

**State of Indiana
Commission for Higher Education**

Minutes of Meeting

Friday, November 9, 2012

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Commission for Higher Education met in regular session starting at 1:00 p.m. at University Place Hotel, IUPUI Campus, 850 W. Michigan St., Room 137, Indianapolis, IN 46202, with Chair Marilyn Moran-Townsend presiding.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Members Present: Gerald Bepko, Carol D’Amico (via conference call), Susana Duarte De Suarez, Jud Fisher, Marilyn Moran-Townsend, Chris Murphy (via conference call), Eileen O’Neill Odum (via conference call), Dan Peterson, George Rehnquist, Hannah Rozow, Kent Scheller, and Mike Smith.

Members Absent: Dennis Bland, Chris LaMothe.

CHAIR’S REPORT

Ms. Moran-Townsend said that the Commission had a good morning session, when they heard Dr. Nasser Paydar, Vice Chancellor, IUPUI, sharing information about the University’s completion success strategy.

Ms. Moran-Townsend also mentioned a speech Dr. Richard Ludwick, President and CEO, Independent Colleges of Indiana, gave at lunch, regarding some strategies on completion and student success that work really well at independent colleges.

COMMISSIONER’S REPORT

Ms. Teresa Lubbers, Commissioner, spoke about the regional College Success Coalition meetings around the state. Five out of eight meetings have been completed, including convenings in Jeffersonville, South Bend, Richmond, Marion and Greencastle. The rest of the meetings will be completed by the beginning of December, and those will include convenings in Kokomo, Indianapolis, and Evansville. The meetings have provided the Commission with a great opportunity to meet with local community and educational leaders to discuss the need for education beyond high school.

Ms. Lubbers mentioned that most encouraging has been learning more about efforts that are underway in these counties/regions. Ms. Lubbers stated that county coalitions have recruited nearly one thousand local organizations and implemented more than one thousand targeted activities designed to increase college access and completion. In particular, the Commission’s focus has been on the newly designed 21st Century Scholars Program and its potential to reach more scholars. At the conclusion of the day, the coalition hosts a free screening of the award-winning documentary film “First Generation.” Ms. Lubbers explained that this series of regional meetings will be followed by the completion of the first iteration of the Commission’s “Return on

Investment Report” in early January, continuing the Commission’s commitment to highlighting the value of postsecondary education.

Ms. Lubbers then said that the Commission is refining its legislative agenda and budget recommendations in preparation for the 2013 legislative session. Following last year’s significant higher education session, the Commission will again have several important measures it will be bringing to the General Assembly. These include further efforts to improve articulation and transfer; clarifications to the Board of Proprietary Education and quorum rules for the Commission; further efforts to unify a data system; and several improvements to the state’s financial aid system.

In conclusion, Ms. Lubbers thanked all members of the Commission for their tireless efforts on behalf of Indiana’s higher education system. Ms. Lubbers pointed out that while this is a volunteer board, the work is increasingly time-consuming and challenging, and the Commission members’ efforts do not go unnoticed. She added that their willingness to share their considerable talents with the Commission staff improves the quality of the work the Commission does.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2012 COMMISSION MEETING

R-12-08.1 RESOLVED: That the Commission for Higher Education hereby approves the Minutes of the October 2012 regular meeting (Motion – Smith, second – Scheller, unanimously approved)

II. THE PUBLIC SQUARE - DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Program Review – Institutional Practices: A Panel Discussion

Ms. Moran-Townsend invited Dr. John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy, Indiana University; Dr. Jack Maynard, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Indiana State University; and Dr. Mary Ostrye, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Ivy Tech Community College; to join Commissioner Lubbers for a panel discussion.

Ms. Lubbers said that the Commission has had an on-going discussion with the universities about their academic programs, how they are aligned with the economic needs of the state, and how the universities make decisions regarding creating new programs and eliminating programs that have run their course and are no longer needed.

In response to Ms. Lubbers’ question regarding the process of reviewing the programs and criteria used for the evaluation of these programs, Dr. Ostrye responded that every program is reviewed every three years. The criteria used for this review are based on one of Ivy Tech’s academic policies called Academic Quality Indicators, which is one part of the program review. Two other features in Ivy Tech’s overall program review process are technical outcome assessment results and general education outcome assessment results.

Dr. Ostrye explained that for programs that do not have a two-year exam at the end of the class, the faculty develop a portfolio of criteria for program review. The information on program review is included in Ivy Tech's overall strategic review, their strategic plans and budget process.

In response to Ms. Lubbers' question about program review at Indiana University, Dr. Applegate responded that IU is a much larger and diverse institution, which covers a wide range of disciplines from professional schools to regional campuses. Dr. Applegate stated that, like Ivy Tech, IU follows practices for program review that are standard across the country among accredited institutions. Program review is an on-going process, which takes place every time a professor or a department chair puts together a schedule of courses for the next year. The budget decisions also depend on this process.

Dr. Applegate spoke about accreditation, another aspect of reviewing programs closely related to a program review. IU has eight campuses, and each of them is accredited. IU has 123 accredited programs that are being reviewed on regular basis. Then Dr. Applegate mentioned an internally generated program review, which is mostly done in areas that are not separately accredited. A university policy on program review requires a program to be reviewed every five to seven years.

Dr. Maynard, responding to the same question from Ms. Lubbers, said that the concept of constant and persistent review of the programs is an evolving process. Some time ago the program review was used as an opportunity to see how to make a program better. The expectation now is that program is assessed in quality. Dr. Maynard said that ISU's process of program review is similar to that of other institutions: the period for review is also between five and seven years, and it is a coordinated process.

Dr. Maynard also stated that USI had regional accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission, and the university has more than 30 specialized accreditations. Several years ago the university did a comprehensive review of all programs on campus, and came up with a set of program reviews, using such criteria as demand for the program and possible future for it. Based on the results, the university eliminated about 20 percent of their programs, saving thousands dollars.

In response to Mr. Smith's question regarding the outcomes of the review and whether a decision to eliminate a program might be influenced by the status of the instructional staff in the program, Dr. Applegate responded that this has not been their experience. The university usually takes the preexisting resources and redirects them to a new program.

Mr. Smith noted that he rarely heard about a new program being a replacement for or an adjustment to an existing program. Dr. Maynard responded that the evolution and revision of the existing programs occur on regular basis. Eliminating a program is a challenge, and the university has policies on how to treat faculty in such cases.

Responding to a question from Mr. Peterson regarding feedback from graduates, Dr. Applegate responded that given the diversity of its programs, IU does not have a single way of doing that. The Higher Learning Commission, an accrediting body for IU, has a new outcome-driven approach to the accreditation process. If any given

profession has a large community, reaching out to them is typically a part to the approach. Dr. Ostrye added that all Ivy Tech's programs have advisory boards that have a very high representation from the industry. Dr. Maynard said that at ISU they survey the graduates and the employers to get their feedback.

In response to questions from Dr. D'Amico regarding the number of programs that were discontinued at Ivy Tech, as well as the role the program review played in discontinuing these programs, Dr. Ostrye responded that Ivy Tech has only 58 programs, and most recently two programs were taken off the inventory. Dr. Ostrye stated that the program review was extremely helpful in demonstrating that there was no longer any need for these programs.

Dr. Applegate said that at IU the programs change by evolution rather than by removal. Program review helps the university to understand how they can adapt programs in order to serve the new needs of students or the workplace better. Most of the new programs are interdisciplinary. Dr. Applegate added that they indeed have programs that were discontinued, but the program review is essential to see the programs adapt over time.

Dr. Maynard added that USI currently has a program that is being phased out, but it was done by their annual review of program degrees.

Dr. Bepko pointed out that it would be helpful to understand what the renewal process does both in terms of creating the new degrees and eliminating the old ones. Dr. Bepko also asked whether the reports from the Higher Learning Commission were confidential, to which Dr. Maynard responded that to his knowledge these reports were not confidential; many institutions post these reports online. ISU, being a public institution, shares these reports with public.

In response to Ms. Moran-Townsend's question regarding advice the universities could give the Commission as a coordinating body regarding the right number of programs, Dr. Applegate responded that a new program is being created only after the university checks whether any students will be enrolled in it, and that is a part of a program review, as well. Dr. Applegate also made a comment, concurred by Dr. Maynard, that there may be a small number of graduates in a certain program, but this program might be essential for another, more advanced degree.

In response to Ms. Duarte De Suarez' questions whether the categories for the reviews are the same across the disciplines, and whether there is an approach at the higher level, Dr. Maynard responded that the template ISU follows for its programs is the same, but there is some flexibility, since for the professional programs the questions may be answered in a different manner. Dr. Maynard added that some reviews occur within the college, with the Dean of that college and the Provost, depending on the programs. The university does not have an overarching body to conduct oversight of all the programs.

Dr. Ostrye explained how the reviews are done in Ivy Tech, and pointed out that they have a system which provides a broader oversight over all of the programs that were reviewed within the year.

Responding to a comment from Mr. Murphy regarding the increased specialization of the programs, Dr. Maynard agreed that some programs become very specialized. Dr. Applegate added that the focus should be on the mission of the degree or the program and its level, because doctoral degrees are often very specialized.

Dr. Ken Sauer, Senior Associate Commissioner, Research and Academic Affairs, Commission for Higher Education, said at that at the prior evening's Academic Affairs Committee meeting, members of the Committee prepared the headcount and degree data for all of the IU and Purdue regional campuses. This data can be helpful in looking at the context for the programs that are delivered by the regional campuses. A next step would be to discuss this in front of the Committee, and then before the whole Commission.

Dr. Sauer also pointed out that, in regards to the subject of the new programs and the information that ought to be presented, the Agenda book contains information for programs that exist throughout the state, and it includes data on the number of programs in Indiana, number of students enrolled statewide, and other information.

In response to Dr. Bepko's question on how many degree programs with low enrollment were taken out of the inventory, Dr. Sauer responded that there were probably at least 60 or 70 such programs.

III. RHAM DECISIONS AND OTHER DECISION ITEMS

A. Academic Degree Programs

1. Bachelor of Science in Technical Communications to be offered by Purdue University through the IUPUI Campus

R-12-08.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves *the Bachelor of Science to Be Offered by Purdue University through the IUPUI Campus*, in accordance with the background discussion in this agenda item and the *Program Description* (Motion – Bepko, second – Rozow, unanimously approved)

Dr. Candiss Vibbert, Assistant Vice President for Engagement, Purdue University, presented this proposal.

Dr. Sauer gave the staff recommendation.

B. Capital Projects

1. Mills Residence Hall Renovation – Indiana State University

R-12.08-4 **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education recommends Approval to the State Budget Agency and the State Budget Committee the following project: *Mills Resident Hall Renovation – Indiana State University*. Staff recommendations are noted in the staff analysis (Motion – Rehnquist, second – Smith, unanimously approved)

Dr. Diann McKee, Vice President for Business Affairs, Finance & University Treasurer, presented this item.

Mr. Jason Dudich, Associate Commissioner and Chief Financial Officer, Commission for Higher Education, gave the staff recommendation.

2. International Studies Building – Indiana University Bloomington Campus

R-12-08.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education recommends approval to the State Budget Agency and the State Budget Committee the following project: *International Studies Building – Indiana University – Bloomington*. Staff recommendations are noted in the staff analysis (Motion – Smith, second – Fisher, unanimously approved).

Mr. Dudich presented this project.

Mr. Smith said he was very pleased to see how the two Big Ten Indiana Universities for the second time are using athletic revenue to fund academic buildings.

3. Capital Projects on Which Staff Proposes Expedited Action

Ms. Moran-Townsend presented a list of capital projects for expedited action.

R-12-08.6 **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves by consent the following capital project, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item:

- Indiana University – Indianapolis Campus: School of Dentistry Renovation - \$2,300,000 (Motion – Bepko, second – Peterson, unanimously approved)

C. Administrative Item on Which Staff Proposes Expedited Action

R-12-08.7 **RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves by consent the following administrative action, in accordance with the background information provided in this agenda item:

- Authorize staff to renew a license agreement with the National Center for College Costs for the ongoing implementation of the Indiana College Costs Estimator (Motion – Smith, second – Duarte De Suarez, unanimously approved)

IV. 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

IX. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

X. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:26 P.M.

Marilyn Moran-Townsend, Chair

Chris LaMothe, Secretary