of campus housing is also increased.

Coach Steve Bruce noted that while we are currently in compliance with Title IX, these programs will also be in compliance. He expects that more students in the area will look at IU South Bend more carefully and we will increase our enrollment.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba asked if the Cheer and Dance programs were co-ed.

Coach Bruce responded that Cheer does involve men. There are NAIA rules on team structure that will be followed. Dance is usually entirely female.

Andrea Rusnock asked if someone is keeping track of all costs related to student athletics vs. funds coming in and evidence of student achievement, retention, etc.

Chancellor Allison responded that his office keeps track of statistics on these issues and these sports were selected in part based on their low-cost. He noted that the Student Government Association also presents a budget each year, and this year’s student budget recommended that more funds be placed into Athletics. Allison has suggested that they lower that amount in order to diversify their support of a wide variety of student activities and programming.

Stankrauff noted that Coach Bruce has done a lot of research into teams that are in the area so that we can expect students to be interested in these athletic programs.

Coach Bruce added that we are not providing scholarship money for any of these new sports.

Alison Moss noted that she has seen issues with grade checks; if we are not handling this well how can we improve that process with an increase in student athletes.

Coach Bruce responded that he works with the coaches and encourages them to distribute those grade checks to their students at their own intervals.

Betsy Lucal asked why the students are in charge of this form. Perhaps the process could be handled in a more formal and organized way.

Joe Chaney suggested that some kind of electronic process would be helpful and beneficial for all concerned.

Peter Bushnell noted his concern with advisees not being able to complete a biology degree because the students could not take classes after 2 p.m. He has had students have to change majors based on practice schedules.

Coach Bruce noted that the sport of baseball came up quickly and unexpectedly and agreed that there are issues that need to be worked out.

Bushnell noted that there are afternoon and spring sports on the list of potential new teams that could have the same issues.

Carolyn Schult asked if we are paying to use facilities and if so are these reasonable costs.

Coach Bruce responded in the affirmative and noted that so far we have great, cooperative relationships with Adams High School and are using School Field for baseball. Golf teams will play at the South Bend Country Club; negotiated fees are reasonable.

Pant noted that the campus is on a river and asked if we could have rowing as a potential sport.

Allison noted that he has heard the question before. There is no other rowing team in the conference for competition and it's actually an expensive sport.

Louise Collins noted that as we move forward with introducing more teams, particularly as we consider part-time coaches, that we can do more to implement the educational component and ensure the academic integrity of the student athletes. We can hopefully address the scheduling issues and encourage students to be proactive in working with their professors. We need to meet our responsibility as faculty to make sure that the student athletes flourish and to make sure that the students understand their responsibilities. It is important to find ways for the faculty to have a way to address concerns. It is obvious that there is some work to be done.

Bruce agreed that there is some work to be done and that he will work to make this a high class operation. There are some kinks in the process and since the coaches are part-time, he will need to work to have things in place so that faculty feel good about the student athletes in classes. He will keep working hard on these issues.

Sharon Jones urged faculty to visit iusb.titans.com to learn more about the athletic programs.

President Opasik noted that the Athletics Committee has presented this information as a motion to add these new programs. He opened the floor for discussion.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that he was in favor of adding these new programs. He reiterated that as we expand it is more important to Coach Bruce to keep track of and deal with these issues that we have noted.

Motion to close debate, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

C. Ad hoc Committee on Handbook/Constitution Revision of PTR Section

Peter Bushnell and Jerry Hinnefeld reported on the work of the Committee, which also included Bill Feighery, Chair, and Cyndi Sofhauser. The Committee reviewed both the Academic Handbook and the Senate Constitution.

The Handbook portion of the Committee's work wrapped up some time ago and the Academic Senate Executive Committee has worked on editing the wording since that time. Hinnefeld noted that the Committee and the Executive Committee agree that it would be difficult to deal with the proposed changes this quickly. The document will be posted to the Senate website. The faculty should study the document over the summer and be prepared for discussion and approval in the fall.

The proposed changes to the Constitution are minimal. Hinnefeld highlighted the proposed changes and explained the rationale for the changes.

In Section 2, a sentence was added to clarify that an individual could not serve on more than one PT&R committee at the same time. We observe this principle now.

In section 4, a sentence was added to clarify that the Chair and other officers must be voting members of the Committee.

Anurag Pant asked if this would apply to the status of new hires – if they were at rank at a previous institution and came here at a different rank.

Hinnefeld responded that their status here is all that would be relevant.

Bushnell and Hinnefeld noted that the deletion of letter F in the document is related to acquiescence to IU policy changes. The Executive review procedure as it stands now is that after a case leaves the EVCAA's office it is decided jointly by the Chancellor and someone higher up

While we have disagreed with the practice, the UFC has supported this and it is in fact practice at this time.

Hinnefeld noted that the floor was open for discussion and then there will be a mail ballot on the issue.

Cyndi Sofhauser commented that if we make these changes, we need to clarify whose responsibility is it to make the changes in the document. There is a history of changes not being made in a timely and effective manner.

Hinnefeld noted that President Opasik has pulled the Constitution and Handbook out separately and that they are posted separately on the Academic Senate website. The front matter states the responsibility for revisions. Next fall after Handbook changes are approved the Executive Committee will work with Academic Affairs to make certain that they changes are incorporated.

IU has gone to a set of policies instead of a set handbook. Hinnefeld hopes that we can adopt something similar, making it easier to find relevant policies and keep them current.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba noted that it would be helpful to have a listing of resolutions passed each year so that one didn't have to search meeting minutes.

Opasik noted that there is a listing of resolutions that have been passed on the Academic Senate website. He also noted that the Library is working on an archival project – AIM – that employs optical character recognition so that documents in the depository can be searched by keyword.

Alison Stankrauff added that this project was at Aim.IU.edu

Josh Wells commented on the removal of letter F. While the Executive review may be a moot point, transparency is another issue. He questioned us removing that aspect from the Constitution.

Hinnefeld noted that he cannot answer that question as it refers to the Chancellor's practice.

Larry Lambert answered from the school committee perspective that the Chancellor has provided a detailed report to the committee in the recent past.

Chancellor Allison noted that it would be an unwise Chancellor that did not give a reason in the response letter. Indeed that is true for all letters at all levels of review. If there is disagreement with previous levels of review, precise reasons are given in the letters.

Louise Collins asked if– procedurally – we could split F into two parts?

Parliamentarian David Vollrath advised that we would need a motion to divide the question.

Motion to divide the question, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

President Opasik opened discussion.

Elaine Roth noted that in the future if we had an unwise Chancellor we might feel differently.

Linda Chen noted that perhaps it should be explicit that every level of review should provide a detailed letter if they disagree with the previous level of review.

Anurag Pant agreed that it could be at any level.

Hinnefeld noted that letter E does address that to some degree. "In the case of negative recommendations, reasons must be given in writing if the candidate so requests."

Chen noted that that doesn't address all cases.

Pant noted that this doesn't address reversal of prior levels.

Hinnefeld thinks that we might consider that but that perhaps it doesn't apply to a Constitutional change.

Pant suggested a friendly amendment.

Discussion of language.

Hinnefeld noted that he would want the first three changes to go out on the ballot now and there could be a second ballot on whether or not F is struck. He is not inclined to accept any friendly amendments at this point.

Motion to close debate, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

Motion to divide the question to include F as a separate question, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

The Constitutional changes will be voted on via ballot.

Opasik thanked the Committee for their work.

D. Research and Development Committee

Murhli Nair discussed the R & D Committee's work during the past year. He noted that there were many excellent proposals but it is difficult to consider these adequately when there are not members from each unit of the campus. The suggestion is to change the Academic Senate Constitution so that Committee membership is spread out over the Schools & Colleges.

Gwynn Mettetal noted that the example you gave does not clarify that CLAS – Science, CLAS – Social Science, and CLAS – Humanities would be clearer.

Jerry Hinnefeld asked how many members serve on the Committee. He agrees with the proposal to control the membership a little more. This is an appointed committee so it is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to make sure that there is even distribution.

Erika Zynda responded that there are nine members.

Dean Elizabeth Dunn noted that she is not positive that you need someone from the three families of CLAS but if you choose to go that route, please consider a recent document from CLAS that defines these areas.

Jeff Wright noted that if we mean every school or college, we should say that instead of unit.

Dunn responded that in IU terminology, Unit means School or College.

Motion to close debate, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

President Opasik noted that we will move forward with a ballot for these changes.

4. Common Calendar and Fall Break (Action Item)

President Opasik presented information which comes to us for the Center for Research Campus Excellence (EVCAA on regional campuses). One part of the proposal is to move fall break to the week of

Thanksgiving. This is to align the calendar dates for IUOCC to replicate classes more easily and to make the calendar consistent for students that are taking online classes across two or more campuses.

Carolyn Schult asked if this proposal had been discussed in the Academic Affairs Committee because they have jurisdiction over the calendar.

Opasik noted that there was not time to send this forward through them.

Andrea Rusnock asked what might happen if we say no.

Betsy Lucal noted that she finds this to be very narrow-minded. It means that decisions are made at a higher level.

EVCAA Jann Joseph offered some background on the issue. She noted that the University Registrar works with all campuses and he created a very large spreadsheet with all campus calendars in order to look for compromises across campuses. For us, the suggested change of fall break seemed logical because it is relatively new to our campus. Each campus has been asked to make some changes. This would not take effect until 2017.

Micheline Nilsen commented that we don't need a break at Thanksgiving, we need it earlier in the semester.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that the Academic Senate discussed this extensively two years ago and came to a decision. We can talk about it again but he does not support taking action today. We need to defer to the Academic Affairs committee for a recommendation.

Peter Bushnell questioned why it matters when fall break is to an online student. He noted that coordinating fall breaks for this reason doesn't make sense.

Cathy Borshuk would like us to be cautious and consider the march to standardization and the push toward giving up our autonomy.

Hinnefeld moved to refer the issue to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Motion to refer to Academic Affairs, seconded.

President Opasik opened the floor for discussion.

No discussion.

Motion to close debate, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

5. President's Report

A. Electronic Voting

President Opasik reported that the Executive Committee has studied the move to electronic voting. Hossein Hakimzadeh created a test ballot on Qualtrics and the Executive Committee conducted testing. Qualtrics uses ADS authentication.

In order to move in this direction we must first change the Constitution to allow for electronic balloting.

Opasik opened the floor for discussion. No discussion.

This issue will be sent out for a vote in the upcoming ballot.

B. Review of Department PTR Guidelines

Opasik reported that the Executive Committee and the EVCAA recently discussed the review of PT&R Guidelines and have agreed that there will be a small group that would set up guidelines and a timeline for the review of all PT&R processes on campus. Cyndi Sofhauser, John McIntosh, Gwynn Mettetal, and someone from the current PT&R Committee that is rotating off will be appointed. This process will occur during the next academic year.

C. Faculty Welfare Committee charge

Opasik reported that the Executive Committee has charged the Faculty Welfare Committee with developing a faculty position on course releases and stipends. The Committee has been asked to consider the following:

- What workload is appropriate for/requires a course release?
- What is a reasonable stipend for what work?
- Should untenured or non-tenure track instructors serve as area coordinators, department chairs, etc.?
- What is a reasonable term limit for chairs/coordinators/directors?
- How should inequities of course releases and amount of stipends across campus be addressed?

D. IU Domestic Partner Benefits Resolutions

Opasik reported that IU East and IU Southeast campus faculty have passed resolutions on this matter. IU Northwest votes at their meeting today. It is expected that four will be sent forward. Not all of the campuses resolutions match ours. He hopes that the Trustees will reconsider.

E. Additional comments.

Opasik reminded faculty members to send their committee preferences for next year.

Opasik asked Committee chairs to send minutes and end of year reports to Secretary Nancy Colborn for posting to the AS website. The yearend report should include a description of the work of the committee and an assessment of how the committee carried out its work.

President Opasik thanked all of the faculty for their service on Academic Senate and noted that a lot was accomplished this year. He outlined the activities of several of the committees.

Opasik thanked the Executive Committee for their service and particularly Vice President Lee Kahan and Nancy Colborn, Secretary.

6. Administrative and Officer Reports

A. Chancellor Allison

Chancellor Allison congratulated and thanked Scott Opasik for his service as President of Academic Senate. He noted that he looks forward to working with Ken Smith as incoming President.

Allison noted that there are lots of great activities going on. He is looking forward to Commencement. Ken Baierl is still looking for stories to feature graduates – both undergrad and graduate students. Please share those with him.

Allison addressed concerns about the rocky startup of baseball. He noted that he does meet with Coach Bruce regularly and that they have shared concerns about the rough startup and Allison shares that responsibility. Allison noted that perhaps the two of them could meet with the faculty athletic representative to start to address some of these issues.

Chancellor Allison addressed budget questions. He noted that it was the intention to start discussions earlier. VC Bill O'Donnell's departure was part of the problem, but switching to banded tuition and other issues also contributed to the delay and clouded the budget picture. The intent is to start conversations for next year in the fall of 2016 to at least discuss priorities. Allison referred to the budget handouts available at the meeting. In the area of revenue, we did receive performance based funding because of improvement in several areas over the last three years. We will be collecting more revenue because of banded tuition but we also know that we may lose some revenue with students taking fewer hours. We anticipate higher revenues overall.

Allison noted that first priorities for spending were to cover the structural deficit and to meet the IU mandated salary recommendations. In addition, there are many employee change issues that will affect salary spending and not all of those have been fully clarified. There are issues with exempt employees, minimum wage changes, and some other salary issues. After that there was actually very little money left to allocate to anything else.

Allison noted that spending included some initiatives that have not had a base budget (centers in LA&S, for example) and now do. In addition, the budget included:

- An increase in the library monograph budget
- Increased student worker budgets
- Student services budget given additional funds

Chancellor Allison noted that the budget includes a considerable amount for advertising and marketing. This is not in the base budget, is taken from campus reserves as planned spending.

Allison noted that the structural deficit has been decreasing, we still have some salary savings, and we hope to start the year with a balanced budget.

Anurag Pant questioned revenue item #5 on budget highlight sheet.

Chancellor Allison offered an explanation of book voucher accounting changes.

PN Saksena asked if the budget guideline for using funds effectively was considered in shaping the budget.

Allison noted that you would mostly see that in the faculty position decisions in terms of faculty/student ratio. He noted that there was not a lot of reward to pass around.

Dean Elizabeth Dunn questioned the section in 2A – expenditures – that noted that not all was expended.

Allison noted that proposals were requested and those received did not add up to the full amount available. The Administration could have asked for more proposals but because of the overall shape of the budget they did not do that.

Chancellor Allison noted that enrollment trends for fall are looking good.

He reported that salaries are being examined for specific groups of faculty and staff for salary adjustments in the future.

Allison reported that many faculty and biweekly staff members received salary changes but that the Trustees will vote on budget proposals and salary changes in June so those cannot be communicated until after that time.

Chancellor Allison congratulated Gwynn Mettetal who has been selected as the next Chancellor's Professor.

B. EVCAA Joseph

EVCAA Joseph commented on budget issues related to salary. 1% was designated for allotment for normal satisfactory performance. With the remaining 1.5% salary pool, all units were asked to address compression.

Some requests were very generous. Some cases did not receive the raises as they were basically reclassifications of positions. Some units asked for more money than others; they were more assertive. Academic Affairs went back and asked for more proposals.

Affirmative Action and Human Resources will start a comprehensive analysis in the fall of our salary structure. They will examine inequities and consider gender and time served.

In terms of Faculty salaries and compression, Joseph noted that they were able to address some compression in the library, that one unit was given money to address compression for full professors, and that next year they hope to address compression at the associate level.

EVCAA Joseph congratulated recent award winners. Gary Kern won the IU President's Award for Teaching. Mark Bradford won the part-time Teaching Award. Elizabeth Bennion was awarded the Brian Douglas Hiltunen Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement. Scott Sernau has been named the Lundquist award winner. Kyoko Takanashi was selected for FACET.

Trustees' Teaching Awards were received by Sushma Agarwal, Gretchen Anderson, Sue Anderson, Kelcey Ervick, Hayley Froysland, Sharon Imes, Vincci Kwong, Xing Lu, Betsy Lucal, Jennifer Muniz, Dennis Rodrigues, Zach Schrank, Carolyn Schult, Kyle Schwieterman, Cyndi Sofhauser, Kathleen Sullivan, and Jeff Wright.

Joseph congratulated Gwynn Mettetal for her receipt of the Chancellor's Professorship and commended her for her work over her career. She mentioned several projects that she and Gwynn have considered for upcoming year-long project including a sabbatical showcase project that would coincide with the Faculty Publications showcase. Another idea is to highlight the excellent teaching that so many faculty on this campus are involved in by creating Teaching Tables. This would involve considering how to showcase this and how to share and talk about our work.

Joseph noted that we have survived two difficult years with a focus on solving budgetary issues. We have made difficult choices and sacrifices and she thanked the faculty for our grace and patience and noted that she hopes to move forward and celebrate all of the things that we do well.

Joseph reported that Dean Mario Ortiz has resigned. Dean Ortiz has done extraordinary work in the three years that he has been here. He has been a strong advocate for his College and has moved programs forward. He was recruited away from us and we could not match the salary offer.

Joseph noted that while we often discuss faculty and staff salaries, Administrator Salaries are also below expectations. It is difficult to compete in the higher education marketplace. We will need to find money to be able to hire good people.

EVCAA Joseph told the faculty to have a great summer and noted that Academic Affairs is around during that time if you have questions or concerns.

There were no announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy W. Colborn

Academic Senate Secretary

Budget Committee Report

April 23, 2016

Members: Hossein Hakimzadeh, Jerry Hinnefeld, Larry Lambert, Maryann Oake, Andrea Rusnock, Rolf Schimmrigk, Anthony Smith, Susan Thomas, Ganesh Vaidyanathan

- Budget hearings were held on Mar. 21-22
- Multiple members were in attendance at all presentations
- Committee met on 3/31 and 4/5 to formulate recommendations

Committee's estimate of funds available for new spending

- Estimated net new revenue of \$1.0M (state approp (+); tuition increase (+); banded tuition (+); current year shortfall (-))
- Identified, from budget proposals and hearings, spending reductions already decided (\$454k)
- Recommended further reduction in Utilities budget (\$190k)
- Recommended change in routing of funds into Distance Learning, freeing up \$240k for budgeting
- Final estimate = \$1.884M for new spending

Recommended priorities for new spending

Highest priority: 2.5% increase in salary pool (\$1.025M); endorsed EVCAA proposal for new minima for assistant professors and lecturers

Placed selected requests for new funding into two categories...

- First Priority list totaled \$461k
- Second Priority list totaled \$338.5k

- Identified opportunities for utilizing general fund reserve
- Found some requests amenable to one-time funding
- Found no requests for new spending to be without merit

New/Replacement Faculty Positions

The committee was uncomfortable making recommendations on requests for new or replacement faculty positions based on limited information. We recommended that Academic Affairs work on a timetable and framework for input on this issue from the Academic Personnel Committee.

Questions?

First priority:

AdminFiscAff	Police (salary improvement)	\$62,000
CHS	Health Care Provider for H&W Clinic	\$90,000
EnrolServ	Workstudy support	\$90,000
StuServ	Case manager	\$61,000
StuServ	21st Century Scholars	\$24,000
StuServ	ACE tutors	\$30,000
StuServ	DSS mentoring	\$14,000
CLAS	Budget and dir. stipends for Sust. Studies	\$14,200
CLAS	Natatorium purchase and operation (In a sense this is not new spending, since IUSB has already been paying for the operation of this facility, in part from current-year general funds and in part from Designated Other Funds.	\$40,000
LIB	Materials Budget	\$30,000
LIB	hourly wages	\$6,000

Second Priority:

AdminFiscAff	VCAFA replacement (\$56k requested, but unlikely this position will be filled before 1/1/2017)	\$28,000
AdminFiscAff	Clerical support for new VCAFA (see comment above)	\$12,500
AcadAff	Carnegie Engaged Campus	\$10,000
AcadAff	Faculty Associates Program	\$5,000
BUSE	Business Law & Ethics faculty position	\$100,000
EDUC	Lecturer in Counseling & Human Services	\$58,000
EnrolServ	ABC Summer Bridge	\$20,000
StuServ	Leadership Academy	\$55,000
All...	Travel	\$50,000

Identified opportunities for utilizing general fund reserve

ChancOff	Athletics	\$119,500
EnrolServ	Tuition offsets: MSEP, etc.	\$282,200

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTH BEND
2016-17 FINAL GENERAL FUND BUDGET**

South Bend							
	Adjusted Base (4 Jan 2016)		4/15/16 Projected			Annual	
	2015-16	% of TOTAL	2016-17	% of TOTAL	\$ Change	Pct Chg	EXPLANATION
Revenues							
State Operating Appropriation	\$ 22,613,874	35.3%	\$ 23,001,758	34.6%		1.7%	
Fee Replacement Appropriation	3,817,057	6.0%	3,812,267	5.7%		-0.1%	
* Subtotal, Appropriations	\$ 26,430,931	41.3%	\$ 26,814,025	40.4%	\$ 383,094	1.4%	Year 2 of State Biennial Appropriation
Instructional Fees							
Resident Undergraduate	26,613,685	41.6%	26,991,953	40.6%	378,268	1.4%	Tuition revenues based on SCH projections
Nonresident Undergraduate	4,169,959	6.5%	4,757,860	7.2%	587,901	14.1%	Tuition revenues based on SCH projections
Resident Graduate & Professional	1,991,755	3.1%	2,118,222	3.2%	126,467	6.3%	Tuition revenues based on SCH projections
Nonresident Graduate & Professional	1,115,399	1.7%	1,362,086	2.1%	246,687	22.1%	Tuition revenues based on SCH projections
Other Fees	2,735,094	4.3%	2,790,296	4.2%	55,202	2.0%	Fee revemies based on IUSB INC INC projection
* Subtotal, Student Fees	\$ 36,625,892	57.2%	\$ 38,020,417	57.2%	\$ 1,394,525	3.8%	
Indirect Cost Recovery	0		0				
Interest Income	0		0				
Administrative Cost Recoveries	51,200	0.1%	50,000	0.1%	\$ (1,200)	-2.3%	Fee revemies based on IUSB INC INC projection
Other Revenues	909,642	1.4%	1,557,748	2.3%	648,106	71.2%	Fee revemies based on IUSB INC INC projection
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 64,017,665	100.0%	\$ 66,442,190	100.0%	\$ 2,424,525	3.8%	TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES INCREASE
Expenditures							
Academic Salaries	\$ 19,125,496	29.7%	19,633,318	29.5%	507,822	2.7%	
Budget reductions to fund fac sal pgm			(464,386)	-0.7%	(464,386)	-2.4%	
Academic Salaries faculty promotions			147,573	0.2%	147,573	0.8%	
Adjunct Faculty	1,601,026	2.5%	1,608,192	2.4%	7,166	0.4%	
Professional Salaries	4,787,711	7.4%	4,878,008	7.3%	90,297	1.9%	
Nonexempt Salaries	4,073,266	6.3%	4,145,043	6.2%	71,777	1.8%	
Temporary Wages and Supplemental Faculty Online Dev	1,223,157	1.9%	1,600,500	2.4%	377,343	30.8%	Increase of minimum wage to \$10.15 AND benefits
Exempt Retirement	3,178,577	4.9%	3,242,149	4.9%	63,572	2.0%	
PERF/Retire. Saving	554,067	0.9%	776,105	1.2%	222,038	40.1%	
FICA	2,099,546	3.3%	2,141,537	3.2%	41,991	2.0%	Total cost increase for all benefits
Other Benefit Programs	135,209	0.2%	137,913	0.2%	2,704	2.0%	3.9%
Group Insurance	5,089,815	7.9%	5,191,611	7.8%	101,796	2.0%	432,101
* Subtotal, Compensation	\$ 41,867,870	65.0%	\$ 43,037,563	64.8%	1,169,693	2.8%	Total increase in all salaries and benefits
Student Financial Aid	2,352,930	3.7%	2,428,948	3.7%	76,018	3.2%	Increased at rate of tuition + allocation of \$41,150
Energy and Utilities	1,916,975	3.0%	1,999,146	3.0%	82,171	4.3%	Projected cost increases from utility providers
Library and Equipment	752,201	1.2%	791,201	1.2%	39,000	5.2%	Chancellor's allocation for inflation relief
Other Expenses	4,530,677	7.0%	4,860,151	7.3%	329,474	7.3%	primarily operating exp assoc with new course fees
Administrative Service Charge	3,367,418	5.2%	3,440,097	5.2%	72,679	2.2%	Bloomington central assessment increase
Other Cost Recovery Expenses	4,962,043	7.7%	5,061,702	7.6%	99,659	2.0%	Bloomington IT and Shared Services recharges
Facilities Debt Service	4,375,382	6.8%	4,374,292	6.6%	(1,090)	0.0%	
Held for Reallocations	286,318	0.4%	79,618	0.1%	(206,700)	-72.2%	Remaining funds for Veteran's Affairs counselor
Other Adjustments (excl. debt svc and fee replmt)			369,472	0.6%	369,472		Fin aid book vouchers not previously budgeted
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 64,411,814	100.0%	\$ 66,442,190	100.0%	2,030,376	3.2%	Total increased expenditures for 2016-17
Incremental Expenditures					\$ 2,030,376		
Marginal Surplus/(Deficit) of 16-17 budget			\$ 0		\$ 394,149		
Structural Deficit (planned) for 15-16 budget	\$ (394,149)	-0.6%	\$ 0	0.0%	(394,149)		Elimination of 2015-16 structural deficit
Fiscal Year Surplus/(Deficit)	\$ (394,149)		\$ 0		\$ 0		

Indiana University South Bend General Fund Budget Highlights for 2016/17

Revenues

1. Revenues predicted to increase by 3.8%
2. Performance-based funding added to our base
3. Anticipating some of the impact of banded tuition added to our base; students predicted to enroll in more units
4. Non-resident population predicted to grow based on growth pattern
5. Significant changes in other revenues and other adjustments (on the expense side) reflect recognition beginning in 2016-17 of financial aid funds now being budgeted in support of the student book voucher program.

Expenditures

1. We covered the previous **structural deficit** of nearly \$400,000. Still, there are some significant ongoing programs that the balanced budget for 2016/17 does not cover. (see "Future Budgets")
2. Increased **salaries and benefits** constitute the major use of new revenues.
 - a. IU South Bend followed the IU salary guidelines and provided pools of 1% for satisfactory performance to units as well as addressing equity, market, and performance through an additional 1.5% pool, not all of which was expended.
 - b. Academic Affairs was able to raise the annual salary floor for all full-time instructors and Assistant Professors. We have begun to address compaction but this will need to be addressed over a longer term.
 - c. Given our past faculty hiring, considerable funds were allocated to promotions (\$147,573)
 - d. The IU Board of Trustees have made considerable efforts to raise the wages and benefits of part-time and temporary workers. Those raises are incorporated into our allocations.
 - e. A federal ruling has indicated that many more professional staff will move from exempt to paid overtime status. We have allocated \$75,000 for overtime and will need to enforce limits about overtime work.
 - f. IU-wide, police officers received significant increases to respond to market conditions (we keep losing officers to city police departments that pay more)
 - g. Benefit costs will grow at only a small level, less than 1%, but this still has a significant impact on ability to budget for other items. (over \$250k)
 - h. Replacing deans and vice chancellors will add to current costs as IU South Bend senior management salaries have been between 70-90% of peer median salaries. Part of these added costs are reflected in this year's budget
3. Given the salary and benefits increases, **investment in other programs** is quite limited.
 - a. Centers in CLAS were given small permanent base budgets (\$5000 each)
 - b. Library acquisitions budget will receive a small boost (\$30,000) and increased student worker spending in the library and elsewhere will increase (\$18,094)
 - c. Student Services will begin to address priority needs (\$72,000) and financial aid will increase somewhat (\$41,150)
 - d. Softball and salary/benefits program will add \$81,142 to the Athletics budget.

Future Budgets

The revenues and expenditures presented above provide a predicted balanced budget. But there are other ongoing programs that present “Planned Use of Reserves” for 2016/17.

1. Advertising and marketing, including direct marketing, will cost approximately \$425,000
2. Institutionally funded scholarships are still not at the level we would like. We would like to increase them as well as externally funded scholarships.
3. Summer bridge, leadership academy, and other retention/transfer programs such as ABC will be funded from existing institutional scholarship funds with some portion potentially coming from reserves

Other than reserves, planned salary savings and, more significantly, salary savings from turnover provide the primary source of current funds to balance the overall university budget when ongoing activities have no base funding. The 2016/17 budget reduces significantly the scope of planned activities that are not in the base. As enrollment recovers in 2016/17 and beyond, all ongoing expenditures should be covered in the base budget allocation.

For 2017/18, IU South Bend will:

1. Continue to enhance the academic quality of IU South Bend through student, faculty, and staff support
2. Continue to focus on retention of students for the benefit of students, and incidentally to increase performance-based funding and tuition and fee revenues
3. Consider adding additional low-cost athletic programs to attract and retain more students
4. Continue to add academic programs needed in our region that will attract new students
5. Continue to analyze results of expanded direct marketing and recruitment efforts for maximum efficiency in attracting new students to our campus

Mid-year analysis of 2015/16 closing

IU South Bend’s structural deficit has been decreasing over the past three years. This year we anticipate balancing general fund revenues and expenditures with a smaller use of reserves than in the last two fiscal years. With the adjustment of the book voucher program, we have identified a growing source of previously unpredicted revenues so there’s a clearer picture of how we are able to (nearly) balance current general funds when not all current activities have had base funding.

Capital Expenditures

IU South Bend continues its efforts to upgrade facilities through a planned use of about \$10 million in campus capital reserves as well to invest state funds of over \$10.5 million in Northside. University Advancement actively seeks external gift and grant funding to substitute for our reserve capital funding to free our capital reserves for even greater investment in campus improvements.