



INDIANA *for* COMMISSION  
HIGHER EDUCATION

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Those Concerned  
**From:** Teresa Lubbers  
Commissioner  
**Date:** June 3, 2011  
**Subject:** Commission Meeting

Enclosed are agenda materials for the June Commission meeting. The meeting schedule is as follows:

### **Thursday, June 9, 2011**

University of Southern Indiana  
University Center  
8600 University Blvd.  
Evansville, IN 47712

**\*\* Times below are based on CENTRAL time; 1 hour behind Indpls. [Eastern Daylight Time]**

- 4:30 – 5:30 p.m.** **Tour**, new Business & Engineering Center and University Center (UC) addition, meet USI staff at the fountain on the Quad between UC West and UC East
- 5:30 – 6:30 p.m.** **Reception**, for Commission members and staff, USI staff, and invited guests, Traditions Lounge, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
- \* 6:30 - 8:30 p.m.** **Dinner Working Session** (*public meeting*), Room UC 2207, 2nd floor



**MEMORANDUM**

June 3, 2011

Page 2

**Friday, June 10, 2011**

**\*\* Times below are based on CENTRAL time; 1 hour behind Indpls. [Eastern Daylight Time]**

University of Southern Indiana  
University Center  
8600 University Blvd.  
Evansville, IN 47712

**\* 7:45 - 8:45 a.m. Breakfast Working Session (public meeting)**  
UC 2220, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

**\* 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. Commission Meeting (public meeting)**  
UC 2217-2219, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

**12:00 p.m. Luncheon, Traditions Lounge, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor**

If you have questions, suggestions, or need a reasonable accommodation, please contact this office.

\* The Commission for Higher Education abides by the Indiana Open Door Law (Indiana Code 5-14-1.5). All business meetings are open to the public. (Meals will not be provided.)



# AGENDA

Commission for Higher Education

## COMMISSION MEETING

**University of Southern Indiana**  
University Center, Room 2217-2219  
8600 University Blvd.  
Evansville, IN  
Phone: 812-464-1756

**Friday, June 10, 2011**

**\*\*NOTE: Meeting time listed below is based on CENTRAL time;  
1 hour behind Indianapolis, which is on Eastern Daylight Time**

- I. CALL TO ORDER -- 9:00 a.m.**
- II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**
- III. CHAIR'S REMARKS**
- IV. COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**
- V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY  
COMMISSION MEETING .....1**
- VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
  - A. Evolution of *TransferIN* Website: Implementation of H.E.A. 1135-2010.....15
  - B. Dual Credit Review Process.....27
- VII. DECISION ITEMS**
  - A. Academic Degree Programs
    - 1. Master of Science in Occupational Therapy To Be Offered by Indiana  
State University at Terre Haute .....33



2.	Certificate, Technical Certificate, and Associate of Applied Science in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) To Be Offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Lafayette, Kokomo, Muncie, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Evansville, and Bloomington .....	39
3.	Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action .....	55
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bachelor of Science in Nursing (Completion) to be offered by Indiana University East at New Castle</li> <li>• Bachelor of Arts in History to be offered by Indiana University East at Richmond</li> <li>• Technical Certificate in Dental Assisting to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College-South Bend at South Bend</li> <li>• Associate of Science in Pre-Engineering to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at South Bend, Warsaw, Fort Wayne, and Indianapolis</li> <li>• Associate of Applied Science in Engineering Technology to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, Warsaw, Fort Wayne, and Sellersburg</li> </ul>	
B.	Capital Projects on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action .....	61
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Manufacturing Center at the University of Southern Indiana: \$2,300,000</li> </ul>	
C.	Release of FY2011 Improving Teacher Quality Program Request for Proposals (RFP).....	65
D.	Adoption of the 2011-12 Indiana/Ohio Reciprocity Agreement.....	117
E.	Election of Officers for 2011-2012 .....	119

**VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A.	Status of Active Requests for New Academic Degree Programs.....	123
B.	Capital Improvement Projects on Which Staff Have Acted.....	125
C.	Capital Improvement Projects Awaiting Action .....	127
D.	Minutes of the May Commission Working Sessions .....	129





E. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings of the Commission .....131

**IX. OLD BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT --** Approximately 12:00 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

The next meeting of the Commission will be on August 12, 2011, in Gary.



**State of Indiana  
Commission for Higher Education**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Friday, May 13, 2011**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Commission for Higher Education met in regular session starting at 9:00 a.m. at Indiana University, Kelley Center, Room 130, 2300 S. Washington St., Kokomo, Indiana, with Chair Mike Smith presiding.

**II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

*Members Present:* Cynthia Baker, Gerald Bepko, Dennis Bland, Carol D’Amico, Susana Duarte de Suarez, Jud Fisher, Keith Hansen, Chris LaMothe, Marilyn Moran-Townsend (via conference call), Chris Murphy, George Rehnquist, and Mike Smith.

*Members absent:* Eileen O’Neill Odum, Ken Sendelweck.

Dr. Richard Helton, President, Vincennes University, also attended the meeting.

**III. CHAIR’S REPORT**

Mr. Smith invited Dr. Michael Harris, Chancellor of Indiana University Kokomo, to give welcoming remarks. Dr. Harris welcomed Commission to the campus. He thanked the Commission members for the work they do and said that the faculty and staff followed the *Reaching Higher* document, which gave them directions on what they need to do to meet the Commission’s expectations.

Mr. Smith welcomed a new At Large member of the Commission, Mr. Chris LaMothe. Mr. Smith briefly described Mr. LaMothe’s previous work as a Chairman of the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, as well as his most recent experience in the private sector.

Mr. Smith invited Ms. Baker to speak about the Faculty Leadership Conference, which took place on April 29th. Ms. Baker gave a brief recap of the Conference, the subject of which was “*Faculty Engagement toward Student Learning Outcomes*”. Sixty representatives from 27 campuses attended the conference. Dr. Carol Geary Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities, was the keynote speaker.

Mr. Smith acknowledged the work Ms. Baker did as a faculty representative on the Commission and thanked her and Mr. Hansen, student representative on the Commission, for taking to a new level the engagement and participation of student and faculty constituency.

Mr. Smith asked Ms. Teresa Lubbers, Commissioner, Commission for Higher Education, to comment on the Kent Weldon Conference, which took place on April 15<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Lubbers noted that the focus of the Kent Weldon Conference, as well as the Faculty Conference, was on learning outcomes. Ms. Lubbers said that it is very important to insure quality learning and to understand what learning outcomes really mean. Ms. Lubbers pointed out

that the Commission continues to press for more degree attainment through the performance funding formula. In this connection, Ms. Lubbers commended Chancellor Harris for focusing on more degrees and insuring quality at the same time. In conclusion, Ms. Lubbers thanked those Commission members who were able to attend the conference.

Ms. Lubbers suggested that in the future the Commission members consider combining all three conferences (Student Leadership, Faculty Leadership and Weldon Conference) every three to four years.

Mr. Smith stated that the Commission adopted a framework document *Reaching Higher*, in which the Commission addressed a goal for Indiana's higher education system to increase the number of high quality degrees and certificates. Mr. Smith pointed out that it is time to formally establish the Commission's efforts to set more specific targets for Indiana's higher education system.

Mr. Smith read the resolution to set clear college completion and credential targets.

**R-11.03-1**      **WHEREAS** the Indiana Commission for Higher Education is charged by state statute with planning and coordinating Indiana's system of higher education; and

**WHEREAS** the Commission developed and adopted its *Reaching Higher* strategic plan with the recognition that Hoosiers need an unprecedented level of educational attainment for Indiana to compete and to thrive; and

**WHEREAS** the Commission translated the principles of *Reaching Higher* into a set of state goals and actions for driving college preparation, affordability, completion and economic development; and

**WHEREAS** clear completion and college credential production targets are essential to informing and driving progress across the Indiana's higher education system and among the state's colleges and universities; and

**WHEREAS** the goals of *Reaching Higher* must continuously be refined to ensure the state's higher education system meets Indiana's needs for college completion, degree production and workforce development;

**NOW THEREFORE** be it resolved, that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education:

**Affirms its role as a national leader in increasing the percentage of Hoosiers with a quality college degree or credential to 60 percent by 2025; and further**

**Commits to establishing college credential production targets for the state system, Indiana's higher education institutions and individual campuses by the end of 2011 in an effort to reach this goal (Motion – Hansen, second – Fisher, unanimously approved.)**

#### **IV. COMMISSIONER’S REPORT**

Ms. Lubbers acknowledged the presence in the audience of State Representatives Tom Dermody and Mike Karickhoff. Ms. Lubbers especially recognized Representative Dermody’s leadership on higher education issues, and thanked both legislators for their service.

Ms. Lubbers welcomed Mr. LaMothe on the Commission, saying that he brings a strong commitment to education.

She also thanked Chancellor Harris for his leadership and all the work the university does for students and the region.

Ms. Lubbers announced that the 2011 Faculty Nominating Committee met on April 25<sup>th</sup>, and chose three names, which were forwarded to the Governor for consideration. The Commission should have a new faculty representative by June’s meeting.

Ms. Lubbers provided an update on the legislative session. Much of the session’s focus was on education, especially on K-12 issues. K-12 is seeking to improve the preparation of their students, which makes the work of the higher education more rewarding. Ms. Lubbers also mentioned the work on the budget and the commitment of the legislature to performance funding. The Commission indicated the desire to have five percent of the funding for higher education to be allotted to performance metrics, and at least 50 percent of this funding would be assigned to degree performance metrics. The General Assembly met those goals.

Ms. Lubbers also mentioned the work the Commission did on the financial aid study over the course of the last year. She noted that Representative Dermody was a point person on this study. Several of the Commission’s recommendations were accepted during the legislative session.

#### **V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2011 COMMISSION MEETING**

**R-11-03.2 RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education hereby approves the Minutes of the March 2011 regular meeting (Motion – Duarte de Suarez, second – Murphy, unanimously approved)

#### **VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

##### **A. Presentation on Prior Learning Assessments by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL)**

Dr. Ken Sauer, Senior Associate Commissioner, Research and Academic Affairs, gave a brief introduction and overview of CAEL. He introduced Dr. Pam Tate, President and CEO, CAEL, and invited her to present the report.

Dr. Tate began by giving the history and the mission of CAEL, which is to expand lifelong learning opportunities for adults. Dr. Tate spoke about LearningCounts.org, as CAEL’s solution to help students demonstrate their prior learning. Dr. Tate mentioned the funders of LearningCounts.org, as well as national partner organizations (The College Board and the American Council on Education – ACE) and partner institutions. She mentioned that Ivy Tech Community College and Indiana University School of Continuing Studies are among those institutions.

Dr. Tate said that partner institutions are sending CAEL students for assessment, and then CAEL gets feedback from these institutions. Dr. Tate explained the process of evaluating prior learning for course credit by ACE. She spoke about some policies that would have to be changed in Indiana, so that the assessment process could work for adults.

CAEL has come up with three policies. The first is the financial aid issue; if the state financial aid could cover the cost of assessment, this will help people to complete colleges more quickly.

Dr. Tate described the second area that CAEL looked at: the possibility to use an individual training account that is offered to the unemployed through workforce system in Indiana, to cover the cost of assessment. So far this money has only been used for training. CAEL met with the head of workforce system in Indiana, and it was confirmed that it is possible to do, so Indiana could become a model for other states to foster this practice.

The third policy Dr. Tate spoke about is changing employer tuition policy. At present the tuition is only for training purposes, but not for assessment for learning. If these policies could be changed, companies could have their employees go back to the institutions and finish more quickly and at a lower cost. Dr. Tate said that the first company to have a contract with CAEL was Starbucks, and now they work with McDonald Corporation, Verizon, Verizon Wireless and other large corporations, that are currently changing their tuition practices.

Dr. Tate pointed out that CAEL would like to collaborate with the Commission for Higher Education and the Department of Workforce Development to get the message out to Indiana employers regarding changing corporate tuition practices in order to further the college completion agenda in Indiana.

Dr. Tate said that Indianapolis is one of 57 cities in the USA competing for the Talent Dividend Prize that has just been launched by CEOs for Cities. One million dollars will be given to the city that increases its college graduation rates by one percent in the next three years. Dr. Tate said that the USA needs higher percentage completion rates not only in order to compete with other countries, but because this will bring economic benefits to our cities and states.

Dr. Tate said that currently in Indiana more public than private institutions offer more assessment options and that 81% of the institutions surveyed said that there will be an increased need for prior learning assessment opportunities for the students in the future.

Mr. Smith thanked Dr. Tate for her presentation.

Mr. Murphy commented that many large businesses offer their employees training courses, for which employees can receive credit. He asked how CAEL encourages this and makes this happen. Dr. Tate responded that the employees have an opportunity to go through assessment of the prior learning the businesses had offered by going to LearningCounts.org and starting the process. She added that the business, through their tuition program, could pay for these assessments.

Mr. Hansen asked whether there is an age limit for the students. Dr. Tate responded that anyone who has any college level learning that was received somewhere else, is eligible for assessment.

Mr. Bland asked whether CAEL has any intention to address the needs of the population that has been incarcerated. Dr. Tate responded that CAEL has their first potential partnership with Kansas State Department of Corrections, and would be happy to work in Indiana.

Ms. Duarte de Suarez asked whether CAEL has any public outreach. Dr. Tate confirmed that the Lumina Foundation helped CAEL to launch a major social marketing campaign, which starts on June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Smith acknowledged the work of Dr. Charles Bantz, Chancellor of IUPUI, and Mr. Brian Payne, head of the Central Indiana Community Foundation, who are actively involved with CEOs for Cities.

## **VII. DECISION ITEMS**

### **A. Academic Degree Programs**

#### **1. Doctor of Philosophy in Urban Education Studies to Be Offered by Indiana University through its IUPUI Campus**

Dr. Barbara Bichelmeyer, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, Indiana University Bloomington, presented this proposal.

This degree proposal was presented to the Commission in February, at which time members decided to table taking action on it. Dr. Bichelmeyer said that as a result of discussions with the Commission members and staff, a few changes were made to the proposed program. Dr. Bichelmeyer briefly outlined these changes.

Mr. Smith shared some comments provided to him by members of the Commission who were unable to attend the meeting. There is an on-going concern regarding the use of state funds to create a separate degree program, especially since a similar educational doctoral degree program already exists. Even though the staff recommendation states that no new state funding is required, this new program will inherently increase a need of additional administration, thus possibly triggering the necessity of additional spending, whether this is an allocated or a new cost. Mr. Smith asked for a clarification on this matter.

Dr. Bichelmeyer responded that she spoke to IU's budget officer, and he provided her with the estimate that confirms that the only additional expenditure would be from the tuition and fees that are gained by students enrolled in the program. If students enroll in the program, they will provide the finances needed to teach courses.

Mr. Smith wanted to make sure the records of the meeting show that the questions from the absent Commission members were addressed.

Mr. Smith asked whether Indiana University was participating in the Woodrow Wilson's Fellows STEM programs. Dr. Pat Rogan, Executive Associate Dean, Education, IUPUI, confirmed that IUPUI is participating, but IU Bloomington is not.

Dr. Sauer gave the staff recommendation.

**R-11-03.3**     **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves the *Ph.D.in Urban Education Studies* to be offered by Indiana University through its IUPUI Campus, in accordance with the background discussion in this agenda item and the *Abstract*, April 29,2011; and

That the Commission recommends no new state funds, in accordance with the supporting document, *New Academic Degree Program Proposal Summary*, April 29, 2011 (Motion – Fisher, second – Rehnquist, unanimously approved)

## **2. Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action**

Staff presented a list of degree program proposals for expedited action.

**R-11-03.4**     **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education hereby approves by consent the following degree programs, in accordance with background information provided in this agenda item:

- Bachelor of Science in Human Life Science to be offered by Indiana State University East at Richmond
- Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry to be offered by Indiana University East at Richmond
- Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences to be offered by Indiana University Kokomo in Kokomo
- Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry to be offered by Indiana University Kokomo in Kokomo (Motion – Fisher, second – Bepko, unanimously approved)

## **B. Capital Projects**

### **1. Qualified Energy Savings Project at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis**

Dr. Thomas Morrison, Vice President of Capital Projects and Facilities, Indiana University, presented this project.

Mr. Smith asked whether Indiana University has collaborated with any large for-profit contractors who lead the movement of energy conservation across the country.

Dr. Morrison said that this is exactly how IU does it. They utilize a consultant to come in to identify the projects in select buildings, and then IU reviews the projects and selects the consultant who can give them the best return.



Mr. Smith announced that he will have to abstain from the vote on this project, since he is a board member of Vectren Corporation, a company that is in this business and competes for this type of work.

Mr. Smith asked Dr. Morrison to speak to some options that many of the contractors offer to their clients. Dr. Morrison explained that IU elected not to use the option of guaranteed savings, because IU believes they could monitor this internally. IU is starting to look at certain types of solar and wind alternatives that might help finance this project in a different way.

Mr. Hansen asked what the expected return in savings is for this project. Dr. Morrison responded that the financing is for ten years; IU's goal is between five and eight years.

Mr. Bland asked whether IU could quantify the savings. Dr. Morrison responded that doing it as a simple basis of \$1.3 million a year at 5.8 percent over a ten year period the return would be 30-40 percent above and beyond the debt.

Mr. Jason Dudich, Associate Commissioner and Chief Financial Officer, gave the staff recommendation.

Dr. Bepko wanted to say for the record that he is a board member of Citizens Energy, but he will vote in favor of the project.

Mr. Bland said that he is also a board member of Citizens Energy, and he will abstain from voting for the project.

**R-11-03.5      RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education recommends approval to the State Budget Agency and the State Budget Committee the following project: *Qualified Energy Savings Project at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis*, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item (Motion – Bepko, second – Hansen, two abstained, approved)

## **2. New Third and Union Residence Hall Complex at Indiana University Bloomington**

Dr. Morrison presented this project.

Mr. Hansen asked whether the fees for the housing will be increased. Dr. Morrison responded that the fees have not been established yet, but there will be a lot of options for students. Mr. Hansen asked whether the new housing is expected to be fully occupied. Dr. Morrison confirmed that they would.

Mr. Smith related to Dr. Morrison some concerns from a commission member who was unable to attend the meeting. These concerns were regarding the dorm rates and making sure that the Commission does not add potentially higher dorm increases to the future tuition increase. Dr. Morrison responded that IU has a variety of space. Four percent of the units are single units; 32 percent are single bedroom units. Dr. Morrison said that IU could have sold the single units many times over, but they choose not to do this; this is what drives the low cost per square foot.

As to overall rates, Dr. Morrison explained that IU is trying to take a longer view over their capital needs, which are reflected in on campus housing rates. They are looking at it as a long-term; and they are saving money over the long-term, knowing that they will have to reinvest in future facilities on campus. The increase in residence hall rates over the entire campus is only five percent from the previous year.

Mr. LaMothe asked whether there has been a serious effort to look at the privatization of the building and R&R. Dr. Morrison confirmed that the university has previously looked at this option.

Mr. Dudich gave the staff recommendation.

Mr. Hanson asked whether freshmen are required to live on campus. Mr. Dudich confirmed that.

Ms. Duarte de Suarez asked whether it is possible to request from IU a history of on campus housing rates, to see the total impact on students across the board. Dr. Morrison responded in the affirmative.

**R-11-03.6      RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education recommends approval to the State Budget Agency and the State Budget Committee the following project: *New Third and Union Residence Hall Complex at Indiana University Bloomington*, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item ( Motion – Bepko, second – Blend, unanimously approved)

### **3. New Third and Union Apartment Complex at Indiana University Bloomington**

Dr. Morrison presented this project.

Ms. D'Amico asked why the university is in the apartment business; why not let the private sector take over. Dr. Morrison responded that 70 percent of the IU students are renting in the private market. Some students prefer to live on campus, and this is one of the options the university wants to offer them.

Mr. Smith asked whether the university could hire a private constructor to build and manage the apartment complex according to the university's specifications. Dr. Morrison responded in affirmative. Mr. Smith asked why the university would like to commit the university capital to this project. Dr. Morrison explained that there is never interplay between the university capital and housing capital. Those are two separate sides, according to state statutes. The university cannot take housing funds and fund the university. Mr. Smith asked whether this fund can be used for other dorms. Dr. Morrison responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Duarte de Suarez asked whether the fees for the students would be reduced if this complex was managed by a private sector. Dr. Morrison responded that it depended on how much the students are paying in the private market.

Mr. Smith said that he asked IU for some additional information, and he received a report that is called "Auxiliary Enterprises". This shows \$193 million gross surpluses. Mr. Smith said that he would assume that in tough economic times the surplus in one area

could be applied to another area, but it seems that this is not the case; there are two different enterprises. Dr. Neil Theobald, Vice President and CFO, Indiana University, confirmed that according to state statutes IU cannot take money from the Auxiliary Enterprises fund and apply it to general operations fund.

Mr. Smith relayed to Dr. Morrison a comment from Ms. Odum, that military and other similar institutions have demonstrated a trend to get out of the apartment business. Ms. Odum wondered why IU persists in staying in the business of building an apartment complex. Dr. Morrison went back to his original comments on the matter of student housing versus military housing. Military housing is the family type housing; student housing that IU offers is in interest of creating a community, and is a part of the learning process for students. Dr. Morrison also stated that IU is often approached by developers, but never on the Bloomington campus. Typically, the developers are looking mostly to build townhouses for professional students.

Dr. Morrison added that there is another problem which IU and other peer universities face sometimes: the developer begins construction and then goes out of business; in this case, the university sometimes feels obliged to buy the construction. Mr. Smith agreed that this is a complicated situation.

Mr. Dudich gave the staff recommendation.

Mr. Smith stated that he is going to vote “No” on this project, in quest of broader strategic review of private versus institutional ownership alternative. Mr. Smith added that the Commission needs to take a look at the frangibility of the reserves.

Due to a few other “No” votes, a roll call vote was taken. The project was approved by the majority of votes.

**R-11-03.7**      **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education recommends approval to the State Budget Agency and the State Budget Committee the following project: *New Third and Union Apartment Complex at Indiana University Bloomington*, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item (Motion – Bepko, second - Fisher, approved).

#### **4. Capital Projects on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action**

**R-11-03.8**      **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves by consent the following capital projects, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item:

- Michael A. Carroll Track and Soccer Stadium Field Replacement at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis: \$1,200,000
- Warehouse Renovation at Indiana University Bloomington: \$2,275,000

- Homeland Security/Public Safety Renovation at Vincennes University: \$2,000,000 (Motion – Rehnquist, second – Hansen, unanimously approved)

**C. Adoption of Non-Binding Tuition and Mandatory Fee Targets for 2011-12 and 2012-13**

Mr. Smith thanked Commissioner Lubbers and the Commission's staff for their six-month long work on recommendations, which they made using a careful assessment of recent trends and increases in cost of higher education, as correlated to a decade long trend of lack of growth in personal income in our state.

Mr. Dudich presented this item. He explained that, by law, the Commission must recommend the non-binding tuition and mandatory fee increase targets for each public educational institution. Mr. Dudich acknowledged the participation of the Commission members, institutions, and national experts, who were involved in this process.

Mr. Dudich gave an overview of the process. He said that the Commission contacted NCHEMS (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems), and they provided feedback regarding approved metrics used by the Commission.

Mr. Dudich explained that the dates the staff used range from 2006 to 2011. Out of thirty possible metrics, the staff selected five: the consumer price index, the Indiana per capita personal income, the average resident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee in Indiana's two- and four-year institutions; state operating appropriations per undergraduate resident FTE; and the state financial aid public award cap, calculated each year by SSACI (State Student Assistance Commission of Indiana) to be handed out to students attending public institutions.

Rather than apply all five metrics to each individual campus, Commission staff felt that they needed to establish a base at which to start each institution. For this purpose, the staff took two of the five metrics: the consumer price index and Indiana per capita income; and used the average change that took place over two years, to come up with the base target of 2.5 percent.

After that, the staff looked at each institution, to see how they differentiate from each other, and whether the institution should be higher than 2.5 percent: either 2.5, 3, or 3.5 percent, not to exceed 3.5 percent.

During this process the staff looked at three other factors mentioned earlier: state operation appropriations per FTE, state financial award public aid cap, and the tuition that is charged to resident undergraduate students. The staff also took into consideration the mission differentiation among each campus, as well as their access and affordability.

Mr. Dudich pointed out that the Commission recognizes that many of Indiana's postsecondary institutions are facing the budget reductions. The Commission challenges every institution to use other means available, including finding efficiencies, reducing costs, and seeking other revenue sources before turning to students and their families for additional revenue. The recommendations presented

to the Commission assume that every institution will make every reasonable effort to maximize these other means.

Mr. Dudich went over the Commission recommendations for each state institution. IU Campuses: Bloomington – 0 - 3.5 percent, East – 0 - 2.5 percent, Kokomo – 0 - 2.5 percent; Northwest – 0 - 2.5 percent; Southeast – 0 - 2.5 percent, IUPUI – 0 - 2.5 percent.

Tuition increases for Purdue campuses: West Lafayette – 0 - 3.5 percent, Calumet – 0 - 2.5 percent; North Central – 0 - 2.5 percent; IPFW – 0 - 2.5 percent. Mr. Dudich explained that in 2009 the General Assembly authorized the construction of the Student Recreational Center Expansion and Renovation at PU West Lafayette. In order to pay for this project, Purdue will be adding one percent increase to their tuition and fees in the upcoming year.

Tuition increases for the rest of the state institutions: Indiana State University – 0 - 2.5 percent; University of Southern Indiana – 0 - 3.0 percent; Ball State University – 0 - 3.0 percent; Vincennes University – 0 - 2.5 percent; and Ivy Tech all campuses – 0 - 3.0 percent. All these tuition increases apply for both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years.

Mr. Smith asked approximately what percentage of the undergraduate students on the Bloomington campus will pay standard rate. Mr. Dudich responded that based on the enrollment numbers he received from the university it would be 89 percent of the population. Mr. Smith said that sometimes the Commission hears from various sources about extraordinarily higher percentage increases, so he wanted to make sure that for the vast majority of undergraduate resident students this data will apply. Mr. Dudich confirmed this.

Mr. Hansen thanked the Commission and staff for focusing on students' affordability while still considering the quality and mission differentiation among the institutions.

Mr. Bland asked for some clarification on the tuition rates at Purdue University. Mr. Dudich explained that the difference in rates depends on the type of program the students are in.

Mr. Murphy made a comment that the Commission is trying to draw attention of Hoosiers to an importance of a degree completion in Indiana, rather than to focus just on a cost of education.

Mr. Smith remarked that the Commission, being a coordinating agency, has a deep concern for its statutory duties, and that is what the recommendations refer to. Mr. Smith assured representatives from the state institutions that the Commission has no intention of telling them how to operate in order to get to the desired economic outcomes.

Dr. Bepko made a following statement: "When I first saw the classifications developed for purposes of setting tuition targets, I thought they contained an effort to reclassify IUPUI as a regional campus. In my view such a reclassification would be unwise, but that was not the intent of the ICHE staff proposal. Let me explain.

IUPUI has long since moved from being a regional campus by establishing a broad range of programs of research and teaching consonant with its mission and its emergence as a leader of a new generation of urban public campuses devoted to engagement and impact. This is the policy of IU as adopted by its Trustees.

Apropos of its urban university focus, the word “impact” is in the title of the current campaign for IUPUI. This is a \$1.25 billion dollar campaign that will end, most likely successfully, in 2013. While most of the funds raised in the Campaign will be for health sciences, a substantial portion will be for the General Academic Programs. This is a pattern that was followed in the Campaign for IUPUI titled “The Future is Here”, which ended in 2004 with a total of \$1.04 billion. These campaigns seem to make clear that the IU vision for IUPUI is well supported by the relevant alumni and communities.

This strong vision and the increase in new advanced programs of value to Indiana and its Capital Region, along with relatively low IUPUI General Academic state funding, has caused the default rate for undergraduate tuition to be set at a higher level than for the regional campuses. At the same time the commitment to engagement and to the population center’s student populations caused IUPUI to continue to provide opportunities for students whose paramount need is access and affordability. It is this cohort of students that the ICHE is attempting to address in its recommendation for IUPUI General Academic Programs by placing them in the stratum that involves the least flexibility in setting tuition rates.

Properly understood, the tuition recommendations do not reclassify IUPUI’s General Academic Programs. Instead, the goal of these targets is to address those students who are in need of affordability and access points. They often will be low income students who don’t have opportunities for institutional financial aid. These tuition targets address a need to protect low income students whose ability to pay for college may be overcome by tuition increases.

Also, the tuition target applies only to what is called the default rate. This does not restrict tuition rates in those special programs that have higher costs, more demanding threshold requirements, and special opportunities for their graduates. This includes undergraduate academic programs, such as those in the School of Nursing, Engineering, Science, Kelley School of Business, and the Herron School of Art. These programs have not been covered by the default rate in the past and will be considered exceptional cases in the 2011-2013 cycle.

A matter about the makeup of the IUPUI General Academic Program undergraduate students seems to remain open. Data developed in this process show that these IUPUI General Academic programs have attracted more and more high performing students. This is at odds with the description of a “primary affordability and access point.” Entering credentials of the most recent first year class have SAT and Class Rank characteristics in many categories that are approaching or equivalent to Ball State, and higher than Indiana State and the University of Southern Indiana.

Also, in IUPUI’s General Academic Programs institutional financial aid has increased greatly. It has been a point of pride and a matter of emphasis for Chancellor Charles Bantz. It is not clear, therefore, whether or to what degree this

defining characteristic of this ICHE classification criterion continues to fit IUPUI General Academic.

Finally, while there is no suggestion that these tuition targets are being used to balance or set off for other perceived benefits or disadvantages deriving from the actions of the 2011 General Assembly, it is worthy of note that IUPUI General Academic Programs have performed very well under the ICHE established performance standards. Based on these funding formulas they have earned for 2011-2013 a total of more than \$10 million, which is more than any other campus including IU Bloomington and PU West Lafayette. This includes a very large Performance Funding allocation for an increase in the number of degrees awarded and an impressive award for increases in research funding. This is for increases only in the IUPUI General Academic Programs. The performance payment for research was nearly as large as the award for IUPUI Health and a little less than twice the award for IU Bloomington. While this should not be a justification for restricting tuition increases to the lowest level, it does tend to help with the resource situation in the IUPUI General Academic Programs.

The study of these issues will continue, but there is a need now to move ahead. Staff has invested heavily in their recommendations which are generally very well researched and reasoned. Given my discomfort in being a lone voice or one of a small minority of persons who have serious reservations about this aspect of the Tuition Target process; given my discomfort with urging a change in an important and carefully prepared, broadly supported staff recommendation dealing with IU/IUPUI, with which I am closely associated; given my profound commitment to the collegiality and high minded debate that prevails under Mike Smith's leadership, as it did under Jon Costas' and Chris Murphy's leadership; and in light of my deep respect for Teresa (Lubbers) and our succession of chairs; my conclusion is that this proposal should go forward for adoption. With these comments, caveats, and the expected continuing review of tuition setting, I will support it."

**R-11-03.9**            **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education adopts the recommendation of non-binding tuition and mandatory fee increase targets for each of Indiana's public postsecondary institutions for 2011-12 and 2012-13 consistent with this agenda item (Motion – Murphy, second – Fisher, unanimously approved)

**D.    Policy on Dual Credit Courses Taken in a High School Setting**

Mr. Jon Gubera, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning Studies, presented this item.

Mr. Gubera asked for an amendment to the document on page 67 in the Agenda book: the word "*courses*" is to be added after word "*credit*" in the sentence "**The Indiana Commission for Higher Education's Policy on Dual Credit Taken in a High School Setting**".

**R-11-03.10**        **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves, as amended, the *Policy on Dual Credit Courses Taken*

*in a High School Setting*, dated May 6, 2011 (Motion – Hansen, second – Rehnquist, unanimously approved as amended)

**E. Policy on Vincennes University’s Role and Mission**

Mr. Gubera presented this item.

Mr. Smith thanked Dr. Helton for indulging the Commission in this process, which may establish a precedent to involve the Commission’s taking a look at similar documents for other institutions.

Mr. Murphy suggested that Dr. Helton make some comments.

Dr. Helton thanked the Commission, in particular Commissioner Lubbers, for their hard work. This has been a healthy process, and VU needed to be identified in terms of what its role is, so all these discussions and meetings have been fruitful.

Ms. Lubbers especially acknowledged Mr. Sendelweck and Mr. Rehnquist for their help to the Commission’s staff during their work on VU’s policy.

**R-11-03.11 RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves the *Policy on Vincennes University’s Role and Mission* (Motion – Bland, second – Fisher, unanimously approved)

**VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. Status of Active Requests for New Academic Degree Programs
- B. Capital Improvement Projects on Which Staff Have Acted
- C. Capital Improvement Projects Awaiting Action
- D. Minutes of the March Commission Working Sessions

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

There was none.

**X. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

---

Mike Smith, Chair

---

Jud Fisher, Secretary



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

**DISCUSSION ITEM A:**                    **Evolution of *TransferIN* Website: Implementation of HEA 1135-2010**

**Staff Recommendation**                    For discussion only.

**Background**                                    The Advanced Placement (AP) program is administered by The College Board, a national not-for-profit educational organization best known for its collegiate entrance exam - the SAT. Their mission is to “connect students with college success and opportunity,” and the AP subject exams are conducive to that end.

Secondary students take an AP exam typically after finishing a course of study over a particular subject, e.g., Calculus. The exams are graded by the College Board and scores of one (1) through five (5) are awarded for each exam with scores of three (3) and higher considered to be passing. High school students may earn college credit or advanced placement based on these scores and the institution they choose to attend for postsecondary studies.

AP courses and exams are a dual credit opportunity for Hoosier students in that they may receive both high school and college academic credit for a particular course. Over the past two years Indiana has led the nation in the increase of the number of AP exams taken by students, and was second in the nation in 2010 for the increase in the percentage of graduating seniors passing at least one AP exam.

In 2010, the Indiana General Assembly passed H.E.A. 1135, better known as the new AP law. The statute requires that Indiana public institutions award college credit that counts toward meeting the student’s degree requirements when a student earns a passing score on an AP exam. A passing score is defined in code as a three (3) or higher. The statute affects all exams taken in the spring of 2011 and thereafter.

H.E.A. 1135 required the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (CHE) to work with each state educational institution to implement and communicate the new policy. Staff worked over the past year with each state institution to execute the mandate.

The articulation of course credit granted by every Indiana public institution (by campus) for all thirty-four (34) AP subjects is published on CHE’s *TransferIN* website. This provides a single access point for all educational stakeholders to understand the

tangible value of AP scores in terms of college credits earned toward a degree that is consistent with an expectation in CHE's *Policy on Dual Credit Opportunities in Indiana (2010)* for "greater statewide consistency and transparency of the corresponding exam scores students must demonstrate in order to earn college credit for Advanced Placement..."

**Supporting Documents**

(1) *"Indiana Earns an A on AP Exams"*

(2) *HEA 1135-2010*

(3) *Sample – Ball State University AP Publication*

(4) *Policy on Dual Credit Opportunities in Indiana – 2010*

**Presentation**

*Navigating TransferIN*

# Indiana earns an A on AP exams

## Growth in students who passed is 2nd-highest

Indy Star, Dan McFeely, 12:48 AM, Feb. 10, 2011

Jakob Beirat has taken nine college-level AP classes over the past three years at Herron High School - and he passed all but one of them.

"Chemistry . . . a lot of math, and that's just not my thing," the senior art student said.

But Beirat's success in Advanced Placement history, English, government and art has helped **Indiana score the nation's second-best growth rate of students with passing grades on the hard-nosed AP exams.**

A report issued Wednesday by the College Board, the New York-based college preparation group, shows **Indiana's percentage of high school graduates passing an AP exam grew from 10.4 percent in 2009 to 12.4 percent in 2010 -- a 2 percent increase that was second only to Vermont's 2.5 percent jump.**

It was Indiana's single biggest increase in the seven-year history of the annual report, topping the 0.9 percent jump reported from 2004 to 2005.

The results not only indicate students performing better in the academically challenging courses, they also show schools are working harder to encourage more students to take the classes as a way to prepare for college. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Bennett said he was proud that students were "challenging themselves" with the rigorous courses.

"College preparation is one of the most important functions of our high schools," Bennett said in a prepared statement. "By providing challenging academic opportunities, we prepare our students to reach their goals."

**Indiana also had the nation's highest increase in AP course participation, jumping from 20.7 percent in 2009 to 29.3 percent in 2010. And the percentage of the state's low-income graduates passing an AP exam increased by 27 percent.**

Beirat, an 18-year-old who attends the Herron charter school in Indianapolis, is trying to get accepted to one of the New York City art schools, which is his motivation for taking so many AP classes.

"Well, I was motivated to go to a good college, and I knew this would look good on my transcripts," he said. **"But I also had friends who took these classes and said their freshman year in college was comparable to what we do here. And I want to be overprepared when I get to college."**

Herron received special recognition by Bennett for having the highest individual growth rate among high schools in Indiana -- 38.8 percent of graduates passed at least one AP exam, compared to 5 percent in 2009, according to the report.

Faculty members at the 453-student school, which opened in 2006, begin encouraging AP classes in students' freshman year.

"We do not limit students taking these courses," said Janet McNeal, head of school at Herron. "We think exposing college rigor to our students is the best way to have them succeed."

**Over time, studies indicate, students who pass AP exams have a 25 percent to 35 percent better chance of completing their college studies within five years, according to the College Board.** The numbers vary based on factors such as race and income.

AP exams typically consist of dozens of multiple-choice questions along with a variety of free-response questions such as essays, translations, problems and oral responses. AP courses have been around since 1955 and are developed with the help of college faculty to mirror the kinds of things students will learn on campus.

The AP program offers more than 30 courses across multiple subject areas. Exams are administered each May.

**In Indiana, most high schools participate in AP programs, but many also channel students into similar programs such as the International Baccalaureate and dual-credit classes.**

**Bennett has set a goal of raising the state's passing rate on AP exams to 25 percent. On Wednesday, he said 21 schools met that 25 percent mark in 2010, an increase from 12 in 2009.**

Leading the pack in Indiana was the Signature School in Evansville, which had an 88.1 percent passing rate.

In Central Indiana, Zionsville High School was tops with a 50.7 percent passing rate.

**For more information on Advanced Placement in Indiana, visit [www.doe.in.gov/ap](http://www.doe.in.gov/ap).**

PRINTING CODE. Amendments: Whenever an existing statute (or a section of the Indiana Constitution) is being amended, the text of the existing provision will appear in this style type, additions will appear in **this style type**, and deletions will appear in ~~this style type~~.

Additions: Whenever a new statutory provision is being enacted (or a new constitutional provision adopted), the text of the new provision will appear in **this style type**. Also, the word **NEW** will appear in that style type in the introductory clause of each SECTION that adds a new provision to the Indiana Code or the Indiana Constitution.

Conflict reconciliation: Text in a statute in *this style type* or ~~this style type~~ reconciles conflicts between statutes enacted by the 2009 Regular and Special Sessions of the General Assembly.

## HOUSE ENROLLED ACT No. 1135

AN ACT to amend the Indiana Code concerning education.

*Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:*

SECTION 1. IC 20-32-2-2.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA CODE AS A **NEW SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010]: Sec. 2.5. "Satisfactory score" means a score of 3, 4, or 5 on an advanced placement examination sponsored by the College Board's Advanced Placement Program.**

SECTION 2. IC 20-32-3-10, AS ADDED BY P.L.1-2005, SECTION 16, IS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010]: Sec. 10. A student who undergoes an advanced placement examination under IC 20-36-3 and receives a satisfactory score on the advanced placement examination is entitled to receive:

- (1) a certificate of achievement; **and**
- (2) **postsecondary level academic credit at a state educational institution for the particular subject area in which the student was tested; that counts toward meeting the student's degree requirements, if elective credit is part of the student's degree requirement. The state educational institution may require a score higher than 3 on an advanced placement test if the credit is to be used for meeting a course requirement for a particular major at the state educational institution.**

SECTION 3. IC 20-36-1-4 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA CODE AS A **NEW SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010]: Sec. 4. "Satisfactory score" means a score of 3, 4, or 5 on**

HEA 1135 — CC 1+



C  
O  
P  
Y

**an advanced placement exam sponsored by the College Board's Advanced Placement Program.**

SECTION 4. IC 20-36-3-6, AS ADDED BY P.L.1-2005, SECTION 20, IS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010]: Sec. 6. (a) Each student who enrolls in an advanced course may take the advanced placement examination to receive high school credit for the advanced course.

(b) Any rule adopted by the department concerning an academic honors diploma must provide that a successfully completed mathematics or science advanced course is credited toward fulfilling the requirements of an academic honors diploma.

(c) If a student who takes an advanced placement examination receives a satisfactory score on the examination, the student is entitled to receive:

- (1) a certificate of achievement; and
- (2) **postsecondary level academic credit at a state educational institution that counts toward meeting the student's degree requirements, if elective credit is part of the student's degree requirement. The state educational institution may require a score higher than 3 on an advanced placement test if the credit is to be used for meeting a course requirement for a particular major at the state educational institution.**

for the subject area included in the advanced placement examination:

SECTION 5. IC 20-36-3-11, AS AMENDED BY P.L.2-2007, SECTION 235, IS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010]: Sec. 11. Each state educational institution shall work with the department in the development of a policy of granting academic credit and advanced placement to students who:

- (1) attend the state educational institution; and
- (2) receive a satisfactory score as determined by the state educational institution on the advanced placement examination:

**The department and the commission for higher education shall work with each state educational institution on implementing and communicating the state educational institution's policy for awarding advanced placement credits under IC 20-32-3-10 and section 6 of this chapter. The plan to implement each policy must be developed by March 1, 2011.**

SECTION 6. [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010] (a) **Not later than July 1, 2011, the department of education, in cooperation with other appropriate associations, shall develop a uniform job description for school counselors. The job description must allow school**

**C  
O  
P  
Y**



**corporations flexibility in assigning duties to school counselors based on local needs.**

**(b) This SECTION expires December 31, 2011.**

**C  
o  
p  
y**



## BALL STATE UNIVERSITY - ADVANCED PLACEMENT CREDIT POLICY

March, 2011

AP Exam Title	AP Score	BSU Equivalency	BSU Credit Hours	Comments
Art History	3	AHS 100	3	
	4	AHS 101	3	
	5	AHS 101, 102	6	
Biology	3	BIO 100	3	
	4	BIO 111	4	
	5	BIO 111,112	8	
Calculus AB	3	MATHS 161	3	
	4,5	MATHS 165	4	
Calculus BC	3	MATHS 161,162	6	
	4,5	MATHS 165,166	8	
Calculus BC - AB subscore	3	MATHS 161	3	
	4,5	MATHS 165	4	
Chemistry	3	CHEM 100	3	
	4	CHEM 108,111	7	
	5	CHEM 111,112	8	
Chinese Language and Culture	3	CH 201	4	
	4	CH 201, 202	8	
	5	CH 201, 202, 301	12	
Comparative Government and Politics	3,4,5	POLS 280	3	
Computer Science A	3,4,5	CS 120	4	
English Language and Composition	3,4	ENG 103	3	
	5	ENG 104	3	
English Literature and Composition	3,4,5	ENG 206	3	
Environmental Science	3,4,5	NREM 101	3	
European History	3,4,5	HIST 999	3	Undistributed/General Elective credit toward graduation
French Language	3	FR 201,202	6	
	4,5	FR 201,202,301,302	12	
German Language	3	GER 201,202	6	
	4	GER 201,202,301	9	
	5	GER 201,202,301,302	12	
Human Geography	3,4,5	GEOG 121	3	
Italian Language and Culture	3,4,5	ITAL 101, 102	8	
Japanese Language and Culture	3	JAPAN 201	4	
	4	JAPAN 201, 202	8	
	5	JAPAN 201, 202, 301	12	
Latin Vergil	3,4,5	LAT 302	3	
Macroeconomics	3	ECON 116	3	
	4,5	ECON 202 or ECON 116	3	
Microeconomics	3	ECON 116	3	
	4,5	ECON 201 or ECON 116	3	
Music Theory	3,4,5	MUSED 265	3	
Physics B	3	PHYSC 110	4	
	4,5	PHYSC 110,112	8	
Physics C: Electricity and Magnetism	3	PHYSC 112	4	
	4,5	PHYCS 122	5	



**BALL STATE UNIVERSITY - ADVANCED PLACEMENT CREDIT POLICY**

March, 2011

Physics C: Mechanics	3	PHYS 110	4	
	4,5	PHYS 120	5	
Psychology	3,4,5	PSYC 100	3	
Spanish Language	3	SP 201,202	6	
	4	SP 201,202,303	9	
	5	SP 201,202,301,303	12	
Spanish Literature	3	SP 201,202	6	
	4,5	SP 201,202,360	9	
Statistics	3	MATHS 181	3	
	4,5	MATHS 181 or PSYC 241 or MATHS 221 or ECON 221	3	
Studio Art Drawing	3	AFA 990	3	Undistributed/General Elective credit toward graduation
	4,5	AFA 101	3	
Studio Art: 2-D	3	ADS 990	3	Undistributed/General Elective credit toward graduation
	4,5	ADS 101	3	
Studio Art: 3-D	3	ADS 990	3	Undistributed/General Elective credit toward graduation
	4,5	ADS 102	3	
U.S. Government and Politics	3,4,5	POLS 130	3	
U.S. History	3	HIST 202	3	
	4,5	HIST 201,202	6	
World History	3	HIST 152	3	
	4,5	HIST 151,152	6	



## Policy on Dual Credit Opportunities in Indiana

Adopted February 12, 2010

### *Preamble*

*The State of Indiana regards the offering of rigorous dual credit courses as means for expanding access to postsecondary opportunities, encouraging students to pursue higher education, and increasing college completion rates.*

*For the purposes of this policy, dual credit courses are defined as courses taken by high school students that satisfy requirements for earning credits toward both a high school diploma and a college degree. Dual credit courses are taught by regular high school faculty or by regular or adjunct college faculty.*

*The principles outlined on the pages that follow are designed to promote greater clarity, quality, consistency, transparency and transferability of dual credit opportunities for the benefit of Hoosier students.*

### *Basic Conditions*

*All dual credit courses shall meet the following conditions:*

- 1) Postsecondary campuses shall take appropriate steps to ensure that dual credit courses are of identical quality and rigor to qualify for college credit; in this regard, postsecondary dual credit programs shall embody the following characteristics:
  - a) All secondary students taking dual credit courses shall meet the same academic prerequisites for taking those courses as apply to students taking the same courses on the postsecondary campus; beyond that, the secondary school and the postsecondary campus may jointly establish additional criteria for determining how students are selected into dual credit courses;
  - b) Course syllabi used for dual credit courses in liberal arts<sup>1</sup>, professional, and career/ technical disciplines shall be identical to course syllabi used in the same courses taught on the postsecondary campus, including class assignments, laboratory experiments, examinations; and textbooks shall be comparable;
  - c) Student learning outcomes expected for dual credit courses in liberal arts, professional, and career/technical disciplines shall be the same as student learning outcomes expected for the same courses taught on the postsecondary campus;

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “liberal arts” includes English language and literature, foreign languages, history, the life sciences, mathematics, philosophy and religion, the physical sciences (such as chemistry, physics, and geology), psychology, the social sciences (such as economics, political science, and sociology), and the visual and performing arts.

- d) An academic unit on the postsecondary campus shall be responsible for monitoring, throughout the school year, the delivery and quality of dual credit instruction; such monitoring shall include visits to the secondary class;
  - e) The secondary school and academic unit on the postsecondary campus shall work together to identify instructors of dual credit courses based on criteria established by the postsecondary institution. The postsecondary campus shall approve the individuals who will teach the dual credit courses in the secondary school, but the school corporation shall be responsible for hiring and compensating this personnel;
  - f) Approved instructors of dual credit courses shall have credentials consistent with the credentials required for on-campus faculty or a development plan approved by the postsecondary institution to satisfy this requirement;
  - g) The academic unit on the postsecondary campus shall be responsible for ensuring that professional development opportunities are available and communicated to secondary faculty, who are teaching dual credit courses;
  - h) The postsecondary campus shall establish a mechanism for evaluating and documenting, on a regular basis, the performance of students, who complete dual credit courses; and
- 2) Postsecondary institutions shall generate transcripts for all students who enroll in dual credit courses.
  - 3) All postsecondary institutions and campuses offering dual credit courses in liberal arts, professional, or career-technical disciplines shall:
    - a) Maintain compliance with the Commission for Higher Education's (CHE) dual credit policy;
    - b) Demonstrate adherence to the standards advocated by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships to the satisfaction of CHE;
    - c) Demonstrate ongoing adherence to this policy and NACEP standards by submitting to CHE the results from regular self-audits;
    - d) Be subject to state reviews conducted on a periodic (and as-needed) basis by a standing subcommittee of CHE's Statewide Transfer and Articulation Committee (STAC).
  - 4) Since a dual credit course in a liberal arts, professional, or career/technical discipline is deemed to be academically equivalent to the same course taught on-campus by the institution offering the course (see #1 above), the dual credit course shall, consistent with the transfer policies developed by CHE's Statewide Transfer and Articulation Committee (STAC):
    - a) Apply toward meeting the degree requirements of the institution offering the course, in the same way as the on-campus course; and
    - b) Transfer to the other public postsecondary institutions in the state, in the same way as the on-campus course.
  - 5) Wherever possible, the course syllabi for dual credit courses in the liberal arts shall also prepare students for successfully passing Advanced Placement (AP) examinations in the same academic area.

- 6) The Commission for Higher Education, Department of Education and the postsecondary institutions, shall ensure greater statewide consistency and transparency of the corresponding exam scores students must demonstrate in order to earn college credit for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate coursework.
  
- 7) The Commission for Higher Education, in partnership with the Department of Education, postsecondary institutions and local school corporations, shall prioritize state funding, expand accessibility, and build instructional capacity for student dual credit, Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate opportunities in the following 10 core subject areas: American Government, American History, Biology, Calculus, Chemistry, Economics, English Composition, Physics, Psychology and World Languages.

*As passed by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, February 12, 2010*

# COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

## **DISCUSSION ITEM B:                    Dual Credit Review Process**

### **Staff Recommendation**

For discussion only.

### **Background**

The *Policy on Dual Credit Opportunities in Indiana* approved by the Commission for Higher Education last year calls for postsecondary institutions offering dual credit courses to “demonstrate ongoing adherence to this policy and NACEP [National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships] standards” and “be subject to state reviews conducted on a periodic (and as needed) basis by a standing subcommittee of CHE’s Statewide Transfer and Articulation Committee (STAC).” The purpose of this agenda item is to provide the Commission with an update of how these components of the *Policy* are being implemented.

In essence, the Dual Review Credit Sub-Committee of STAC will apply the NACEP standards to all institutions offering dual credit courses in three stages, beginning with those standards that were deemed to be most critical and could be implemented readily. The first stage, which will begin this month, will conclude with a list of preferred providers, consisting of those institutions that have met all of the stage one standards. This list will be made public and shared with the Indiana Department of Education to provide guidance to high school counselors in advising students and parents on making decisions for dual credit programs.

A separate document (not attached to this agenda item) provides examples of evidence that institutions might present to demonstrate adherence to the NACEP standards, although institutions have the flexibility to provide whatever evidence they deem appropriate, irrespective of whether the evidence is mentioned in the examples or not. The evidence provided will be reviewed by teams consisting of various stakeholders, including representatives from the public and independent institutions, high schools, the Department of Education, Independent Colleges of Indiana (ICI), the Center for Excellence in Leadership of Learning (CELL) at the University of Indianapolis, and Commission staff.

### **Supporting Document**

*Indiana Dual Credit Review Process*, June 2, 2011



# Indiana Dual Credit Review Process

June 2, 2011

## Overview

The Indiana Dual Credit Review Subcommittee (IDCRS) of the Statewide Transfer and Articulation Committee (STAC) has established the following process for review of dual credit programs offered in liberal arts, professional, or career-technical disciplines in Indiana's high schools. This review process results from legislation passed by the 2008 Indiana General Assembly (HEA 1246), which created the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership, whose work continued in 2009 with the creation of the Indiana Dual Credit Advisory Council by the Education Roundtable. As a result of the work of the council, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education adopted the *Policy on Dual Credit Opportunities in Indiana* in February 2010. The review process described here builds on the review processes established in other states such as Florida, Illinois, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah and Virginia.

The Indiana Commission for Higher Education's 2010 policy requires that the state's dual credit programs demonstrate adherence to standards advocated by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP). NACEP has established standards for courses that are taught by trained high school teachers, in the high schools, to students for both high school and college credit. The IDCRS seeks to meet the needs of Indiana by ensuring that all dual credit programs adhere to standards similar to those advocated by NACEP. This policy applies to high school teachers who teach in a high school setting, but does not apply to college faculty who teach in a high school setting.

## IDCRS Standards

The IDCRS Standards include the following standards relating to student experiences, quality of the curriculum, faculty qualifications and the continuing assessment of programs. All college/university programs must provide evidence that the following student, curriculum, faculty and assessment standards are being met.

### **Student Standards**

- Sa) The college/university officially registers dual credit students as degree-seeking, non-degree seeking, or non-matriculated students of the college/university and records courses administered through dual credit on official college/university transcripts.
- Sb) The college/university ensures dual credit students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university.
- Sc) The college/university provides dual credit students and high schools with a comprehensive publication that outlines rights and responsibilities of enrolled registered dual credit students.

### **Curriculum Standards**

- Ca) Courses administered through a college/university are catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.
- Cb) Concurrent enrollment courses reflect the pedagogical and philosophical orientation of the college/university discipline.
- Cc) The college/university ensures that courses offered through dual credit programs are the same as the courses offered in “traditional college classes”.

### **Faculty Standards**

- Fa) High school instructors teaching dual credit courses are approved by the respective college/university departments and meet academic department requirements for teaching the college/university course.
- Fb) The college/university provides new high school dual credit program instructors with discipline-specific training and orientation regarding, but not limited to, course curriculum, assessment criteria, pedagogy, course philosophy and administrative responsibilities and procedures prior to the instructor’s teaching the course.
- Fc) The college/university provides annual discipline-specific professional development activities and ongoing collegial interaction to address course content, course delivery, assessment, evaluation, and/or research in the development in the field. The high school ensures high school dual credit program instructor participation.
- Fd) College/university procedures address high school instructor non-compliance with the college/university’s expectations for courses offered through dual credit programs (for example, non-participation in dual credit program training and/or activities).

### **Assessment Standards**

- Aa) Dual credit high school students are held to the same standards of achievement as those expected of college students in “traditional college classes”.
- Ab) The college/university ensures that dual credit high school students are held to the same grading standards as those expected of college students in “traditional college classes”.
- Ac) Dual credit high school students are assessed using the same methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as college students in “traditional college classes”.

The IDCERS acknowledges that sufficient time is needed for substantive program evaluation. All providers will be required to submit evidence of a detailed evaluation plan for each of the evaluation standards.

### **Evaluation Standards**

- Ea) The college/university distributes student end-of-course evaluations to all dual credit high school students, replicating the university/college student end-of-course evaluation instrument distributed to college students enrolled in a “traditional college class”. Additional dual credit program related questions may be added to the survey tool, as long as all required questions for the “traditional college class” student end-of-course evaluation are included.



- Eb) The dual credit high school conducts an annual survey of dual credit program alumni who are one year out of high school. Survey includes IDCERS questionnaire (additional questions may be added). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents.
- Ec) The dual credit high school conducts a survey of dual credit program alumni who are four years out of high school. Survey includes IDCERS questionnaire (additional questions may be added). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents.
- Ed) The college/university conducts surveys of participating high school instructors, principals, and guidance counselors at least once every three years. Survey includes IDCERS questionnaire (additional questions may be added). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents.

### **Indiana Dual Credit Review Sub-Committee**

The IDCERS will be responsible for recommending approval by the ICHE of all dual credit programs offered by public and private institutions. The committee includes, but is not limited to, representatives from regional, private, community college, and public postsecondary institutions, as well as the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, Independent Colleges of Indiana, High Schools, Center of Excellence in Leadership of Learning, and the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

### **Program Approval**

Beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year, all new dual credit programs must undergo a program review and be recommended for approval by the IDCERS before implementation. Existing concurrent enrollment programs, which are accredited by NACEP, and those institutions which have begun the NACEP process, but are not yet accredited by NACEP, are exempt from this process.

### **Preferred Provider List**

ICHE will develop a list of those dual credit providers that have obtained accreditation from NACEP or through this process. This list will be shared with IDOE to provide guidance to high school counselors when advising students and parents on making decisions for dual credit programs.

### **Annual Reporting**

All providers of dual credit courses that are accredited through the present process must submit annual program reports demonstrating that the programs continue to meet the student, curriculum, and faculty standards. In addition, the college/university needs to submit evidence, which demonstrates compliance with the continuing evaluation standards.

## **Review Process Timeline**

### **Stage 1 (June – November 2011):**

Submit evidence to IDCRS of compliance with Student Standards Sa, Sb, and Sc; Curriculum Standard Ca; Faculty Standard Fa, and Assessment Standard Aa.

### **Stage 2 (January – November 2012):**

Submit evidence to IDCRS of compliance with Curriculum Standard Cb; Faculty Standards Fb and Fd; Assessment Standards Ab and Ac; and Evaluation Standard Ea.

### **Stage 3 (January – November 2013):**

Submit evidence to IDCRS of compliance with Curriculum Standard Cc; Faculty Standard Fc, and Evaluation Standards Eb, Ec, and Ed.

## **Indiana Dual Credit Review Sub-Committee Recommendations**

Based on the report provided by reviewers, the IDCRS will either recommend that the program has met standards and may continue, or that the program has failed to meet the standards and recommendations and will be removed from the Preferred Provider List. Once a program has been removed from the Preferred Provider List, the college or university dual credit provider must re-apply for approval before offering the program again.

## **Statewide Support**

Ensuring quality dual credit programs is a collaborative effort, and all those involved are encouraged to keep lines of communication open and facilitate review and approval for all providers. Meeting IDCRS standards and adhering to the Policy on Dual Credit Opportunities in Indiana determined by the ICHE benefits Indiana's entire educational system and the students it serves.

## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

### DECISION ITEM A-1:

#### Master of Science in Occupational Therapy To Be Offered by Indiana State University at Terre Haute

#### Staff Recommendation

That the Commission for Higher Education approve the Master of Science (M.S.) in Occupational Therapy to be offered by Indiana State University at Terre Haute, in accordance with the background discussion in this agenda item and the *Abstract*, May 27, 2011; and

That the Commission recommend no new state funds, in accordance with the supporting document, *New Academic Degree Program Proposal Summary*, May 27, 2011.

#### Background

Two public universities (Indiana University at IUPUI and the University of Southern Indiana), and one independent institution (University of Indianapolis) offer accredited master's programs in Occupational Therapy. The proposed Indiana State University program, which is projected to have 30 graduates per year at steady state, will have a special emphasis on serving rural communities. In this regard, the University will utilize its existing Rural Health Innovation Collaborative (RHIC) in placing Occupational Therapy students in rural, clinical settings.

The proposed program has been designed to meet the accreditation standards of the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA). All AOTA accredited programs have made the transition from the baccalaureate level to the master's level, which is the entry-level educational requirement for the profession. Of the 155 programs accredited by AOTA, all are entry-level master's or combined baccalaureate/master's programs, with the exception of five entry-level doctoral programs. All but three states have at least one AOTA accredited program.

The U.S. Department of Labor has designated Occupational Therapy as an occupation for which there is a national shortage and includes the profession among the 20 fastest growing occupations, with 27 percent more employed Occupational Therapists projected by 2016. The Indiana Department of Workforce Development projects a similar increase at the state level.

## **Supporting Documents**

- (1) *Abstract* – Master of Science in Occupational Therapy to be offered by Indiana State University at Terre Haute, May 27, 2011
- (2) *New Academic Degree Program Proposal Summary* –M.S. in Occupational Therapy, May 27, 2011

## Abstract

Master of Science in Occupational Therapy  
To Be Offered by  
Indiana State University at Terre Haute

May 27, 2011

**Objectives:** To provide competent health care providers in occupational therapy who possess basic skills as a direct care provider, consultant, educator, manager, researcher, and advocate for the profession and the consumer; to decrease the occupational shortage in Terre Haute, rural communities, and the nation; and to improve patient access and quality care for rural and underserved populations.

**Clientele to be Served:** Post-baccalaureate students who desire a professional career as an Occupational Therapist. Students will enter the program with baccalaureate degrees from an array of disciplines including, but not limited to, Athletic Training, Biology, Psychology, Exercise Science, and other allied health care profession degree programs.

**Curriculum:** A total of 81 graduate credit hours are required to complete the program, distributed as follows:

Occupational Therapy Didactic Core Courses (40 credit hours)

Occupational Therapy Introduction (2)  
OT Process and Theory (3)  
Assistive Technology (2)  
OT Rehabilitation Disability Participation (4)  
OT Work & Industry (2)  
Older Adult & Aging (3)  
OT Mental Health Advocacy (4)  
OT with Children and Youth (5)  
Participatory Outcome/Research (3)  
Reasoning & Complex Clients (3)  
Management and Leadership (3)  
Advance Upper Extremity Conditions (3)  
Research Project (3)

Occupational Therapy Skill Courses (Laboratory; 6 credit hours)

Skills I (2)  
Skills II (2)  
Skills III (2)

Occupational Therapy Fieldwork Courses (9 credit hours)

Fieldwork IA Rehab & Work (1)  
Fieldwork IB Pediatrics & Mental Health (1)  
Fieldwork IC Community & Older Adults (1)  
Fieldwork IIA (3)  
Fieldwork IIB (3)

Core Courses Other Disciplines (26 credit hours)

Research Methods in AMR (3)

Advanced Pathophysiology (3)

Health Behavior Theory (3)

Biomechanics (3)

Advanced Human Anatomy (8)

Applied Neuroscience (3)

Pharmacology (3)

***Employment Possibilities:*** The majority of OT employment is in ambulatory healthcare services. Other major employers are hospitals, offices of other health practitioners, public and private educational services, nursing care facilities, home healthcare services, outpatient care centers, offices of physicians, individual and family services, community care facilities, community care facilities for the elderly, and government agencies.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Indiana State University to be offered at Terre Haute

Program: M.S. in Occupational Therapy

	Year 1 FY2013	Year 2 FY2014	Year 3 FY2015	Year 4 FY2016	Year 5 FY2017
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	30	60	90	90	90
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
Total	30	60	90	90	90
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	30	60	90	90	90
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
Total	30	60	90	90	90
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	30	30	30
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-17

Campus Code: 9563

County: Vigo

Degree Level: 07

CIP Code: Federal - 512306; State - 512306

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.





## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

### DECISION ITEM A-2:

**Certificate, Technical Certificate, and Associate of Applied Science in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning To Be Offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Lafayette, Kokomo, Muncie, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Evansville, and Bloomington**

### Staff Recommendation

That the Commission for Higher Education approve the Certificate, Technical Certificate (T.C.), and Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Lafayette, Kokomo, Muncie, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Evansville, and Bloomington, in accordance with the background discussion in this agenda item and the *Abstract*, May 27, 2011; and

That the Commission recommend no new state funds, in accordance with the supporting document, *New Academic Degree Program Proposal Summary*, May 27, 2011

### Background

Ivy Tech Community College currently offers several options for students who want to pursue career opportunities in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC). At the certificate level, students have three options: (1) an 18-hour Certificate in Industrial Technology with a concentration in Heating and Air Conditioning; (2) a 31-35-hour Technical Certificate in Industrial Technology with a concentration in HVAC; and (3) a 34-36-hour Technical Certificate in Construction Technology with an HVAC concentration. At the associate degree level, students can pursue up to 18 hours of HVAC coursework as part of either an A.A.S. in Industrial Technology or an A.A.S. in Construction Technology.

The proposed program, which utilizes existing courses and adds a capstone course, will allow students to earn an A.A.S. in the field of HVAC itself, with more courses in that field, rather than simply taking fewer elective courses as part of an associate degree in Industrial Technology or Construction Technology. The Certificate program builds toward the Technical Certificate, which in turn builds toward the A.A.S.

In FY2010 – statewide and combining the certificate and associate programs – Ivy Tech enrolled 2,094 headcount

students in Industrial Technology and 972 headcount students in Construction Technology.

### **Supporting Documents**

- (1) *Abstract - Certificate, Technical Certificate, and Associate of Applied Science in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Lafayette, Kokomo, Muncie, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Evansville, and Bloomington, May 27, 2011*
- (2) *New Academic Degree Program Proposal Summary – Cert., T.C., and A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)*

## Abstract

Certificate, Technical Certificate, and Associate of Applied Science  
in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning  
to be offered by  
Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Lafayette,  
Kokomo, Muncie, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Evansville, and Bloomington

May 27, 2011

**Objectives:** To prepare students to become qualified technicians in all aspects of residential and light commercial heating, cooling, and refrigeration systems.

**Clientele to be Served:** Traditional students, both full and part time, who are recent high school graduates; and non-traditional adult students who are underemployed or preparing to enter/re-enter the workforce.

**Curriculum:** Required semester credit hours for each program level are as follows:

### ***ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCE*** (63-66 credits)

#### General Education Core (20-24 credits)

- Fundamentals of Public Speaking (3)
- English Composition (3)
- Life Skills Elective (1-3)
- Geometry/Trigonometry (3)
- Science of Traditional and Alternative Energy (4)
- Humanities or Social and Behavioral Sciences (3)
- Sciences Elective (3-4)

#### Professional/Technical Core (25 credits)

- Computer Fundamentals for Technology (3)
- Construction Blueprint Reading (3)
- Electrical Basics (3)
- Heating Fundamentals (3)
- Refrigeration I & II (6)
- Electrical Circuits & Controls (3)
- Heating Service (3)
- HVAC Capstone (1)

#### Statewide Electives (18 credits)

***TECHNICAL CERTIFICATE*** (31-33 credits)

General Education Core (7-9 credits)

- Fundamentals of Public Speaking (3)
- Life Skills Elective (1-3)
- Geometry/Trigonometry (3)

Professional/Technical Core (24 credits)

- Computer Fundamentals for Technology (3)
- Construction Blueprint Reading (3)
- Electrical Basics (3)
- Heating Fundamentals (3)
- Refrigeration I & II (6)
- Electrical Circuits & Controls (3)
- Heating Service (3)

***HVAC CERTIFICATE*** (18 credits)

Professional/Technical Core (18 credits)

- Electrical Basics (3)
- Heating Fundamentals (3)
- Refrigeration I & II (6)
- Electrical Circuits & Controls (3)
- Heat Pump Systems (3)
- Heating Service (3)

***Employment Possibilities:*** Graduates will be able to work in a variety of settings including self-employed/private practice and for area employers. These positions include those in which the student will plan, design, install, and operate building ventilation, heating, and air conditioning systems. In addition, these courses can also be very useful to design engineers, plant managers, contractors, and architects.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Valparaiso

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
Part-Time	<u>16</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>32</u>
Total	<u>28</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>56</u>
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
Part-Time	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	<u>20</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>39</u>
Degree Completions Projection	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 10040

County: Porter

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

## NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-South Bend

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
Part-Time	<u>15</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>
Total	<u>27</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>54</u>
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
Part-Time	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	<u>19</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>38</u>
Degree Completions Projection	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 8423

County: St. Joseph

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Fort Wayne

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	18	29	35	37	37
Part-Time	24	38	46	49	49
Total	42	67	81	85	85
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	18	29	35	37	37
Part-Time	11	18	22	23	23
Total	29	47	57	60	60
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	4	10	20
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 9926

County: Allen

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

## NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Lafayette

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
Part-Time	<u>15</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>
Total	<u>27</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>54</u>
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
Part-Time	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	<u>19</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>38</u>
Degree Completions Projection	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 10039

County: Tippecanoe

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.



**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Kokomo

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	16	26	31	32	32
Part-Time	15	24	29	30	30
Total	31	50	60	62	62
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	16	26	31	33	33
Part-Time	7	11	14	14	14
Total	23	37	45	47	47
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	3	8	15
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 10041

County: Howard

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**  
 May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Muncie  
 Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	10	16	19	20	20
Part-Time	14	22	27	28	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	10	16	19	20	20
Part-Time	7	11	13	13	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	2	6	12
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-16  
 Campus Code: 9924  
 County: Delaware  
 Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04  
 CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Terre Haute

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	14	22	27	28	28
Part-Time	14	22	27	28	28
Total	28	44	54	56	56
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	14	22	27	28	28
Part-Time	7	11	13	13	13
Total	21	33	40	41	41
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	3	7	13
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 8547

County: Vigo

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**  
May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Indianapolis

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	18	29	35	37	37
Part-Time	20	32	39	41	41
Total	38	61	74	78	78
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	18	29	35	37	37
Part-Time	9	15	18	19	19
Total	27	44	44	56	56
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	4	9	18
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 9917

County: Marion

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Evansville

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	12	19	23	24	24
Part-Time	15	24	29	30	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	12	19	23	24	24
Part-Time	7	11	14	14	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	2	7	13
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 9925

County: Vanderburgh

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**  
May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-Bloomington

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	12	19	23	24	24
Part-Time	14	22	27	28	28
Total	26	41	50	52	52
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	12	19	23	24	24
Part-Time	7	11	13	13	13
Total	19	30	36	37	37
Degree Completions Projection	0	0	2	6	12
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

**II. Prepared by CHE**New State Funds To Be Considered  
For Recommendation (Actual) \*

-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

New State Funds To Be Considered  
For Recommendation (Increases) \*

-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

CHE Code: 11-16

Campus Code: 35213

County: Bartholomew

Degree Level: 02, 03, and 04

CIP Code: Federal – 470201; State – 470201

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.

**NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

May 27, 2011

**I. Prepared by Institution**

Institution/Location: Ivy Tech Community College-All Campuses

Program: Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

	Year 1 FY2012	Year 2 FY2013	Year 3 FY2014	Year 4 FY2015	Year 5 FY2016
Enrollment Projections (Headcount)					
Full-Time	<u>136</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>262</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>250</u>
Part-Time	<u>146</u>	<u>218</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>326</u>
Total	<u>282</u>	<u>415</u>	<u>575</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>576</u>
Enrollment Projections (FTE)					
Full-Time	<u>136</u>	<u>217</u>	<u>262</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>275</u>
Part-Time	<u>67</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>152</u>
Total	<u>203</u>	<u>309</u>	<u>412</u>	<u>397</u>	<u>427</u>
Degree Completions Projection	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>142</u>
New State Funds Requested (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds Requested (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

**II. Prepared by CHE**

New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Actual) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
New State Funds To Be Considered For Recommendation (Increases) *	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>

\* Excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding.





**COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Friday, June 10, 2011

**DECISION ITEM A-3: Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action**

**Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission for Higher Education approve by consent the following degree programs, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item:

- Bachelor of Science in Nursing (Completion) to be offered by Indiana University East at New Castle
- Bachelor of Arts in History to be offered by Indiana University East at Richmond
- Technical Certificate in Dental Assisting to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College-South Bend at South Bend
- Associate of Science in Pre-Engineering to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at South Bend, Warsaw, Fort Wayne, and Indianapolis
- Associate of Science in Engineering Technology to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, Warsaw, Fort Wayne, and Sellersburg

**Background**

At its August and September 2004 meetings, the Commission for Higher Education began implementing a new policy on new academic degree programs on which staff proposes expedited action. These programs meet the criteria identified in that policy and are hereby presented for action by consent, in accordance with the aforementioned policy and the information presented in the supporting documents.

**Supporting Documents**

- (1) *Background Information on Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action, May 27, 2011*
- (2) *Policy for New Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action, September 2, 2004*



**Background Information on Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action**

May 27, 2011

**CHE 11-03 Bachelor of Science in Nursing (Completion) to be offered by Indiana University East at New Castle**

Proposal received on March 7, 2011  
CIP Code: Federal – 513801; State – 513898  
Projected Annual Headcount: 40; FTEs: 43; Degrees: 20  
New State Funds Requested, Actual:  
Year 1: \$ 0  
Year 2: \$ 0  
Year 3: \$ 0  
Year 4: \$ 0  
Year 5: \$ 0

An articulation agreement with Ivy Tech Community College exists for this program. Approval of the B.S. in Nursing (Completion) is consistent with the regional campus agreement.

**CHE 11-06 Bachelor of Arts in History to be offered by Indiana University East at Richmond**

Proposal received on March 7, 2011  
CIP Code: Federal – 540101; State – 540101  
Projected Annual Headcount: 92; FTEs: 64; Degrees: 52  
New State Funds Requested, Actual:  
Year 1: \$ 0  
Year 2: \$ 0  
Year 3: \$ 0  
Year 4: \$ 0  
Year 5: \$ 0

An articulation agreement with Ivy Tech Community College exists for this program. Approval of the B.A. in History is consistent with the regional campus agreement.

**CHE 11-08 Technical Certificate in Dental Assisting to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College-South Bend at South Bend**

Proposal received on April 7, 2011  
CIP Code: Federal – 510601; State – 510601  
Projected Annual Headcount: 24; FTEs: 24; Degrees: 23  
New State Funds Requested, Actual:  
Year 1: \$ 0  
Year 2: \$ 0  
Year 3: \$ 0  
Year 4: \$ 0  
Year 5: \$ 0

Ivy Tech is currently authorized to offer Dental Assisting programs at the certificate and/or associate degree level in five regions. The College also offers an A.S. in Dental Assisting in South Bend, which enrolled 77 students in FY2010.

**CHE 11-13 Associate of Science in Pre-Engineering to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at South Bend, Warsaw, Fort Wayne, and Indianapolis**

Proposal received on April 28, 2011  
CIP Code: Federal – 140102; State – 140102

***South Bend***

Projected Annual Headcount: 53; FTEs: 38; Degrees: 12

***Warsaw***

Projected Annual Headcount: 30; FTEs: 25; Degrees: 7

***Fort Wayne***

Projected Annual Headcount: 65; FTEs: 50; Degrees: 15

***Indianapolis***

Projected Annual Headcount: 85; FTEs: 66; Degrees: 20

New State Funds Requested, Actual:

Year 1: \$ 0

Year 2: \$ 0

Year 3: \$ 0

Year 4: \$ 0

Year 5: \$ 0

The Commission approved the first A.S. in Pre-Engineering programs for Ivy Tech in May 2006. Articulation agreements with four public campuses are in place for these programs.

**CHE 11-15 Associate of Science in Engineering Technology to be offered by Ivy Tech Community College at Valparaiso, Warsaw, Fort Wayne, and Sellersburg**

Proposal received on May 4, 2011  
CIP Code: Federal – 150000; State – 150000

***Valparaiso***

Projected Annual Headcount: 47; FTEs: 34; Degrees: 11

***Warsaw***

Projected Annual Headcount: 26; FTEs: 21; Degrees: 6

***Fort Wayne***

Projected Annual Headcount: 47; FTEs: 34; Degrees: 11

***Sellersburg***

Projected Annual Headcount: 26; FTEs: 21; Degrees: 6

New State Funds Requested, Actual:

Year 1: \$ 0

Year 2: \$ 0

Year 3: \$ 0

Year 4: \$ 0

Year 5: \$ 0

The Commission approved the first A.S. in Engineering Technology programs for Ivy Tech in March 2010. Articulation agreements with the Purdue University B.S. in Engineering Technology offered through Purdue Statewide Technology are in place for these programs.

## **Policy for New Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action**

September 2, 2004

Pursuant to the Commission's desire to expedite action on new academic degree program requests whenever possible, the staff has identified a set of factors, which though not exhaustive, suggest when a request might be considered for expedited action by consent and when a request would require Commission consideration prior to action. With respect to the latter, the presence of one or more of the following factors might suggest a significant policy issue for which Commission attention is needed before action can be taken:

- Consistency with the mission of the campus or institution
- Transfer of credit
- New program area
- New degree level for a campus
- Accreditation
- Unnecessary duplication of resources
- Significant investment of state resources

In the absence of these factors or an objection from another institution, Commission staff will propose expedited action on new program requests. Examples of situations that pose no policy issues for the Commission include, but are not limited to:

- Adding a second degree designation to an existing program (e.g. A.S. to an A.A.S.)
- Delivering an on-campus program to an off-campus site through faculty available on-site or traveling to the site
- Adding a degree elsewhere in a multi-campus system to a new campus within the system.

All requests to offer new academic degree programs must continue to be accompanied by a full program proposal, unless otherwise specified in the guidelines. It is only after a proposal is received that a determination will be suggested as to how the request might be handled.

**COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Friday, June 10, 2011

**DECISION ITEM B: Capital Projects for Which Staff Proposes Expedited Action**

**Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission for Higher Education approve by consent the following capital project(s), in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item:

- Advanced Manufacturing Center at the University of Southern Indiana: \$2,300,000

**Background**

Staff recommends the following capital project be recommended for approval in accordance with the expedited action category originated by the Commission for Higher Education in May 2006. Institutional staff will be available to answer questions about these projects, but the staff does not envision formal presentations. If there are questions or issues requiring research or further discussion, the item could be deferred until a future Commission meeting.

**Supporting Document**

*Background Information on Capital Projects on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action, June 10, 2011*





## **Background Information on Capital Projects on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action**

June 10, 2011

### **G-0-11-1-01    Advanced Manufacturing Center Project Cost: \$2,300,000**

The Trustees of the University of Southern Indiana request authorization to proceed with the construction of the Advanced Manufacturing Center located on the USI campus. This project is estimated to cost \$2,300,000 and is to be funded by federal funds. This project will support the academic requirements of the University's advanced manufacturing degree program.



# COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

**DECISION ITEM C:**                    **Release of FY2011 Improving Teacher Quality Program Request for Proposals (RFP)**

**Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission authorize staff to release the *FY2011 Application for Competitive Grants under Indiana's Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program (Public Law 107-110) CFDA 84.367A*.

**Background**

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The Commission for Higher Education has new responsibilities under Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund.

The Commission is responsible for conducting a competitive Improving Teacher Quality State Grants process to fund partnerships comprised, at a minimum, of schools of education and schools of arts and sciences from institutions of higher education, along with one or more "high need" schools/school corporations. The partnerships must use the funds to conduct professional development activities in core academic subjects in order to ensure that highly qualified teachers have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects they teach, or in computer-related technology to enhance instruction.

The FY2011 Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program Request for Proposals has an anticipated release date of June 2011, pending federal notification. The deadline for proposals to be received by the Commission is October 3, 2011.

**Supporting Document**

*FY2011 Request for Proposals Draft*





**FY 2011  
APPLICATION FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS  
UNDER INDIANA'S  
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY  
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
(Public Law 107-110)**

**CFDA Number: 84.367A**

**DATED MATERIAL – OPEN IMMEDIATELY**

**Closing Date: October 3, 2011**

**Indiana Commission for Higher Education**

**101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550**

**Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**

**317-464-4400**

**Fax: 317-464-4410**

---

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section A: Introduction.....	1
Letter from the Commissioner of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.....	2
Notification of Intent to Apply.....	3
Section B: Application Narrative.....	4
Background.....	5
Objective.....	5
Eligibility.....	5
Project Duration and Amount of Awards.....	7
Deadline.....	8
Activities.....	8
Selection Criteria.....	9
Due Process.....	12
Section C: Budget & Accountability Requirements.....	13
General Information.....	14
Budget Limitations.....	15
Matching Funds.....	16
Accountability Requirements.....	16
Section D: Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	17
Definitions.....	18
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	21
Section E: Application Contents.....	22
General Instructions.....	23
Form: Proposal Cover Page.....	24
Form: Budget Summary Page.....	25
Form: “Use” of Funds.....	26
Form: Collaborative Agreement.....	27
Form: Statement of Assurances.....	28
Form: Assurances – Non-Construction.....	29
Form: Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements.....	31
Form: Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transactions.....	33
Form: Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.....	34
Section F: Transmittal Instructions and Application Checklist.....	36
Transmittal Instructions.....	37
Application Checklist.....	38





# SECTION A

# INTRODUCTION





Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your interest in the *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership* program administered by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. This grant opportunity comes at a critical time in our state's effort to ensure that our teachers have the support and resources necessary to fully integrate Indiana's Academic Standards in the classroom. The 2011 *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership* program will bring Indiana's colleges and universities together with high-need school districts to support the professional development needs of teachers.

Through this program, the Commission will provide grants that support teacher quality as a major factor in improving student achievement. Eligible applicants for grants will include partnerships consisting of: (1) a department or school within an Indiana college or university responsible for teacher preparation, (2) a department or school within an Indiana college or university specific to the subject matter being addressed, and (3) a "high-need" local educational agency (LEA). The Indiana college or university partner must be the fiscal agent and official applicant for the grant. Eligible applicants may apply for an award for up to one year.

The package contains all the information, instructions, and forms that applicants will need to apply for a 2011 *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership* grant. Please review the entire package carefully before preparing your application and submitting it to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. To help ensure that your package is complete, an application checklist has been provided in the package.

**Applications must be received no later than October 3, 2011**

Again, thank you for your interest in the *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership* program and your commitment to helping Indiana schools ensure that all of our students achieve to high standards.

Sincerely,

Teresa Lubbers  
Commissioner

**FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO APPLY**

The Indiana Commission for Higher Education will be able to develop a more efficient process for reviewing grant applications if it has a better understanding of the number of partnerships that intend to apply for funding under this competition. The Commission’s ability to do this will depend, in turn, upon advance knowledge of the approximate number of applications that will be received.

For this reason, if you intend to apply for funding under the Improving Teacher Quality partnership program, we ask that you provide us the following information by September 9, 2011.

**Name of Primary Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**College/University:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**City, State, Zip Code:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Telephone:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Fax Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**E-mail address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Targeted Core Academic Subject of Application (Select all that apply):**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS/READING | <input type="checkbox"/> MATHEMATICS       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SCIENCE                       | <input type="checkbox"/> FOREIGN LANGUAGE  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HISTORY/GEOGRAPHY             | <input type="checkbox"/> CIVICS/GOVERNMENT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ECONOMICS                     | <input type="checkbox"/> ARTS              |

Please return this form to:

ATTN: Catisha Coates  
Indiana Commission for Higher Education  
Re: 2011 Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program  
101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Responses may also be scanned to [catishac@che.in.gov](mailto:catishac@che.in.gov).

**NOTE:** The Commission requests this information solely to help it prepare for the peer review process. It will not be used in the review of your application. Not completing this form does not prevent you from applying for a grant.

# SECTION B

## APPLICATION NARRATIVE



# FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM APPLICATION NARRATIVE

## **BACKGROUND**

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. Title II of the ESEA makes funds available to States and local communities under a variety of flexible programs that will assist them in developing and supporting a high-quality teaching force and thereby improving student academic achievement. One of these programs, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund (Title II, Part A), focuses on using practices grounded in scientifically-based research to prepare, train, and recruit high quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified.

## **OBJECTIVE**

As part of the Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund, the State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) is responsible for conducting a competitive Improving Teacher Quality State Grants process to fund partnerships comprised, at a minimum, of schools of education and schools of arts and sciences from institutions of higher education (IHEs), along with one or more high need Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). The partnerships must use the funds to conduct professional development activities in core academic subjects in order to ensure that highly qualified teachers, paraprofessionals, and (if appropriate) principals have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects they teach, or in computer-related technology to enhance instruction.

## **ELIGIBILITY**

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) a Indiana private or State IHE and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals; (2) a Indiana school of arts and sciences; and (3) a Indiana high-need LEA (ESEA, Title II, Part A, Section 2131).

A high-need LEA is defined as an LEA:

- (A) (i) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **or**  
(ii) for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line;

### **and**

- (B) (i) for which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; **or**  
(ii) for which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing. (ESEA, Title II, Part A, Section 2102).

### **Determining if a LEA Meets the High-Need Eligibility Requirement**

Please use the following guidelines to establish whether a specific LEA is a “high-need” LEA.

1. Income requirement for Part A:
  - a. Based on guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Census Bureau data must be used to determine the total number of children in poverty by school district. These data can be found on the U.S. Census Bureau Web site at

<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/tables.html>. (This site reports the number of children in poverty for every school district in the United States. Locate the file for the State's data, and find the LEA in question.);

**and**

2. Teacher Certification requirement for Part B:
  - a. School corporations with at least 5% of teachers teaching on an Indiana limited license will meet the Part B definition of a "high-need" LEA. Data on the number of limited licenses awarded to teachers by Indiana school corporation have been posted at <http://www.in.gov/che/> as reported by the Indiana Department of Education Division of Professional Standards; and/or
  - b. Each LEA may be able to more clearly address Part B of the definition and such information should be provided in your proposal narrative.

**NOTE:** Based on the Census Data referenced by the U.S. Department of Education, the Commission for Higher Education has identified that the following Indiana public school districts that meet the poverty eligibility requirement for the FY 2011 program: Adams Central Community Schools, Anderson Community School Corporation, Barr-Reeve Community School Corporation, Blackford County Schools, Cannelton City School, Cloverdale Community Schools, Crawford County Community School Corporation, Crawfordsville Community School, Culver Community Schools Corporation, Edinburgh Community School Corporation, Elkhart Community Schools, Elwood Community School Corporation, Fayette County School Corporation, Fort Wayne Community School Corporation, Frankfort Community Schools, Gary Community School Corporation, Goshen Community School Corporation, Hamilton Community Schools, Indianapolis Public Schools, Jay School Community, Knox Community School Corporation, Kokomo-Center Township Consolidated School Corporation, Lafayette School Corporation, Lake Ridge Schools, Lake Station Community Schools, Linton-Stockton School Corporation, Marion Community Schools, Michigan City Area Schools, Muncie Community Schools, New Durham Township Metropolitan School District, North Daviess Community Schools, North Knox School Corporation, North Vermillion Community School Corporation, North White School Corporation, Northeast School Corporation, Orleans Community Schools, Paoli Community School Corporation, Peru Community Schools, Pike Township Metropolitan School District, Randolph Central School Corporation, Randolph Eastern School Corporation, Richmond Community School Corporation, River Forest Community School Corporation, Rockville Community Schools, Salem Community Schools, School City of East Chicago, School City of Hammond, School Town of Speedway, Scott County School District 1, Scott County School District 2, Shakamak Schools Metropolitan School District, Shelbyville Central Schools, South Adams Schools, South Bend Community School Corporation, Southwest Parke Community School Corporation, Springs Valley Community School Corporation, Switzerland County School Corporation, Turkey Run Community School Corporation, Union School Corporation, Vigo County School Corporation, Vincennes Community School Corporation, Wabash City Schools, Warren Township Metropolitan School District, Washington Township Metropolitan School District, Wayne Township Metropolitan School District, West Noble School District, West Washington School Corporation, Westview School Corporation, and White River Valley School District.



**The following school corporations meet both the poverty and teacher certification requirements for FY 2011 program, all eligible partnerships must include a school(s) from:**

- ✓ Gary Community School Corporation
- ✓ North White School Corporation
- ✓ Randolph Central School Corporation
- ✓ School City of East Chicago
- ✓ School City of Hammond
- ✓ South Bend Community School Corporation
- ✓ Switzerland County School Corporation

Other Indiana schools and/or school districts can participate in a partnership as noted below.

**Participation of LEAs that Do Not Meet the “High-Need” Requirement**

In addition to the above three required partners, an eligible partnership **also may include** other Indiana LEAs (both “high-need” and not “high-need”), Indiana charter school(s), Indiana private school(s), an Indiana elementary or secondary school, an Indiana educational service agency, an Indiana nonprofit educational organization, other Indiana IHEs, a school of arts and sciences within that Indiana IHE, the division of that IHE that prepares teachers and principals, an Indiana nonprofit cultural organization, an Indiana entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, an Indiana teacher organization, an Indiana principal organization, or an Indiana business. (ESEA, Title II, Part A, Section 2131).

**Fiscal Agent of the Partnership**

An IHE must be the fiscal agent and official applicant of the partnership. While local schools/school corporations are not eligible to apply directly for funds, IHEs may not receive an award without collaborating fully with LEAs. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education strongly encourages teachers and local school corporations to initiate conversations with college and university faculty about proposal ideas and in-service needs.

**PROJECT DURATION AND AMOUNT OF AWARDS**

Proposed projects will last 12 months.

**Annual Projects** will have activities from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.

Proposed projects are expected to include professional development that is sustained over a period of time. Projects offering short courses, workshops, or similar short duration activities, must also include follow-up activities as part of the project.

**The amount available for FY 2011 new projects in Indiana is approximately **TO BE INSERTED WHEN U.S. DOE AWARD NOTIFICATION IS RECEIVED (JUNE 30)**. Large scope projects are encouraged; however, no one proposal will receive the total funds available.**

**DEADLINE**

Proposals are due October 3, 2011. Proposals postmarked after October 3, 2011 will automatically not be considered. Successful applicants will be notified that their proposals have been selected for funding following Commission review and approval at its December 9, 2011 meeting.

## ACTIVITIES

### Required Project Components:

The Indiana Commission for Higher Education must make awards of *Improving Teacher Quality* partnership program funds to support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating “high-need” LEAs:

1. Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that teachers have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning)
2. Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:
  - a. Ensure that those individuals can use challenging State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and State assessments to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;
  - b. May include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional development described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and
  - c. May include activities of partnerships between one or more LEAs, one or more of the LEAs’ schools, and one or more IHEs for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low-performing schools. (ESEA, Title II, Part A, Section 2134).
3. A proposal under this program must respond to the professional development needs of teachers in a specific school, school district, or group of schools as identified in the Local Improvement Plan of the participating LEA(s) partners.
4. Proposals must be the result of collaborative planning between the proposing IHE’s school/department of education/teacher preparation as well as a school/department for the specific discipline(s) in which the professional development focuses and the high-need LEA. The provided Collaborative Agreement Form must be completed, signed, and included as part of a proposal in order to verify that cooperative planning has occurred and that one or more LEA(s) have entered into an agreement with the IHE.

Each proposal must provide a list of those teachers who will or are anticipated to participate in the project.

5. Proposals must advance teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies that are based on “scientifically-based research.”

Note: The law requires any partnership receiving both a subgrant from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and an award under the Partnership Program for Improving Teacher Preparation in section 203 of Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA) to coordinate activities conducted under the two awards.

***Preferences:***

In accordance with the activities to be funded as listed above, preference will be given to proposed activities that meet at least one of the following focus areas for teachers, principals, and/or paraprofessionals:

1. Focus on intensive high quality professional development needs related to **aligning classroom curricula** with Indiana’s Academic Standards and Indiana’s Core Standards in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and/or Social Studies;
2. Focus on **increasing the use of an applied approach** to increase the interest and participation in the STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) through project-based learning (i.e., Project Lead the Way);
3. Focus on **engaging more students in rigorous science and mathematics courses** and support the elimination of lower level mathematics and science classes such as Basic Math or General Math;
4. Focus on **strategies to increase the “high achievement pipeline,”** including working with Advanced Placement, dual credit and International Baccalaureate teachers in core academic subject areas, so that more students have the opportunity to progress to and be successful in higher-level coursework.
5. Focus on **aligning Indiana high school curricula with the first-year of study** at Indiana’s colleges and universities;
6. Focus on **teaching of scientifically-based reading instruction;** and
7. Focus on **increasing the number of “highly-qualified” minority teachers and/or teachers of under-represented groups** in Indiana schools.

All proposals must provide in-service training developed in close collaboration with teachers, principals, and, as appropriate, local school corporation staff (including teacher assistants, office staff, librarians, media and computer specialists and guidance counselors) to be considered for funding.

**SELECTION CRITERIA**

The Commission will select for funding under the Improving Teacher Quality partnership program those applicants that are of the highest overall quality. In determining which applications to recommend for award, peer reviewers will assign each application up to 100 points using the following Selection Criteria. The relative weight for each criterion is indicated in parentheses. Each criterion also includes the factors the reviewers will consider in determining how well an application meets the criterion.

The Selection Criteria are drawn from the general criteria for competitive grants contained in sections 34 CFR 75.209 and 75.210 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in response to 34 CFR 76.400(c) and 76.770. Reviewers will use their professional judgment to assess the quality of each application against these criteria. In determining which applicants to select for funding, the Commission relies upon the reviewers’ scores. However, the Commission may also use other pertinent information about an applicant, and has a responsibility under this program, to the extent

practical, to ensure an equitable distribution of grants in all geographic areas within the state (ESEA, Title II, Part A, Section 2132).

Upon completing its review of proposals, the peer review team will make award recommendations to the Commissioner. The Commissioner will consider the recommendations and present his award recommendations to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education for consideration and approval. The Commission will make all final decisions on Improving Teacher Quality partnership program awards.

Projects may not begin until: (a) they have been approved by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, (b) their budgets have been satisfactorily negotiated with Commission staff, and (c) the Commission's award contract has been signed by the appropriate institutional officer and returned to the Commission. If due process procedures are invoked (see next section), the Commission's decisions and subsequent award contracts may be delayed.

**A. Need for the Project. (10 points)**

In determining the need for the proposed project, the Commission considers:

- (i) The status of the partner LEA as a “high-needs” LEA;
- (ii) The local or state needs being addressed and how these needs were determined;
- (iii) The extent to which K-12 teachers and planners, public and non-public, were involved in the selection of the problem(s) and the formulation of the solution(s);
- (iv) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or activities to be carried out by the proposed project;
- (v) The extent to which proposed activities meet the needs identified in the participating LEA(s) Local Improvement Plan(s); and
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare recipients to integrate Indiana’s Academic Standards into classrooms of “high-need” LEAs.

**B. Quality of the Project Design. (25 points)**

In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Commission considers:

- (i) The extent to which the program focuses on the preferred project activity areas for Indiana;
- (ii) The extent to which the program and programmatic activities are clearly defined;
- (iii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;
- (iv) The extent to which program operations are clearly defined (who will do what, when and where);
- (v) The extent to which program participants are defined and selected;
- (vi) The number of teachers to be supported and the impact on classroom instruction;
- (vii) The extent to which specific dates and times of proposed project activities are defined;
- (viii) The number of days in which there will be interaction with participants;
- (ix) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Improving Teacher Quality financial assistance;
- (x) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for improving teacher quality;
- (xi) The extent to which the proposed project serves multiple school districts and/or geographic areas within the state; and
- (xii) The extent to which the proposed project is based on “scientifically-based research.”

**C. Quality of Project Services. (20 points)**

In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Commission considers:

- (i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services;
- (ii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services;
- (iii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are likely to ensure that recipients of those services will be highly qualified in the core academic subject taught by the recipients;
- (iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services; and
- (v) The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

**D. Quality of Project Personnel.** (10 points)

In determining the quality of project personnel, the Commission considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience of:

- (i) The project director;
- (ii) Key project personnel; and
- (iii) Project consultants or subcontractors.

**E. Adequacy of Resources.** (10 points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Commission considers:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization;
- (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project; and
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

**F. Quality of the Management Plan.** (10 points)

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Commission considers:

- (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks;
- (ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project; and
- (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

**G. Quality of the Project Evaluation.** (15 points)

In determining the quality of the project evaluation, the Commission considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation:

- (i) Are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project;
- (ii) Provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies; and
- (iii) Include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

### **DUE PROCESS**

An applicant desiring an explanation of the Commissioner's decision not to recommend its proposal for funding must contact Commission staff. Decisions regarding the relative merit of competing proposals are considered final. However, an institutional applicant who is dissatisfied with the review process may request a hearing. Such a request must be made in writing and received at the Commission office within ten days of the notification of a decision not to recommend. Hearings will be conducted before the Commissioner for Higher Education. Upon completion of the hearing, the Commissioner will consider all arguments and factor such information into his final award recommendations to the Commission. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education will consider the recommendations of the Commissioner and make all final award decisions.

# SECTION C

## BUDGET & ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS





# FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM BUDGET/ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS

## GENERAL INFORMATION

A detailed budget and a budget summary using the provided budget summary form are required. Each item must be justified for its contribution to the program. Budget categories include:

- Salaries and fringe benefits for faculty and other instructional personnel;
- Salaries and fringe benefits for student and teacher assistants;
- Salaries and fringe benefits for clerical and other support personnel;
- Participant support costs such as travel, subsistence, fees, and stipends;
- Administrative costs;
- Other instructional costs such as books, materials, supplies;
- Contractual costs such as consultants and evaluators;
- Indirect costs.

## SPECIAL NOTE

The law requires that no single participant in an eligible partnership, (*i.e.*, no single high-need LEA, no single IHE and its division that prepares teachers and principals, no single school of arts and sciences, and no single other partner), may “use” more than 50 percent of the subgrant. The provision does not focus on which partner receives the funds, but which partner directly benefits from them.

### Example: Correct Use of Funds

Jefferson University, its College of Education, and its College of Arts and Sciences partner with the Lincoln high-need school district to provide professional development in instructional leadership for 20 principals. Jefferson University’s Grants Office receives **100%** of the Title II, Part A funds for the partnership. The Grants Office gives:

- the College of Education **25%** of the funds to use to pay its faculty to deliver professional development in instructional leadership methodologies for 20 principals at Lincoln school district;
- the College of Arts and Sciences **25%** of the funds to use to pay its faculty to deliver professional development content knowledge in instructional leadership for 20 principals at Lincoln School District;
- Lincoln School District **50%** of the funds to use to pay stipends for its principals to participate in the professional development offered by faculty from the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences at Jefferson University.

In this example no partner uses more that 50% of the funds for its own benefit.

### Example: Incorrect Use of Funds

Jefferson University, its College of Education, and its College of Arts and Sciences partner with the Lincoln high-need school district to provide professional development in instructional leadership for 20 principals. Jefferson University’s Grants Office receives **100%** of the Title II, Part A funds for the partnership. The Grants Office gives:

- the College of Education **10%** of the funds to use to pay its faculty to deliver a professional development summer course in instructional leadership methodologies for 20 principals at Lincoln school district;
- the College of Arts and Sciences **10%** of the funds to use to pay its faculty to deliver a professional development summer course in instructional leadership content knowledge for 20 principals at Lincoln school district;
- a mentor principal **10%** of the funds to work with the 20 Lincoln school district principals, in their buildings, applying what they learned in the professional development summer courses;
- Lincoln school district **70%** of the funds to pay tuition for the 20 principals to attend the professional development summer courses offered by the faculty from the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences at Jefferson University.

In this example one partner uses more than 50% of the funds for its own benefit.

### **BUDGET LIMITATIONS**

A grant may pay either for participant tuition or for the direct instructional costs of program delivery. It cannot pay for both. Direct costs may include summer or released time salaries and fringe benefits for faculty and staff, participant stipends, participants' living costs, travel, supplies, and consultants' fees.

While it is not required, *Improving Teacher Quality* partnership projects may offer university undergraduate or graduate credit for participants. If credit is granted at no cost to the participants, then the awarding of participant stipends is not recommended.

**1. Salaries and Wages (or tuition fees).** These should be determined in accordance with institutional policies and regulations. For each project staff member, indicate how his/her salary or wages were derived. If tuition reimbursement is being requested **rather** than salaries, make note of this and list the cost in this column. Note: Salary expenses should not exceed 30 percent of total budget.

**2. Fringe Benefits.** These should also be consistent with institutional policies and regulations. Indicate each type of benefit -- retirement, social security, and medical -- separately.

**3. Consultants.** The project narrative should include justification for the use of each consultant. In the budget narrative, explain the number of days each will assist the project and the amount to be paid per day, being mindful of the \$200/day guideline. Provide the name of each consultant, if possible.

**4. Supplies and Expenses.** Identify each general category of expendable supplies and their estimated costs. Customary categories include printing, postage, classroom supplies, and software.

**5. Equipment.** Small equipment-supply rental and/or purchase are permissible and must be essential to the specific in-service needs of the project. Small equipment-supply items must individually cost no more than \$500. Funds cannot be used to finance capital expenditures or office equipment. The LEAs participating in the project must retain equipment-supply items purchased with *Improving Teacher Quality* partnership program funds.

**6. Travel.** Travel reimbursement should conform to institutional policies and regulations. If applicable, indicate the estimated number of in-state trips and mileage. Travel-related meals or other expenses should be itemized. Out-of-state travel will not be approved.

**7. Participant Stipends.** The Commission will authorize stipends for teachers participating in *Improving Teacher Quality* partnership program in-service activities. Such stipends should be modest; for example, they might be based on what school corporations pay substitute teachers in order to release regular teachers for in-service programs. The recommended stipend is \$60/day (6-8 hours).

**8. Other Direct Cost.** These should be itemized. Examples include space rental and computer time.

**9. Indirect Cost.** Indirect cost for activities supported by *Improving Teacher Quality* partnership program funds should be calculated at a maximum of eight (8) percent for federal direct cost.

Excluded from payment are:

- Planning costs;
- Individual capital equipment items costing more than \$500;
- Salary payments for faculty and staff overload; and
- Registration/travel to conventions or professional meetings.

### **MATCHING FUNDS**

In-kind and cash contributions from the LEA(s), the IHE(s), or other sources are generally expected to make up at least 10 percent of the budget. Exceptions require special justification. Support and cooperation from local schools, professional organizations, and other projects is encouraged. Examples of such contributions and support include:

- Local schools or one of the school districts sharing the cost of participant expenses, materials, or stipends,
- Local schools providing for the cost of hiring substitutes while participants attend project activities,
- Professional associations assuming the cost of a conference or a publication which disseminates information or materials from the project, and/or
- Other agencies linking a complementary project with the one proposed for the *Improving Teacher Quality* partnership program.

Partial project sponsorship by industry or a not-for-profit group with education related objectives would be regarded favorably. Cooperative support from LEA ESEA Title II funding is especially encouraged and is expected in most cases.

### **ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS**

A financial and project report is required within thirty (30) days of the end of the project period. The project report includes participant data and describes funded activities. Forms for the two reports will be provided to project directors.

The provisions of part 74 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) govern the use of funds provided to institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations. Allowable costs are determined by the cost principle contained in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB Circular A-21 and A-122, respectively.)

Institutions receiving Title II funds must submit to the Commission OMB circular A-133 audit reports for each fiscal year in which project activity occurs.



# SECTION D

## DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS



**FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS, AND ABBREVIATIONS**

**DEFINITIONS**

**ARTS AND SCIENCES:** When referring to an organizational unit of an institution of higher education, any academic unit that offers one or more academic majors in disciplines or content areas corresponding to the academic subjects in which teachers teach; and B) when referring to a specific academic subject, the disciplines or content areas in which an academic major is offered by an organizational unit [*Title II, Part A, section 2102(1)*].

**CORE ACADEMIC SUBJECTS:** The term core academic subjects means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX, Part A, section 9101(11)*].

**HIGH-NEED LEA:** An LEA that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; and for which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; or for which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing [*Title II, Part A, section 2102(3)*].

**HIGHLY QUALIFIED PARAPROFESSIONAL:** A paraprofessional who has not less than 2 years of: A) experience in a classroom; and B) post-secondary education or demonstrated competence in a field or academic subject for which there is a significant shortage of qualified teachers [*Title II, Part A, section 2102(4)*].

**HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER:**

- A. When the term “highly qualified teacher” is used with respect to any public elementary school or secondary school teacher teaching in a State, it means that:
- The teacher has obtained full State certification as a teacher (including certification obtained through alternative routes to certification) or passed the State teacher licensing examination, and holds a license to teach in such State, except that when the term is used with respect to any teacher teaching in a public charter school, the term means that the teacher meets the certification or licensing requirements set forth in the State’s public charter school law (*see entry below for the definition of a highly qualified charter school teacher*); and
  - The teacher has not had certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis.
- B. When the term “highly qualified teacher” is used with respect to:
1. An elementary school teacher who is new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (A) above, and:
    - Holds at least a bachelor's degree; and
    - Has demonstrated, by passing a rigorous State test, subject knowledge and teaching skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of the basic elementary school curriculum (which may consist of passing a State-required certification or licensing test or tests in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of basic elementary school curriculum); or
  2. A middle school or secondary teacher who is new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (A) above, holds at least a bachelor's degree, and has

demonstrated a high level of competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches by:

- Passing a rigorous State academic subject test in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches (which may consist of a passing level of performance on a State-required certification or licensing test or tests in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches); or
- Successful completion, in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, of an academic major, a graduate degree, coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major, or advanced certification or credentialing.

C. When the term “highly qualified teacher” is used with respect to an elementary, middle, or secondary school teacher who is not new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (A) above, holds at least a bachelor's degree, and:

- Has met the applicable standard in the clauses of subparagraph (B), which includes an option for a test; or
- Demonstrates competence in all the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches based on a high objective uniform State standard of evaluation that-
  - a. Is set by the State for both grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge and teaching skills;
  - b. Is aligned with challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and developed in consultation with core content specialists, teachers, principals, and school administrators;
  - c. Provides objective, coherent information about the teacher's attainment of core content knowledge in the academic subjects in which a teacher teaches;
  - d. Is applied uniformly to all teachers in the same academic subject and the same grade level throughout the State;
  - e. Takes into consideration, but not be based primarily on, the time the teacher has been teaching in the academic subject;
  - f. Is made available to the public upon request; and
  - g. May involve multiple, objective measures of teacher competency [*Title IX, Part A, section 9101(23)*].

**HIGH QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:** See the definition for “professional development.”

**LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOL:** The term “low-performing school” means an elementary school or secondary school that is identified under Section 1116 of ESEA.

**PARAPROFESSIONAL:** A paraprofessional is an individual with instructional duties. Individuals who work solely in non-instructional roles, such as food service, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, and non-instructional computer assistance are not considered to be paraprofessionals for Title I purposes.

**PRINCIPAL:** The term “principal” includes an assistant principal [*Title II, Part A, section 2102(6)*].

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:** The term “professional development:”

A. Includes activities that:

1. Improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subjects the teachers teach, and enable teachers to become highly qualified;
2. Are an integral part of broad schoolwide and districtwide educational improvement plans;



3. Give teachers, principals, and administrators the knowledge and skills to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging State academic content standards and student academic achievement standards;
  4. Improve classroom management skills;
  5. Are high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom and are not 1-day or short-term workshops or conferences;
  6. Support the recruiting, hiring, and training of highly qualified teachers, including teachers who became highly qualified through State and local alternative routes to certification;
  7. Advance teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies that are:
    - a. Based on scientifically based research (except that this subclause shall not apply to activities carried out under Part D of Title II); and
    - b. Strategies for improving student academic achievement or substantially increasing the knowledge and teaching skills of teachers;
  8. Are aligned with and directly related to:
    - a. State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and assessments; and
    - b. The curricula and programs tied to the standards described in subclause (a) [except that this subclause shall not apply to activities described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 2123(3)(B)];
  9. Are developed with extensive participation of teachers, principals, parents, and administrators of schools to be served under this Act;
  10. Are designed to give teachers of limited English proficient children, and other teachers and instructional staff, the knowledge and skills to provide instruction and appropriate language and academic support services to those children, including the appropriate use of curricula and assessments;
  11. To the extent appropriate, provide training for teachers and principals in the use of technology so that technology and technology applications are effectively used in the classroom to improve teaching and learning in the curricula and core academic subjects in which the teachers teach;
  12. As a whole, are regularly evaluated for their impact on increased teacher effectiveness and improved student academic achievement, with the findings of the evaluations used to improve the quality of professional development;
  13. Provide instruction in methods of teaching children with special needs;
  14. Include instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform and instruct classroom practice; and
  15. Include instruction in ways that teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, and school administrators may work more effectively with parents; and
- B. May include activities that:
1. Involve the forming of partnerships with institutions of higher education to establish school-based teacher training programs that provide prospective teachers and beginning teachers with an opportunity to work under the guidance of experienced teachers and college faculty;
  2. Create programs to enable paraprofessionals (assisting teachers employed by a local educational agency receiving assistance under Part A of Title I) to obtain the education necessary for those paraprofessionals to become certified and licensed teachers; and
  3. Provide follow-up training to teachers who have participated in activities described in subparagraph (A) or another clause of this subparagraph that is designed to ensure that the knowledge and skills learned by the teachers are implemented in the classroom [*Title IX, Part A, section 9101(34)*].

**SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH:** The term “scientifically based research:”

- A. Means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs; and
- B. Includes research that--
- Employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;
  - Involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
  - Relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
  - Is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions and with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest, with a preference for random-assignment experiments, or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
  - Ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
  - Has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review [*Title IX, Part A, section 9101(37)*].

### **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

**EDGAR:** Education Department General Administrative Regulations.

**ESEA:** Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

**ICHE:** Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

**IDOE:** Indiana Department of Education.

**IHE:** Institution of higher education. This includes both private and public institutions.

**LEA:** Local education agency. This may be a single public school, a public school district, or a consortium of public schools or districts.

**NCLB:** *No Child Left Behind*, the act that amended ESEA.

**NPO:** Non-Profit Organization. This includes certain non-profit organizations, other than colleges and universities that offer professional development.

**RFP:** Request for proposal.

**SAE:** State agency for education. This is the state agency that is responsible for K-12 education. In Indiana, the SAE is the Indiana Department of Education.

**SAHE:** State agency for higher education. In Indiana, the SAHE is the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

# SECTION E

## APPLICATION CONTENTS



## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

To compete for an award under the Improving Teacher Quality partnership program, applicants must include the following eight parts in this order.

### **Part I: Cover page**

This part of the application consists of the standard application cover page to provide basic identifying information about the applicant and application. Use the form provided.

### **Part II: Table of Contents**

### **Part III: Proof of Eligibility**

This part of the application requires documentation regarding the eligibility of the partnership to receive a grant under this program. An eligible applicant must complete the provided Collaborative Agreement form and include a list of potential participants.

### **Part IV: Abstract**

The abstract must be one-page in length and include the objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed project.

### **Part V: Project Narrative**

This part of the application contains information describing the proposed project, responding to the Program's Selection Criteria, which is located on page 9 of this RFP. The narrative is limited to the equivalent of no more than 15 pages, using the following standards:

- A page is 8.5" x 11", with 1" margins at the top, bottom and both sides;
- Use a font that is either 11-point or larger with no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch);
- For charts/tables/graphs, use a font that is either 11-point or larger with no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch); and
- Use the headings provided in the Program's Selection Criteria (page 9 of this RFP) for each section.

### **Part VI: Budgets and Budget Summary**

In order to be considered for funding, the applicant must provide the following:

- Budget summary using form provided.
- A descriptive, itemized budget narrative that explains and justifies the requested amounts for individual cost categories.
- "Use" of Funds form.

### **Part VII: Personnel**

This part must include a brief vita (two-page maximum) for the director(s) and each of the instructional staff. Briefly discuss the qualifications of the project director(s) and faculty/staff for the project.

### **Part VIII: Statement of Assurances**

In order to be considered for funding, the applicant must complete and sign all assurances and certifications that are provided. These include

- Statement of Assurances
- Assurances – Non-Construction Programs
- Certifications Lobbying; Debarment; Suspension, and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
- Certification Regarding Debarment; Suspension; Ineligibility; and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activity

*(Note: Applicants who have previously applied for and/or received funds from the Math Science Partnership Grant Program must note it on their application).*

# FY 2011 TITLE II IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROPOSAL COVER PAGE

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Applying College or University: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Director: Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_, IN Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Level(s) of Project Participants (check all that apply):

- Preservice     K-4     5-6     7-8     9-12     Principals

Field(s) of Study:     English/Language Arts/Reading     Mathematics     Science     Economics

History/Geography     Civics/Government     Foreign Language     Arts

Length of Proposed Project:     One year

Expected number of project participants each year (do not include project staff):

	Year One	
Preservice		
K-12 Teachers		
College/Univ. Faculty		
Others		
<b>TOTAL</b>		

Dates of Project Activities: \_\_\_\_\_

Region of Project Impact (Attach an additional sheet if necessary):

School	School Corporation/District	City

Proposed Sources of Funding:

	Year One	
Title II Grant		
Applying IHE		
LEA Partner		
Other		
<b>TOTAL</b>		

Name of the individual with fiscal authority for the grant:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT DIRECTOR:**

\_\_\_\_\_

TYPED NAME AND TITLE      SIGNATURE      DATE

**INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:**

\_\_\_\_\_

TYPED NAME AND TITLE      SIGNATURE      DATE

## FY 2011 TITLE II IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROPOSAL

Year One

Summary

INSTITUTION: \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

		TITLE II FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCHING FUNDS/ IN-KIND SERVICES	TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES
A. SALARIES	1. Professional	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	2. Non-Professional	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	3. Fringe Benefits	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
B. CONSULTANTS		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
C. SUPPLIES & EXPENSES		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
D. TRAVEL		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
F. PARTICIPANT STIPENDS		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
F. OTHER DIRECT COSTS		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
G. EQUIPMENT		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
H. INDIRECT COSTS		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL		\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

**FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
"USE" OF FUNDS FORM**

Federal law requires that no single participant in an eligible partnership, (*i.e.*, no single high-need LEA, no single IHE and its division that prepares teachers and principals, no single school of arts and sciences, and no single other partner), may "use" more than 50 percent of the subgrant. The provision does not focus on which partner receives the funds, but which partner directly benefits from them. Please note below the percent of requested funds that will be used by each participant in the partnership following the examples provided on pages 13 and 14 of this document.

IHE School/Department of Education or Teacher Prep Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
Description:

IHE School of Arts and Sciences: \_\_\_\_\_  
Description:

High-Need LEA: \_\_\_\_\_  
Description:

Other Partner ( \_\_\_\_\_ ): \_\_\_\_\_  
Description:

Other Partner ( \_\_\_\_\_ ): \_\_\_\_\_  
Description:

Attach additional pages as need.

**TOTAL: 100%**



**FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

The postsecondary institution hereby assures and certifies that the department/school of education and the discipline department/school on which this project focuses have collaborated in the development of this proposal. As such, the proposal reflects the ideas and expertise of both areas in order to provide high quality services to the participants of the proposed project.

1. Describe the collaborative planning, which has resulted in this application, giving meeting dates and participants' names. Indicate the school corporations/specific schools that participated in these meetings. Certify that collaboration will continue throughout the project duration.
  
2. Describe how the proposed in-service training will meet the needs of teachers in the corporations or consortia that are signatories to this agreement.
  
3. Describe how school corporation administrators will support all teachers participating in the project throughout its duration.
  
4. Describe the financial commitments that the LEA(s) is (are) making to the project.

1 Name, Title, Organization/Corporation (Official of Partnering LEA)	Signature	Date
--	-----------	------

2 Name, Title, Organization/Corporation (Official of Partnering School/Dept. of Education/Teacher Prep Program)	Signature	Date
---	-----------	------

3 Name, Title, Organization/Corporation (Official of Partnering School of Science/Arts – content area)	Signature	Date
--	-----------	------

# FY 2011 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

## STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

Participating institutions are required to provide assurances that all provisions of the law and its regulations have been complied with. Although each project's narrative should indicate how compliance has been built into project activities, compliance must also be affirmed in a document signed by an appropriate institutional officer assuring the Commission (and the U.S. Department of Education) that the items listed in the statement on the next page have indeed been incorporated into the project for which Eisenhower funds are sought.

The institution hereby assures and certifies that it will comply with all the regulations, policies, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to the acceptance, and use of funds for this federally funded project. The institution also assures and certifies that it will:

1. Keep such records and provide such information as may be necessary for fiscal and program auditing and for program evaluation and will provide the Commission or its designee any information it may need to carry out its responsibilities under the No Child Left Behind Act.
2. Comply with all provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act and its implementing regulations and all administrative rules of the Commission applicable to the No Child Left Behind.
3. Enter into formal agreement(s) with school corporations to be served by the proposed in-service training program.
4. Submit to the Commission for Higher Education an appropriate A-133 for the fiscal years covered by the project.

---

Institution

---

Name of Authorizing Official

---

Title

---

Signature

---

Date

## ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503

**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.**

**Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.**

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management, and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or Federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874) and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§ 327-333), regarding labor standards for Federally assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clear Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1721 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care,

handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

and OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

- 16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead- based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
- 17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996

- 18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	DATE SUBMITTED

**Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97) Back**

---

**CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER  
RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS**

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying," and 34 CFR Part 85, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

---

**1. LOBBYING**

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

---

**2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER  
RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS**

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110--

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgement rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (2)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transaction (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

---

**3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE  
(GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)**

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610 -

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

**DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE  
(GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)**

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610-

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

---



---



---

Check  if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND / OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

**Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion -- Lower Tier Covered Transactions**

This certification is required by the Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 CFR Part 85, for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.110.

**Instructions for Certification**

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary covered transaction," "principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions," without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

**Certification**

- (1) The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- (2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

ED 80-0014, 9/90 (Replaces GCS-009 (REV.12/88), which is obsolete)

### Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352  
(See reverse for public burden disclosure)

<b>1. Type of Federal Action:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input type="checkbox"/> b. grant <input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement <input type="checkbox"/> d. loan <input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance	<b>2. Status of Federal Action:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input type="checkbox"/> b. initial award <input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award	<b>3. Report Type:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing <input type="checkbox"/> b. material change  <b>For material change only:</b> Year _____ quarter _____ Date of last report _____
<b>1. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Subawardee Tier _____, if Known:   <b>Congressional District, if known:</b>	<b>2. If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:</b>    <b>Congressional District, if known:</b>	
<b>6. Federal Department/Agency:</b>	<b>7. Federal Program Name/Description:</b>   CFDA Number, if applicable: _____	
<b>8. Federal Action Number, if known:</b>	<b>9. Award Amount, if known:</b> _____ :  \$	
<b>10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant</b> <i>(if individual, last name, first name, MI):</i>	<b>b. Individuals Performing Services</b> <i>(including address if different from No. 10a) (last name, first name, MI):</i>	
<b>11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.</b>	<b>Signature:</b> _____ <b>Print Name:</b> _____ <b>Title:</b> _____ <b>Telephone No.:</b> _____ <b>Date:</b> _____	
<b>Federal Use Only</b>	<b>Authorized for Local Reproduction</b> <b>Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)</b>	



## INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF-LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.
2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.
3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a followup report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.
4. Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.
5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.
6. Enter the name of the Federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For

example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.

7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.
8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitations for Bid (IFB) number; grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Included prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE-90-001."
9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.
10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the lobbying registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.  
  
(b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10(a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).
11. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

**According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 2050**



# SECTION F

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS AND APPLICATION CHECKLIST



## APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must meet the following deadline requirements in order to be considered for funding.

### **Applications Sent by Mail**

Applicants must mail the original and twelve (12) copies, all bound or stapled so the opened proposals will lie reasonably flat to:

Indiana Commission for Higher Education  
Re: Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program  
101 W. Ohio Street, Suite 550  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Proposals must be postmarked by October 1, 2010.

Applicants must show one of the following as proof of mailing:

1. A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service Postmark;
2. A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service; or
3. A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.

If the application is mailed through the U.S. Postal Service, please that the Commission will not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

1. A private metered postmark; or
2. A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Services.

Applicants should note that the U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, please check with your local post office.

### **Applications Delivered by Hand**

The Commission will accept applications that are delivered by hand. Applicants may submit the original and twelve (12) copies to the Commission office located on 101 W. Ohio Street, Suite 550, Indianapolis, IN 46204. Applications will be accepted from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, up to and including October 1, 2010. No applications will be accepted by hand-delivery following 5:00 p.m. on October 1, 2010.

## APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Does your application include each of the following?

- Cover Page
- Table of Contents
- Proof of Eligibility (Includes Collaborative Agreement form and a list of potential participants)
- Project Abstract
- Project Narrative
- Year One, Year Two, and Summary Budget Forms and Budget Narratives
- “Use” of Funds Form
- Assurances and Certifications
  - Statement of Assurances Form
  - Assurances--Non-Construction Programs
  - Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment; Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
  - Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion--Lower Tier Covered Transactions
  - Disclosure of Lobbying Activity

Did You –

- Provide one (1) original plus twelve (12) copies of the application?
- Include all required forms with original signatures and dates?
- Adhere to the page limit described in Section C?
- Consecutively number all pages in your application package?

## ASSISTANCE

Questions regarding these proposal guidelines or potential professional development projects should be directed to Catisha Coates at the Indiana Commission for Higher Education by email [catishac@che.in.gov](mailto:catishac@che.in.gov) telephone (317) 464-4400 x25 or by fax (317) 464-4410. Limited assistance and guidance on specific plans for a project are available.

**COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Friday, June 10, 2011

**DECISION ITEM D:                    Adoption of the 2011-12 Indiana/Ohio Reciprocity Agreement**

**Staff Recommendation**                    That the Commission for Higher Education approve the *Memorandum of Understanding Between Indiana and Ohio Regarding Tuition Reciprocity, 2011-2012.*

**Background**                                    The rationale for reciprocity agreements is to expand access to higher education, and also to recognize that population growth, economic development, and the need for postsecondary access seldom pay attention to state boundaries.

In 2004-05, Indiana and Ohio entered into a limited agreement to provide reciprocal tuition for residents of specified counties who attend specified postsecondary institutions.

Historically and currently, the reciprocity agreement between Indiana and Ohio has never achieved enrollment or fiscal parity, with many more Ohio students taking advantage of reduced tuition in Indiana. In the last two years the disparity has narrowed significantly but remains a concern. When determining appropriations for higher education institutions participating in this agreement, funding for the purposes of state support will be capped at 2008-09 levels for Ohio Reciprocity students.

**Supporting Document**                    *To be distributed.*





**COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Friday, June 10, 2011

**DECISION ITEM E:                    Election of Officers for 2011-2012**

**Background**

In line with the Bylaws of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, the Officer Nominating Committee will present a slate of officers to the Commission for approval at its June business meeting.

**Supporting Document**

*Slate of Officers.*



# Indiana Commission for Higher Education

## **Slate of Officers**

*The following names are respectfully submitted by the Officer Nominating Committee for consideration as a slate of officers to serve a one-year term beginning July 1, 2011 and ending June 30, 2012:*

Chair: Ken Sendelweck

Vice-Chair: Marilyn Moran-Townsend

Secretary: Michael “Jud” Fisher, Jr.



# COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

## INFORMATION ITEM A: Status of Active Requests for New Academic Degree Programs

<u>Institution and Site</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Status</u>
1. IU-South Bend	M.A.T. in Special Education	10/18/10	Under CHE review.
2. IU-South Bend	M.S.Ed. in Educational Leadership	10/18/10	Under CHE review.
3. IU-East at New Castle	B.S. in Nursing (Completion)	03/07/11	On June agenda for action.
4. IU-Indianapolis	M.S. in Translational Science	03/07/11	Under CHE review.
5. IU-East	B.A. in History	03/07/11	On June agenda for action.
6. IU-Bloomington Statewide via Distance Education Technology	Ed.D. in Instructional Systems Technology	03/30/11	Under CHE review.
7. ITCCI-South Bend	T.C. in Dental Assisting	04/07/11	On June agenda for action.
8. IUPU-Columbus	M.A. in Mental Health Counseling	04/27/11	Under CHE review.
9. IU-Kokomo	B.S. in Chemical Biology	04/27/11	Under CHE review.
10. ITCCI-South Bend, Warsaw, Ft. Wayne, and Indianapolis	A.S. in Pre-Engineering	04/28/11	On June agenda for action.
11. ITCCI-South Bend, Warsaw, Ft. Wayne and Indianapolis (Cert./T.C. at Indpls. only)	Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in Machine Tool Technology	04/28/11	Under CHE review.
12. ITCCI-Valparaiso, Warsaw, Ft. Wayne, and Sellersburg	A.A.S. in Engineering Technology	05/04/11	On June agenda for action.
13. ITCCI-Valparaiso, South Bend, Ft. Wayne, Lafayette, Kokomo, Muncie, Terre Haute, Indpls., Evansville, and Bloomington	Cert./T.C./A.A.S. in HVAC	05/04/11	On June agenda for action.
14. ISU	M.S. in Occupational Therapy	05/12/11	On June agenda for action.
15. ISU	Ph.D. in Health Sciences	05/12/11	Under CHE review.
16. ISU	Master of Social Work	05/12/11	Under CHE review.



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

### **INFORMATION ITEM B: Capital Improvement Projects on Which Staff Have Acted**

In accordance with existing legislation, the Commission is expected to review and make a recommendation to the State Budget Committee for:

- (1) each project to construct buildings or facilities that has a cost greater than \$500,000;
- (2) each project to purchase or lease-purchase land, buildings, or facilities the principal value of which exceeds \$250,000;
- (3) each project to lease, other than lease-purchase, a building or facility, if the annual cost exceeds \$150,000; and
- (4) each repair and rehabilitation project if the cost of the project exceeds (a) \$750,000, if any part of the cost of the project is paid by state appropriated funds or by mandatory student fees assessed all students, and (b) \$1,000,000 if no part of the cost of the project is paid by state appropriated funds or by mandatory student fees assessed all students.

Projects of several types generally are acted upon by the staff and forwarded to the Director of the State Budget Agency with a recommendation of approval; these projects include most allotments of appropriated General Repair and Rehabilitation funds, most projects conducted with non-State funding, most leases, and requests for project cost increase. The Commission is informed of such actions at its next regular meeting. During the previous month, the following projects were recommended by the Commission staff for approval by the State Budget Committee.

#### I. REPAIR AND REHABILITATION

B-1-11-2-18 Purdue University- West Lafayette  
Hansen LSRB Partial Fourth Floor Renovation  
Project cost: \$1,285,000

The financing and construction of this project on the West Lafayette campus has been approved as required under the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of Purdue University. This project is a complete laboratory renovation of rooms 413, 415, 417 and 419. The estimated cost of this project is \$1,285,000, to be funded from Gift Funds (\$1,200,000) and Repair and Rehabilitation – University funds (\$85,000).

B-1-11-1-19 Purdue University- West Lafayette  
Parking Lot Relocations  
Project cost: \$1,853,500

The financing and construction of this project on the West Lafayette campus has been approved as required under the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of Purdue University. This project is to relocate parking lots lost due to the construction of the U.S. 231 Bypass, and provide parking lots to replace those that will be used for the construction of the Drug Discovery Facility and the Health and Human Services Research Facility. The estimated cost of this project is \$1,853,500, to be funded from Parking Facility Reserves (\$967,250) and INDOT Right-of-Way Acquisition funds (\$886,250).

II. NEW CONSTRUCTION

None.

III. LEASES

None.

IV. LAND ACQUISITION

None.



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

### INFORMATION ITEM C: Capital Improvement Projects Awaiting Action

Staff is currently reviewing the following capital projects. Relevant comments from the Commission or others will be helpful in completing this review. Three forms of action may be taken.

- (1) Staff Action. Staff action may be taken on the following types of projects: most projects funded from General Repair and Rehabilitation funding, most lease agreements, most projects which have been reviewed previously by the Commission, and many projects funded from non-state sources.
- (2) Expedited Action. A project may be placed on the Commission Agenda for review in an abbreviated form. No presentation of the project is made by the requesting institution or Commission staff. If no issues are presented on the project at the meeting, the project is recommended. If there are questions about the project, the project may be removed from the agenda and placed on a future agenda for future action.
- (3) Commission Action. The Commission will review new capital requests for construction and major renovation, for lease-purchase arrangements, and for other projects which either departs from previous discussions or which pose significant state policy issues.

#### I. NEW CONSTRUCTION

B-1-08-1-02      Purdue University  
Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory BSL-3 Facility  
Project Cost: \$30,000,000

Purdue University seeks authorization to proceed with the construction of the Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory BSL-3 Facility on the West Lafayette campus. The expected cost of the project is \$30,000,000 and would be funded from 2007 General Assembly bonding authority. This project is awaiting a letter from the Budget Agency requesting review.

A-7-09-1-09      Indiana University Northwest  
Tamarack Hall Replacement and Ivy Tech Community College – Northwest  
Project Cost: \$45,000,000

The Trustees of Indiana University request authorization to replace Tamarack Hall with a new 106,065 assignable square foot facility in a unique building plan incorporating programs from Tamarack Hall at Indiana University Northwest and Ivy Tech Community College – Northwest under one structure. The expected cost of the project is \$45,000,000 and would be funded from 2009 General Assembly bonding authority. This project is pending review from the Commission for Higher Education.

F-0-08-1-03

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana  
Bloomington New Construction A&E  
Project Cost: \$20,350,000

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana seeks authorization to proceed with the expenditure of Architectural and Engineering (A&E) planning funds for a New Construction project at the ITCCI Bloomington campus. The expected cost of the project is \$20,350,000 and would be funded from 2009 General Assembly (\$20,000,000) and 2007 General Assembly (\$350,000) bonding authority. This project is pending review from the Commission for Higher Education.

B-2-09-1-10

Purdue University Calumet Campus  
Gyte Annex Demolition and Science Addition (Emerging Technology Bldg)  
Project Cost: \$2,400,000

The Trustees of Purdue University seeks authorization to proceed with planning of the project Gyte Annex Demolition and Science Addition (Emerging Technology Bldg) on the Calumet campus. The expected cost of the planning of the project is \$2,400,000 and would be funded from 2007 General Assembly bonding authority. This project is awaiting a letter from the Budget Agency requesting review.

B-4-09-1-21

Purdue University North Central  
Student Services and Activities Complex A&E  
Project Cost: \$1,000,000

The Trustees of Purdue University seeks authorization to proceed with planning of the project Student Services and Activities Complex. The expected cost of the planning of the project is \$1,000,000 and would be funded from 2007 General Assembly bonding authority. This project is awaiting a letter from the Budget Agency requesting review.

A-9-09-1-12

Indiana University Southeast  
New Construction of Education and Technology Building  
Project Cost: \$22,000,000

The Trustees of Indiana University requests authority to proceed with the new construction of the Education and Technology Building on the Indiana University Southeast campus. The new building would be a 90,500 GSF facility and provide expanded space for the IU School of Education and Purdue University College of Technology. The project would be funded through state fee replacement appropriations. This project is awaiting a letter from the Budget Agency requesting review.

II. REPAIR AND REHABILITATION

None.

III. LEASES

None.

## **COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Friday, June 10, 2011

### **INFORMATION ITEM D:** Minutes of the May 2011 Commission Working Sessions

## **MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION WORKING SESSIONS**

Thursday, May 12, 2011

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Commission for Higher Education met in working session starting at 6:30 p.m. (ET) at University of Indiana-Kokomo campus in Kokomo, Indiana. Commission members in attendance were Cynthia Baker, Jerry Bepko, Dennis Bland, Marilyn Moran-Townsend, Carol D'Amico, Jud Fisher, George Rehnquist, Keith Hansen, Chris LaMothe, Chris Murphy, and Michael Smith.

Absent were: Eileen Odum, Ken Sendelweck and Susana Duarte de Suarez

Staff present: Teresa Lubbers, Jason Bearce, Jon Gubera, Jason Dudich, Ken Sauer, and Catisha Coates.

### **II. DISCUSSION**

- A. Jon Gubera, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Jason Dudich, Chief Financial Officer, presented a summary of the legislation that passed in the 2011 General Assembly that affected CHE and higher education, including an emphasis on the results in higher education funding for the biennium.
- B. Jon Gubera, Associate Commissioner for Policy, presented on the policy for dual credit courses including CHE's newly legislatively mandated role of setting rates to be charged to Indiana students taking dual credit courses in a high school setting from Indiana public universities.
- C. Jason Dudich, Chief Financial Officer, presented the findings and methodology used for the staff's recommendation for CHE's legislatively required setting of non-binding tuition and fee increases for each of Indiana's public universities over the biennium (FY 2012 & 13).

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m. (ET).

## MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION WORKING SESSIONS

Friday, May 13, 2011

### IV. CALL TO ORDER

The Commission for Higher Education met in working session starting at 7:45 a.m. (ET) at University of Indiana-Kokomo campus in Kokomo. Commission members in attendance were Cynthia Baker, Jerry Bepko, Dennis Bland, Marilyn Moran-Townsend, Carol D'Amico, Jud Fisher, George Rehnquist, Keith Hansen, Chris LaMothe, Chris Murphy, and Michael Smith.

Absent were: Eileen Odum, Ken Sendelweck and Susana Duarte de Suarez

Staff present: Teresa Lubbers, Jason Bearce, Jon Gubera, Jason Dudich, Ken Sauer, and Catisha Coates.

### V. DISCUSSION

- A. Chancellor Harris of Indiana University-Kokomo gave a presentation about the school and its strategic plan working in concert with CHE's 2010 policy on the roles of regional campuses.
- B. Jason Bearce, Associate Commissioner for Communication, presented staff's proposed resolution concerning adopting new goals for college and career educational attainment in Indiana.
- C. Jon Gubera, Associate Commissioner for Policy, briefed Members on staff's proposed policy on the *Role of Vincennes University*.

### VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:52 a.m. (ET).

# COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, June 10, 2011

## **INFORMATION ITEM E: Calendar of Upcoming Meetings of the Commission**

### **Staff Recommendation**

For information only.

### **Background**

The Commission presents its schedule of meetings twice a year. As it considers the upcoming calendar each six months, the previous calendar is presented and an additional six months is added. This semiannual process permits publication well in advance of the meeting dates as a convenience to all interested parties. *(Meeting dates are customarily scheduled based on the second Friday of the month, but are subject to revision if conditions exist which make a change necessary.)*

This item reaffirms this portion of the schedule presented last December:

July 2011	<i>(No regular meeting)</i>
August 11-12, 2011	Indiana University Northwest, Gary
September 8-9, 2011	Ivy Tech Community College, Marion
October 13-14, 2011	Vincennes University, Jasper
November 2011	<i>(No regular meeting)</i>
December 8-9, 2011	Indianapolis

The following six-month schedule has been added:

January 2012	<i>(No regular meeting)</i>
February 9-10, 2012	Indianapolis
March 8-9, 2012	Indianapolis
April 13, 2012	Indianapolis <i>(Weldon Conf.)</i>
May 10-11, 2012	TBD
June 7-8, 2012	TBD

### **Supporting Document**

None