



REACHING HIGHER, ACHIEVING MORE



# AGENDA

## MATERIALS

September 12, 2013

101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1984  
Tele: 317.464.4400; Fax: 317.464.4410  
[www.che.in.gov](http://www.che.in.gov)



INDIANA COMMISSION  
HIGHER *for* EDUCATION



COMPLETION



PRODUCTIVITY



QUALITY



# AGENDA

## HOTEL ACCOMMODATIONS:

*Holiday Inn*  
*6000 National Road, East*  
*Richmond, IN 47374*  
*765-488-1975*

## MEETING SITE:

*Indiana University East*  
*2325 Chester Boulevard*  
*Richmond, IN 47374*

## CHAIR'S BREAKFAST

8:00 A.M. – 9:00 A.M.

Whitewater Hall  
Community Room

Breakfast Guest: Chancellor Kathryn Cruz-Uribe

## STAFF BREAKFAST

8:00 A.M. – 9:00 A.M.

Whitewater Hall  
Art Gallery

## WORKING SESSION AGENDA

9:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Whitewater Hall  
Vivian Auditorium

## CALL IN INFORMATION:

712-432-1500

PARTICIPANT PIN: 969123#

## DISCUSSION TOPICS

- Degree Mapping Guidance
- Improving Teacher Quality Grant for FY 2014-2015
- Regional Campus Analysis
- Review of By-Laws
- Committee Report Outs

LUNCH - COMMISSION

11:45 A.M. – 1:00 P.M.

Whitewater Hall  
Community Room

Lunch Guests:

Jack Tharp, Sr. Director. Of Financial Literacy  
Jennifer Stephens, Director of Financial Aid Systems and Compliance

LUNCH - STAFF

11:45 A.M. – 1:00 P.M.

Whitewater Hall  
Art Gallery

COMMISSION MEETING

1:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.

Whitewater Hall  
Vivian Auditorium

CALL IN INFORMATION:

712-432-1500

PARTICIPANT PIN: 969123#

- I. **Call to Order – 1:00 p.m. (EDT)**
  - Roll Call of Members and Determination of a Quorum**
  - Opening Remarks by Chancellor Kathryn Cruz-Uribe**
  - Chair’s Remarks**
  - Commissioner’s Report**
  - Consideration of the Minutes of the August 8, 2013 Commission meeting..... 1**
  
- II. **The Public Square**
  - A. **Assessment of Learning Outcomes: An Update on Emerging Practices.....15**
  
- III. **Business Items**
  - A. **Administrative Items – Full Discussion**
    - 1. **LearnMore Indiana’s College GO! Week Campaign.....21**
    - 2. **Guided Pathways to Student Success Study.....29**
    - 3. **Release of 2013 Improving Teacher Quality Program Request for Proposals.....33**
  - B. **Academic Degree Programs – Full Discussion.....71**
    - 1. **Master of Jurisprudence to be offered by Indiana University at the Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis Campus**
  - C. **Academic Degree Programs – Expedited.....91**
    - 1. **Bachelor of Arts in English to be offered by Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis at its Columbus Campus**

- 2. Bachelor of Arts in Central Eurasian Studies to be offered by Indiana University Bloomington at Bloomington
- 3. Master of Arts in Teaching in Mathematics to be offered by Indiana University East at Richmond
- D. Capital Projects – Expedited.....93
  - 1. Vincennes University – Aviation Technology Center
  - 2. Purdue University – Harrison Residence Hall Bathroom Renovation Phase III
  - 3. Purdue University – Seng-Liang Wang Hall Engineering Strategic Growth Swing Space Lease
  - 4. Indiana University – Eigenmann Restroom Renovations, Phase II

**IV. Information Items**

- A. Proposals for New Degree Programs, Schools, or Colleges Awaiting Commission Action .....97
- B. Requests for Degree Program Related Changes on Which Staff Have Taken Routine Staff Action.....99
- C. Capital Improvement Projects on Which Staff Have Acted.....101
- D. Capital Improvement Projects Awaiting Action.....103

**V. Old Business  
New Business**

**VI. Adjournment**

\*\*\*\*\*

The next meeting of the Commission will be on October 10, 2013, in South Bend, Indiana.



**State of Indiana  
Commission for Higher Education**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Thursday, August 8, 2013**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Commission for Higher Education met in regular session starting at 1:00 p.m. at Purdue University North Central (PUNC), with Vice Chair Jud Fisher presiding.

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

*Members Present:* Gerald Bepko, Jon Costas, Jason Curtis, Jud Fisher, Mark Holden, Dan Peterson, John Popp, Hannah Rozow, Mike Smith.

*Members Absent:* Dennis Bland, Susana Duarte De Suarez, Al Hubbard, Chris Murphy, George Rehnquist.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

Mr. Fisher invited Dr. James Dworkin, Chancellor of Purdue University North Central, to give welcoming remarks. Dr. Dworkin thanked the Commission for its support of the PUNC's programs in the recent years; also, for its support of the new building for the Students' Services and Activities Complex. PUNC has been at its present site since 1967, started with almost 1,000 students. Today there are close to 3,500 traditional students and almost 3,000 concurrent enrollment students. Dr. Dworkin welcomed Commission members to the campus.

Mr. Fisher thanked Dr. Dworkin for his hospitality. Mr. Fisher announced that some business items will be moved to the front of the Agenda. First item was the election of officers. Mr. Fisher said that the Commission's by-laws state that the Chair of the Commission shall establish a nominating committee with one member from each class to select the executive team of the Commission. This includes the chair, vice chair and secretary. The slate is presented on page 27 of the Agenda book. The recommendation is the following: Dan Peterson – Secretary; Dennis Bland – Vice Chair, and Jud Fisher – Chair.

**R-13-05.1      RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves the new officers according to the slate (Motion – Smith, second – Costas, unanimously approved)

Mr. Fisher recognized and welcomed the Commission's four new members. They are: Mark Holden, who serves as the Chief Executive Officer of A&R Logistics; John Popp, who serves as the President and CEO of Aunt Millie's Bakery; and Jason Curtis, who is an associate professor of biology at Purdue North Central and will be serving as the faculty member. Al Hubbard, co-founder of E&A Industries, has also been appointed to the Commission and will join the rest of the Commission at the October meeting. Mr. Fisher also congratulated Ms. Susana Duarte De Suarez on her re-appointment to the Commission for another term.

Mr. Fisher said that the Commission has the bittersweet task of bidding farewell to three of its members. Marilyn Moran-Townsend and Chris LaMothe have each completed their terms, and

George Rehnquist has submitted his resignation due to the conflict of interest with another organization, on whose board he is going to serve. Each of these Commission members served this Commission with passion and enthusiasm and will be greatly missed. Mr. Fisher added that the Commission will be honoring their service in October.

Mr. Fisher also mentioned a new hire on the Commission staff. Emily A.E. Sellers has been offered the position of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Coordinator for the West Region. She has most recently served as program director for Indiana Campus Compact and has done significant community and volunteer work with Indiana youth.

**R-13-05.2      RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves the hiring of Ms. Emily Sellers for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars (Motion – Peterson, second – Rozow, unanimously approved)

### COMMISSIONER’S REPORT

Ms. Teresa Lubbers, Commissioner, on behalf of the Commission staff added her thanks to the departing Commission members – Marilyn Moran-Townsend, Chris LaMothe and George Rehnquist – for their extraordinary service. Ms. Lubbers said that the Commission’s work has been made immeasurably better by their willingness to share their perspectives and counsel with the Commission. Ms. Lubbers said she was sure they will find ways to stay involved in the very important issue of increasing education attainment for Hoosiers. Likewise, Ms. Lubbers offered an official welcome to the new Commission members – John Popp, Mark Holden and Jason Curtis, adding that each of them brings to this role a wealth of experience. She said that the Commission looks forward to their participation as it promotes its strategic plan, *Reaching Higher, Achieving More*. Ms. Lubbers congratulated the new officers. She thanked Mr. Fisher for agreeing to serve in capacity of Chair. She also thanked Mr. Bland for taking on the task of serving as a Vice Chair and Mr. Peterson for agreeing to serve as a Secretary.

Against the backdrop of this good news, Ms. Lubbers told members that since the last meeting the Commission lost a member of its staff. Tara Adams, a longtime employee of the Commission for Proprietary Education and a current CHE employee, suffered a fall at her home that took her life. Through the years Tara continued to provide exemplary service in spite of the challenges of having multiple sclerosis. In her honor, the staff made a contribution to the National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Ms. Lubbers said that this year’s legislative session resulted in more than a new budget, including 1) a focus on workforce preparation and the skills gap, and 2) a legislative mandate to study the governance structure and academic offerings at regional campuses. The official part of this work began last week. On Monday, the Indiana Career Council, which was created by statute and is chaired by the Governor, met for the first time. The council is composed of legislative members, business leaders, Ivy Tech’s President Tom Snyder and leaders of the Department of Workforce Development, Indiana Department of Education and the Commission for Higher Education. At the initial meeting, the council reviewed its charge and the existing skill gap analyses. CHE provided data and background that was included in *Reaching Higher, Achieving More*.

Ms. Lubbers told the Commission members that later in the week she traveled to Fort Wayne for the first meeting of the Regional Campuses Study Committee. Members of this group include legislative and university leaders, as well as two Commission representatives, and Ms. Lubbers said that she and Jud Fisher serve in these roles. Ms. Lubbers added that on behalf of the Commission she presented the Commission’s 2010 Policy of Regional Campus Role and

Missions to provide context for the discussion. Since the meeting was held in Fort Wayne (as required by statute), and because an analysis of IPFW is required, several Fort Wayne business leaders and groups made presentations, too. The next meeting of the Committee will be held in Indianapolis in September, and a final meeting will be held again in Fort Wayne in October. It is likely that some legislative proposals will be introduced in the upcoming session as a result of the committee's work. Only the eight legislators are voting members.

In conclusion, Ms. Lubbers expressed her appreciation to all the Commission members who made the effort to be in attendance at today's meeting. She reminded them that by law the Commission is allowed to conduct business only if a quorum is established in person. At that point, other members can participate by phone. Based on action taken in the legislature, the Commission's committees can conduct their meetings by phone, but the official Commission meetings require the establishment of a quorum in person. Ms. Lubbers said that she understands that the Commission members are all very busy people and that serving on the Commission is a significant commitment of time, and sometimes individual members will need to participate by phone. Ms. Lubbers said that she simply wanted to remind the Commission members of the statute and let them know how much the staff values their efforts to attend a meeting in person.

## **CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2013 COMMISSION MEETING**

**R-13-05.3 RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education hereby approves the Minutes of the June, 2013 regular meeting (Motion – Bepko, second – Smith, unanimously approved)

## **II. DISCUSSION ITEM: The Public Square**

### **A. Approaches Recognized by the Voluntary System of Accountability to Assess Learning Outcomes**

For the benefit of the new Commission members, Mr. Fisher provided a brief context for the upcoming item on the Agenda. He said that the Commission faces complex and important issues, and to get to the goal of 60 percent educational attainment by 2025, it is necessary to draw from every resource at the Commission's disposal. The Commission relies heavily on its professional staff of individuals who work on these issues every day. However, Commission members benefit greatly from learning about these issues and hearing from experts on the topics of completion, productivity and quality.

Mr. Fisher explained that a portion of the Commission's afternoon meeting is dedicated to a Public Square panel discussion on a particular topic. The Commission is currently spending three months focusing its attention on the issue of quality, and how the Commission as a state can define and measure quality in higher education. This month, the Commission will discuss the issue of measurement and hear about different ways that the Commission can *quantify* something that is by definition *qualitative*.

Mr. Fisher said that the Commission will hear from Dr. Alexander McCormick, director of the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) at Indiana University. After his presentation, Dr. Don Sprowl, Assistant Provost for Institutional Research and Accreditation at Indiana Wesleyan University, and Dr. Richard "Biff" Williams, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Indiana

State University, will discuss their experience with various measures of quality at their institutions.

Mr. Fisher invited Dr. Ken Sauer, Senior Associate Commissioner, Research and Academic Affairs, to facilitate the panel.

Dr. Sauer said that he has talked to colleagues from other states, and he is not aware of another strategic plan that places as much emphasis on the quality as the Commission's *Reaching Higher, Achieving More*. The quality part constitutes the third portion of the Commission's strategic plan. There are links between the quality and other sections of the plan, but there are also elements of quality section that are truly unique in the essence of this conversation. And while a number of things are mentioned in the quality section, at its core it is about the student learning; what students are supposed to know to be well prepared for the twenty first century; to be well prepared to succeed in their careers; to contribute to the state's economy and to the society in general.

Dr. Sauer mentioned the need of developing metrics in order to find out whether the students are mastering the competencies and outcomes they need to learn and master. Dr. Sauer said that the Commission has an opportunity to get in front of this notion of developing metrics in terms of conversation around the postsecondary education. Dr. Sauer stated that as the Commission thinks about graduating so many more students, it might look at this as an opportunity to increase the quality of programs.

Dr. Sauer explained that this is second of the three part conversation about Quality section of *Reaching Higher, Achieving More*. He mentioned that at the Commission meeting last month, President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), Dr. Carol Geary Schneider, was giving a presentation regarding the AAC&U and the work they done regarding the essential learning outcomes. There was also a panel discussion on how campuses have used those outcomes in their own work. It was a very fruitful discussion that resulted in an action on the part of the Commission, recommending that Indiana become the ninth LEAP state.

Dr. Sauer added that the third discussion will take part at the September meeting, and the Commission will hear a presentation by Dr. George Kuh, who directs the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, which is a joint project of Indiana University Bloomington and the University of Illinois in Urbana - Champaign.

Dr. Sauer said that this meeting is devoted to looking at ways to assess and measure learning outcomes either as indirect measure of learning or as direct measures of learning outcomes. Dr. Sauer mentioned that in the Agenda books there is a reference to a Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The approaches to measuring quality, which will be a subject of today's conversation, are recognized by VSA.

Dr. Sauer introduced the panelists. Dr. Don Sprowl is from Indiana Wesleyan University, this University has been a real partner in to the Commission in several areas. One is transfer: Indiana Wesleyan is one of the three independent institutions who participate in STAC (State Transfer and Articulation Committee). Another area

is SARA (State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement); at a national meeting in Indianapolis one of the three representatives from Indianapolis was from Indiana Wesleyan University.

Dr. Sauer also introduced Dr. Richard “Biff” Williams, who is representing the Indiana State University.

And finally, Dr. Sauer introduced Dr. Alex C. McCormick, Director of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and invited him to make a presentation.

Dr. McCormick said that his presentation will cover questions and some known facts regarding quality; the sources of information about the quality and what is known of student engagement; and how NSSE data may be used for some important quality questions. Dr. McCormick also mentioned Dr. George Kuh, a founding director of the NSSE, adding that this project has enjoyed a great success over the last 14 years.

Dr. McCormick said that the official quality assurance mechanism in the United States is the accreditation system, but it is not very clear to the general public. Traditionally, accreditation is focused mostly on capacity and resources, with limited attention to matters of teaching and learning. This is changing, and has been for over a decade.

Dr. McCormick mentioned another most prominent source of quality information: news magazine writing. But the big problem with this is that they mostly focus on inputs and resources, like average ACT scores of interim students; salaries of the faculty members, etc., but are largely silent on teaching and learning, and that is where the focus needs to be in talking about higher education quality.

Dr. McCormick spoke about student engagement. Fundamentally, student engagement is the extent to which students are exposed to and participate in effective educational practices. Dr. McCormick gave some examples of his meaning of student engagement. One is challenging academic work; complex tasks that involve application, synthesis, and judgment; activities that require students to operate on their knowledge and apply it in certain circumstances.

Another definition of engagement by Dr. McCormick is the enriching student learning activities; and this includes active and collaborative learning and high-impact practices. Equally important is quality involvement with faculty, because this is where students’ learning comes from.

Dr. McCormick mentioned NSSE’s website and said that his office has just concluded a multi-process survey to update the NSSE; the survey deals with students’ experience, and is very much focused on behavior, as well. Operationally, NSSE has served two big goals: enrich the impoverished discourse about college quality by shifting the focus to teaching and learning, through the lens of effective practice; and provide diagnostic and actionable information, based on valid and reliable measures, that can guide improvement efforts and make meaningful comparisons.

Dr. McCormick explained that NSSE asks institutions to give them surveys completed by the first year students and seniors. The survey is completely self-

financed; institutional fees cover the cost of the project on recovery basis. The surveys are conducted by the Indiana University Center for Survey Research. A big benefit of this uniform administration is that it really buttresses the comparison results between the institutions.

Dr. McCormick explained that the institutions receive detailed reports and student data; NSSE provides three comparison groups, customizable through the institutions, and also provides identified student data file that permits further analysis by the institution. The results are confidential; NSSE does not publish institutional results; however, institutions may do so.

Dr. McCormick said that NSSE was launched in 2000 with 276 four-year colleges and universities participating in the survey; this last year there were 621 four-year colleges and universities. Over the life of the project about 1500 institutions in US and Canada participated in the survey. There were several international applications in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and China; and there were several single institutions in the US and other countries. Ninety percent of the original 276 colleges participated between 2010 and 2013. Indiana's 41 institutions (14 public and 27 private) participated between 2010 and 2013.

Dr. McCormick said that most of the questions of the survey were about academic activities and experiences; some questions were related to students' experiences with faculty. There are questions about institutional emphases; the students' gains; their satisfaction, as well as their demographic and enrollment characteristics. Dr. McCormick showed a few sample questions used on the survey. He spoke about the importance of teaching first generation students some learning strategies, as well as personal and social responsibility.

Dr. McCormick explained that in their survey NSSE asks 74 questions relating to student engagement; 12 questions about satisfaction and perceived gains; and another set of questions about demographic characteristics. Then this information goes through statistical process into four themes: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty and Campus Environment. NSSE has six summary measures about high-impact practices; three they provide for first year students and seniors, and three are for seniors only. NSSE provides lots of reports and tries to make them accessible for chief executives and statisticians.

Dr. McCormick talked about some ways to use the results; the most common is peer comparisons; but self-comparison is also quite important. Most of variability in student engagement is actually between students, not between institutions. NSSE results can be used as a parallel survey for faculty members. Dr. McCormick said that the results of NSSE surveys are published in "Change" magazine.

Wrapping up his presentation, Dr. McCormick pointed out that NSSE is not a "magic bullet". Most variations happen within institutions, not between them. Collecting data is the easy part; NSSE is best used in combination with other assessment information. There are dangers with making NSSE a high stakes test, and there is huge sensitivity around institutional data.

In response to Mr. Popp's question whether NSSE surveys 100 percent of freshmen class, Dr. McCormick said that they invite all freshmen and senior class to

participate, but not all of them do. Dr. McCormick said that NSSE's average institutional response has been declining over the years; right now it is about 30 percent.

Responding to a question from Mr. Peterson regarding the users of the data, Dr. McCormick said that for the most part it is the institutions, and a lot of institutions put their data on their website to use it in their strategic plans or accreditation studies.

In response to Mr. Popp's question about the cost of the survey, Dr. McCormick said that it is a sliding cost, based on the enrollment in the institution. For institutions with at least 12,000 undergraduates the total cost is \$7,580. This year they invited 1,600,000 students to fill out the survey from 621 institutions.

Answering Mr. Fisher's question regarding any specific examples on how institutions have changed and how they are doing after utilizing the data, Dr. McCormick said that NSSE shines some light, and sometimes it is an opportunity to test assumptions. It also can call attention to practices that could be improved, and students' feedback is a good example. Dr. Kuh did an earlier study with NSSE going cross-sectionally with institutions that had unusually strong student engagement performance. IUPUI was one of those institutions. These institutions with very positive transfer are also characterized by the culture issue. Change starts with knowledge, with awareness on how the institution is doing, and that leads to specific strategies to get better.

In response to Ms. Lubbers' question regarding the reason for the reduction in people participating in NSSE's survey, Dr. McCormick said that NSSE still has more than 300,000 students, who did the survey. It takes about 20 minutes to fulfill the survey, so it does require a commitment of time. The students are experiencing a lot of testing at the K-12 level, so they are increasingly skeptical about the surveys. Institutions vary in the extent to which they promote participation in the survey. Students, who do fill out the survey, do this because they want to help their school. If the institutions can persuade the students that they really want to know what their experience is, and if they can give an example of what they really learned from past survey, and what kind of changes were implemented, this can motivate the students to participate in the survey.

Responding to a question from Dr. Bepko regarding a reason for a difference between faculty and students' perspective, Dr. McCormick said that student and faculty understand the question differently and bring different perceptions; however, it is still a good opportunity to engage in the conversation and to cause the faculty to look not just at their syllabi but their assessments. Another example is feedback. When students and faculty disagree, this probably reflects different standards for faculty and students on how quickly the assignment should be turned around.

Dr. Sauer invited Dr. Sprowl and Dr. Williams to speak to some nationally available instruments that more directly measure student learning.

Dr. Sprowl spoke about three instruments: AQI, CLA and CLA Plus. AQI stands for Academic Quality Index. It consists of six domains of quality with 17 guiding questions. The domains include students' services, quality of teaching, and student learning. Dr. Sprowl said that one of his tasks is to measure how well their students are learning. Within the AQI, in terms of measuring student learning and student

experience, is included a set of national instruments, one of which is NSSE. They also use the Noel Levitz Collection of Student Satisfaction inventory instruments. Those national instruments have the advantage of being known across institutions, so IWU can compare itself with other schools.

Then Dr. Sprowl talked about CLA, which is one of the national instruments being used at IWU. It stands for Collegiate Learning Assessment; it is an invention of the Council for Aid in Education. CLA is intended to measure student learned skill and several fundamental academic skills to see them in real life context. Dr. Sprowl explained how the process works.

CLA's one weakness, continued Dr. Sprowl, relates to diagnostics. IWU gets a score back on how their freshmen and seniors have done on the CLA. They want to compare how they have grown in time, and then compare them with other schools. Since their students have done fine, an overall answer from the CLA is IWU is doing OK, with regard to teaching CLA measured skills. However, if the grades were bad, CLA would not be telling the university how to fix the problem. Drilling down to where the problem lies within the curriculum is not something that CLA is able to do, so this leads to CLA-Plus.

CLA-Plus is adding scientific and qualitative reasoning to the examination of the students; it provides more flexibility to the administration of the exam, and therefore, schools can use it as a high stakes test. They can add CLA-Plus to the portions of the curriculum, or into departments or programs. CLA-Plus is now providing sub scores for schools and individual students. If the CLA tells the university that they have issues to address, CLA-Plus helps identifying them.

In response to Ms. Lubbers' question why IWU has chosen to use CLA and how they use these results to instruct student and faculty behavior, Dr. Sprowl said that they are using CLA because it is well-designed measure on most important skills, and IWU uses it as the first level assessment.

Answering to another question from Ms. Lubbers regarding the meaning of the expression "We are doing OK," when it pertains to the university, Dr. Sprowl explained that this relates to the comparison with peer institutions. IWU's freshmen perform where they are expected to with regard to national peer norms; their seniors perform significantly better than expected with regards to benchmarks; therefore their measure of institutional value is added with regard to those measures.

In response to Ms. Rozow's question regarding the accessibility of the data, Dr. Sprowl responded that only his office has an access to the raw data; however, the information on the results and actionable meaning of the measures is available to the entire campus.

Dr. Williams spoke about the ISU's using Voluntarily System of Accountability (VSA). ISU has been a part of VSA since 2008. For the past five years they have been updating this data, so that any perspective student could look at the website and see the information pertaining to students' demographics, students' experiences, successes, retention rates, Cost Calculator, etc. With regards to student learning outcomes, ISU chose to use ETS (Educational Testing Services), which is one of the instruments within the VSA. ISU chose it because their assessment team thought this

would fit well for their students and faculty; and they also took into consideration the ease of administration and affordability.

Dr. Williams said that they administered ETS twice, in 2009-10, and in 2012-13. In 2009-10 it was a great learning experience. First they administered the test to 210 freshmen, and then tried to administer it to senior students. The test is voluntary. Out of 210 freshmen tests only 106 were used. Seniors, however, did not want to take the test, or would not complete it. ISU wanted to learn that ETS was the right examination for them, so they started collaborating with other institutions that were using ETS. Also, they were looking for some other instrument to use.

Dr. Williams explained that in 2012-13, they decided to administer ETS again to 230 first year students, and 230 seniors. This time they had enough information to gather data; they saw statistical significance that the students learned over time, from freshmen to seniors. Dr. Williams said that they also looked at how data compared nationally. In 2011 VSA asked the National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessments to see whether it was a valid instrument. Their conclusions are similar to the ISU's conclusions; they also felt that standardized tests lack credibility and validity, and that students have no stake in performing well, so it would be hard to come to some conclusions. Their overall conclusion is that VSA could be transformed into a platform for telling a certain population or public about the institution.

Dr. Williams said that when they were investigating what they did wrong at their first use of ETS, a lot of institutions were saying that they were going to the value instrument, which is rubric based. ISU joined Academy for Assessment Learning through Higher Learning Commission. This Academy helped ISU to create an assessment plan. ISU identified the value rubric as the instrument to use. They university created a four-year plan, and last year they started with writing. Our assessment team came together with a group of professors, who created rubrics and piloted them. 260 freshmen went through the rubric, and they looked at the writing assignments through that course. Last year those rubrics were applied to upper level courses and writing assignments for the seniors. As the results were compared, ISU had positive statistics that their students were learning over time, not only between the first year and the fourth year. They have also seen the different way of measure of learning within the class.

Dr. Williams said that all these results were received at the end of spring term, and they have already seen some changes. It was actually important for the professors, who learned some things about their teaching strategies. Dr. Williams mentioned that ISU will not use ETS again. They have three more years of rubrics, and that is just one measure. There has to be a variety of approaches.

Responding to a question from Ms. Rozow regarding the level of engagement of the faculty, Dr. Williams said that with ETS they were not engaged at all; however, with the rubrics they are highly engaged, because they are really excited to see the progress of their students.

In response to Ms. Lubbers' question whether more schools will be participating in VSA, Dr. Williams said that he believed there will be a variety of instruments, and the universities will decide on the best for them in terms of the learning outcomes.

Answering Mr. Fisher’s question regarding the budget for an assessment, Dr. Williams said that for ETS it was \$15.00 for an examination; he did not have the information for the rubrics.

Mr. Fisher thanked the panelists.

### **III. BUSINESS ITEMS.**

#### **A. Administrative Items – Full Discussion**

##### **3. Student Voices Meeting**

Ms. Rozow said that on July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 she had an opportunity to go to the US Department of Education to attend a “*Student Voices*” meeting with the US Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, his Senior Policy Analyst and fifteen other students from other states. Ms. Rozow said she was asked to report on what the Commission is doing in advancing the higher education policies.

Ms. Rozow mentioned that one of the things she was focused on was Pell Grants and how the Commission is allowing students to use federal funds throughout the year at their convenience. Ms. Rozow said that Secretary Duncan and his Senior Policy Analyst were impressed with this decision.

Ms. Rozow said that she was able to talk about Indiana College Success Coalitions, in response to Secretary Duncan’s inquiry about the ways the Federal Government can play a more active role in creating a college-going culture.

Ms. Rozow pointed out that out of five priority areas Secretary Duncan wanted the students to change, four are already in practice in Indiana. Ms. Rozow said she told Secretary Duncan about the College Cost Calculator and transparency in tuition. She said that Secretary would like for the states to work on performance funding, and Indiana has been doing this for a few years. Ms. Rozow, also, told Secretary Duncan that Indiana redesigned its financial aid to reward the completed credit hours in order to increase the completion rates.

Ms. Rozow said that one of the priorities Secretary Duncan mentioned is the importance of accessing competency-based learning and awarding credit for that. The state of Oregon is making some changes in that regard, so Secretary Duncan was hoping the other states will do something similar, as well. Ms. Rozow pointed out that in Indiana this has already been implemented. Ms. Rozow thanked the Commission for giving her this opportunity.

In response to a question from Mr. Popp regarding a competency credit, Ms. Rozow explained that it is called an experiential learning, when a person has worked X-number of years, and this experience can be translated into the academic course work, for which credit hours can be awarded.

**4. Update on Standard Credit Hour Expectations for Undergraduate Degree Programs**

Mr. Fisher said that this is an update on a policy that was enacted by the 2012 General Assembly with strong support from the Commission. The policy was to help students graduate faster and at lower cost by implementing standard credit hour expectations of 60 credits for an associate degree and 120 for a bachelor's degree. Mr. Fisher invited Dr. Sauer to give an update on the effectiveness of that policy. Mr. Fisher also referred to a press release about this policy that is included in the Commission materials.

Dr. Sauer said that this is an important area, which has affected a lot of students. It is also an area in which the institutions responded extraordinarily well. House Enrolled Act 1220 indicated that all degree programs at the associate and baccalaureate level needed to have 60 or 120 credit hours, respectively, with some exceptions.

The exceptions fell into two categories: one set of exceptions said that the Commission shall accept justifications that deal with external accreditation or occupational certification, or licensure. Another set said that the Commission may accept just two justifications: one that deals with employer requirements, and another – with the enhanced program for quality and contacts, so they are more subjective and needed more judgment.

Dr. Sauer pointed out that this bill gave the Commission a new authority it never had before. Since its inception, the Commission has always had the authority to approve degree programs. With this legislation the Commission also has the authority to amend programs, with respect to the credit hours.

Dr. Sauer said that over the academic year 2012-13, the institutions reviewed all their associate and baccalaureate degree programs, and brought to the Commission the results of this review. Close to 90 percent of associate and baccalaureate programs had more than 60 and 120 credit hours. At the end of this review 85 percent of the programs now have 60 and 120 credit hours. There are only 15 percent of programs that exceed that mark, and for all of them the institutions have provided the justification. This strongly supports the Commission's completion agenda, as well as its efforts in trying to reduce the financial barriers that students face in their education.

Dr. Sauer referred to a table being distributed to the Commission members, and explained that the programs that have more than 60/120 credit hour mark are justified in exceeding this number. Dr. Sauer said that at some point the Commission would like to revisit that and look at it more carefully.

In conclusion, Dr. Sauer said that this is a remarkable achievement, and it is a win-win for everybody concerned.

Ms. Lubbers added that in light of several of the conversations regarding Commission's strategic plan and cost, this has been critically important. The cost of an additional year of college was about \$50,000; even an extra semester can be costly. Ms. Lubbers said it would be great to be able to calculate how much

money the state and the students are actually saving as a result of this process. Ms. Lubbers added that the Commission will need to look at those other programs, to see whether they really need to exceed 60/120 hours.

Ms. Lubbers mentioned that many people who worked on this process should be complemented: legislative leaders, members of the Commission, and each university, who made this happen, going course by course, program by program.

Dr. Sauer invited Dr. Margie Ferguson, Assistant Vice President for Statewide Academic Relations, IUPUI, to speak about this project.

Dr. Ferguson said that one of the reasons for taking her current position was to help coordinate this process. She said they had almost 270 programs to work on; some of those were just a couple of credit hours over 120 credit hour requirement; but some were significantly more. Dr. Ferguson said this was a great work done by their faculty.

## **B. Academic Degree Programs - Full Discussion**

### **1. Bachelor of Science in Health Studies to be Offered by Purdue University North Central at Westville**

Dr. Candiss Vibbert, Assistant Vice President for Engagement, the Associate Director for Discovery Park Engagement, and the Associate Director for Purdue Research Park Engagement, Purdue University, presented this item.

Dr. Karen Schmid, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Purdue University North Central, also spoke about this program.

In response to Mr. Holden's question regarding the number of graduates from the Nursing Program in FY 2012, Dr. Schmid said that they expect much higher graduation rate. Dr. Schmid asked Dr. Diane Spoljoric, Interim Chair of the Department of Nursing, to give a detailed explanation.

Dr. Spoljoric said that the numbers in the report include all the students admitted with the pre-nursing contingent. After one or two semesters these students are eligible to apply to actual nursing curriculum, and only 50 students are accepted per semester. Another reason the numbers will seem different is because in December 2012 they finally graduated their last group as a traditional Associate Degree program.

Dr. Schmid added that one of the reasons they started working on the Health Studies because their nursing programs lost a lot of students for various reasons, and the university wanted to give those students another alternative, where they could persist and pursue a career of their interest.

Dr. Sauer gave the staff recommendation.

Mr. Smith complemented the university and said that this is the most thoughtful program design he has seen in a long time.

**R-13-05.4 RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education approves the *Bachelor of Science in Health Studies* to be offered by the Purdue University North Central at Westville, in accordance with the background discussion in this agenda item and the *Program Description* (Motion – Curtis, second – Rozow, unanimously approved)

## C. Capital Projects

### 1. Indiana University Bloomington – Hodge Hall Kelley School of Business Renovations and Expansion, Phase II

Mr. John Grew, Executive Director of State Relations and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, presented this item.

Mr. Matt Hawkins, Associate Commissioner and CFO, gave the staff recommendation.

**R-13-05.5 RESOLVED:** That the Commission for Higher Education recommends approval to the State Budget Agency and the State Budget Committee the following project: *Hodge Hall Kelley School of Business Renovation and Expansion, Phase II* (Motion – Bepko, second – Rozow, unanimously approved)

### 2. Capital Projects for Which Staff Proposes Expedited Action

**R-13-05.6 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:

- Indiana University – Academic Core Renovations - \$21,000,000
- Indiana University – Deferred Maintenance System-wide - \$29,000,000
- Ball State University – Geothermal Heating & Cooling - \$30,000,000
- Indiana University – Wells Library Scholar Commons - \$2.4,000,000
- Ball State University – Ballpark Complex Improvements \$3.7,000,000
- Ball State University – Football Team Meeting Complex - \$5,000,000 (Motion – Rozow, second – Costas, unanimously approved)

**V. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. Status of Active Requests for New Academic Degree Programs
- B. Requests for Degree Program Related Changes on Which Staff Have Taken Routine Staff Action
- C. Capital Improvement Projects on Which Staff Have Acted
- D. Capital Improvement Projects Awaiting Action
- E. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings of the Commission

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

There was none.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 P.M.

---

Jud Fisher, Chair

---

Dan Peterson, Secretary

## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

**PUBLIC SQUARE A:**                    **Assessment of Learning Outcomes: An Update on Emerging Practices**

**Staff Recommendation**                    For information only.

**Background**                                    This dialog represents the last of a three-part discussion of the *Quality* section of the Commission’s strategic plan, *Reaching Higher, Achieving More* (RHAM).

Consideration of the *Quality* section of RHAM began at the June meeting, when the Commission had an opportunity to discuss various assessment-related projects and initiatives of the Association of American Colleges and University (AAC&U). The Commission heard from three public campuses that were involved in these AAC&U efforts – IUPUI, Ivy Tech Indianapolis, and Purdue University North Central. Dr. Carol Geary Schneider, President of AAC&U, also made a presentation to the Commission at its June meeting.

At its August meeting, the Commission focused on approaches recognized by the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) to assess learning outcomes. The VSA is referenced in the *Quality* section of RHAM as one way of using comparable assessments to gauge student learning. The August discussion began with a presentation by Dr. Alex McCormick, Director of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and was followed by a panel discussion that included representatives from Indiana Wesleyan University and Indiana State University.

The Commission and the State have paid increasing attention to learning outcomes in recent years, beginning in 2009 with Indiana’s involvement in the three-state Tuning pilot project and continuing right through the 2012 and 2013 sessions of the General Assembly, which resulted in the passage of significant legislation. In 2012, a set of competencies and learning outcomes were identified for the legislatively mandated Statewide Transfer General Education Core, and within the past two months, the Commission and the institutions began work on identifying competencies and learning outcomes for a set of ten program areas, as part of the Single Articulation Pathways legislation passed earlier this year. As this work proceeds, attention is now turning to ways of assessing learning outcomes, so stakeholders can be confident that students are mastering the required competencies and outcomes.

The purpose of this discussion is to hear some of the latest thinking and promising innovations on learning outcomes assessment, so that the Commission can have a richer context for future directions in the area of learning outcomes assessment. To that end, the Commission will hear from a nationally recognized expert in this area, Dr. George Kuh, who is a co-principal investigator, along with Dr. Stan Ikenberry, with the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, a leading source of information on this topic.

**Supporting Document**

- (1) George Kuh Bio
- (2) National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment: Making Learning Outcomes Usable & Transparent

## George Kuh

George D. Kuh is Adjunct Professor of Education Policy at the University of Illinois and Chancellor's Professor of Higher Education Emeritus at Indiana University Bloomington. He currently directs the National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment co-located at Indiana University and the University of Illinois. Founding director of the widely-used National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), George has written extensively about student engagement, assessment, institutional improvement, and college and university cultures, and consulted with more than 350 colleges and universities in the U.S. and abroad. His recent publications include *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter* (2005, 2010), *Piecing Together the Student Success Puzzle: Research, Propositions, and Recommendations* (2007), *High-Impact Practices* (2008), and *Ensuring Quality & Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale* (2013). He's been awarded seven honorary degrees and in 2001, he received Indiana University's prestigious Tracy Sonneborn Award for a distinguished career of teaching and research. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) named its award for Outstanding Contribution to Literature and Research after him in 2011. George earned the B.A. at Luther College, M.S. at the St. Cloud State University, and Ph.D. at the University of Iowa.

# National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Making Learning Outcomes Usable & Transparent

## About NILOA

---

**NILOA's primary mission is to champion and support efforts by colleges and universities to obtain, use and share evidence of student learning to strengthen student attainment and improve undergraduate education.**

- Founded in 2008, NILOA is based at the University of Illinois and Indiana University. George Kuh and Stan Ikenberry serve as co-principal investigators. In addition, NILOA works with several senior scholars including Jillian Kinzie, Pat Hutchings, Tim Cain, and Peter Ewell.
- Influential thought leaders and heads of national higher education associations serve as members of the NILOA Advisory Panel and oversee our work.
- NILOA is currently supported by Lumina Foundation for Education, The Teagle Foundation, and the College of Education at the University of Illinois. Past funders include the Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- While NILOA has a strong record of accomplishment, it seeks to expand its impact going forward as much remains to do in order to realize the promise of student learning outcomes assessment as a means to improve student and institutional performance.

## NILOA's Reach

---

**NILOA has become the leading resource on learning outcome assessment at the collegiate level. The primary communication link with campuses is through a rich, well-developed and continuously updated website and a monthly electronic newsletter.**

- On average, over 7,000 individuals visit the NILOA website monthly seeking information, tools, and other resources. This is a 40% increase over previous years. One third of these are regular return visitors, but nearly two out of three are new to the site, and so the level of use is expanding. While most users come from the US, NILOA's reach extends to over 120 countries/territories.
- The NILOA newsletter alerts over 6,000 college presidents, provosts, institutional research directors, faculty, and assessment professionals to new resources, best practices, and fresh thinking about assessment and related topics.

NILOA has addressed the challenge of making learning outcomes visible and useful to the public. A Transparency Framework was created for institutions to use in advancing this work. The Voluntary Framework for Accountability being developed by the American Association of Community Colleges has adopted NILOA's Transparency Framework and thus far over 30 institutions are independently using the Transparency Framework to modify their websites.

- NILOA engaged in an evaluation of the Voluntary System of Accountability student learning outcomes pilot project on the College Portrait website resulting in the evaluation report, *Transparency and Accountability: An Evaluation of the VSA College Portrait Pilot*. NILOA worked with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, a consortium of Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago, on mapping institutional assessment practices and communicating said practices to multiple audiences based around key questions of interest.
- NILOA is shaping and advancing the student learning outcomes agenda in American higher education at the national level through dialogue at national conferences of academic leaders and faculty members from public and independent colleges and universities, community colleges, state governing and planning boards, regional accrediting bodies and many others. NILOA staff have presented or appeared at the following meetings.

## NILOA's Focus

---

**NILOA is committed to creating and disseminating tools, resources, and perspectives useful to campuses as they assemble and use evidence of student learning to improve academic performance and respond to calls for greater accountability to society.**

- **NILOA Reports** provide the first systematic examination of assessment on a national scale since 1999.

*More Than You Think, Less Than We Need: Assessment in Higher Education* reported findings from the first national study about learning outcomes assessment at two- and four-year institutions;

*Down and In: Assessment Practices at the Program Level* summarizes learning outcomes assessment at the program level where improvements in teaching and learning must occur;

*Exploring the Landscape: What Institutional Websites Reveal About Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Activities* summarizes the state of institutional web page transparency;

*Perspectives from Campus Leaders on the Current State of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment* shares the views of campus leaders and others on the current state of quality assessment;

*Connecting State Policies on Assessment with Institutional Assessment Activity* compares NILOA survey findings with a NCHEMS study on state policies on student learning outcomes assessment;

*Making Student Learning Evidence Transparent: The State of the Art* examines the impact of national transparency initiatives, the display or assessment results, and their subsequent use by institutions; and

*Using Assessment Results: Promising Practices of Institutions That Do It Well* presents findings from NILOA's nine case studies regarding using information from student learning to improve.

- **NILOA has engaged the nation's leading scholars and leaders to address challenging contemporary issues.**  
18 Occasional Papers to date examine the current state-of-the-art in assessing learning outcomes in American higher education.

## NILOA's Future

---

**Much remains to be done. Looking to the future NILOA aspires to expand its impact through advocacy and capacity building. NILOA intends:**

- To continue to track institutional engagement with the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) and begin examining DQP in relation to Tuning efforts.
- NILOA has a contract with Jossey-Bass to produce a book on the changing nature of assessment in an effort to reframe the national conversation about assessment from compliance to use.
- NILOA has added Facebook and Twitter accounts which has increased by 40% the number of visitors to our website, now about 7,200 a month.
- Future occasional papers include how to roll assessment results from the program level up to the institutional level, the role of faculty and academic freedom in assessment, competency-based education and its implications for assessment, and the relationship between Tuning and the DQP

# National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Making Learning Outcomes Usable & Transparent

For more information, contact:

National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
340 Education Building  
Champaign, IL 61820

[learningoutcomesassessment.org](http://learningoutcomesassessment.org)  
[njankow2@illinois.edu](mailto:njankow2@illinois.edu)  
Fax: 217.244.5632  
Phone: 217.244.2155

## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

### BUSINESS ITEM A-1:

### Learn More Indiana's College GO! Week Campaign

#### Staff Recommendation

For discussion only.

#### Background

Learn More Indiana's 2013 College GO! Week campaign kicks off statewide during the last full week in September (Sept. 23-27, 2013) with activities and special events continuing throughout the fall semester.

From exploring career options and navigating the college admission process to staying on track to complete college, *College GO! Week* is designed to turn Hoosiers' higher education aspirations into action with practical advice and helpful resources for K-12 students, current college students and returning adult students.

With support from the Indianapolis Colts and the Lumina Foundation for Education, College GO! Week promises to be even bigger and better this year. Students who take the "College Completion Challenge" can enter to win \$529 in a college savings plan and special prizes from the Indianapolis Colts. Schools can earn a \$1,000 College Success Grant or a visit from a Colts player for engaging their students in meaningful college readiness and success activities. Learn more at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org).

*College GO! Week* is one of three annual campaigns sponsored by Learn More Indiana, along with *Cash for College* and *KnowHow2Go*. Designed to engage local partners across the state at strategic points during the year, each campaign has a clear focus with specific steps that help students plan, prepare and pay for college success.

Led by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, Learn More Indiana is partnership of state and local organizations working to help Hoosiers of all ages succeed in school, complete college and connect to careers. Learn more at [LearnMoreIndiana.org](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org).

#### Supporting Documents

*College GO! Week 2013: Starter Guide*

Contests & Fun Ideas

**INSIDE**



# GET IN THE GAME



## 2013 COLLEGE GO! WEEK STARTER GUIDE

**Plan for your future now.**



**CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org**

# College GO! Week Indiana

## THE GAME PLAN

### 1. Show your team spirit.

Decorate with the two-sided posters included in your College GO! Week shipment. Check out our [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) website for printer-friendly college pennants, too.

### 2. Make the (college) call.

Use the promo card included in your shipment to let students know it's College GO! Week. You can find parent handouts, sample morning announcements and more at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org).

### 3. Learn the rules of the game.

Your shipment includes a **LEARN MORE** or **NEXT** magazine for every student, full of college and career planning advice. K-5 schools also receive Educator Guides with lesson plans. See the back page for even more related resources!

### 4. Score extra points.

Make College GO! Week bigger and better with student contests and \$1,000 grants for schools and after-school programs (due Oct. 25). See our website for details.

**Plan for your future now.**



**[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)**



## College GO! Week 2013

### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IDEAS

 Kick off College GO! Week at your elementary school with these fun ideas:

#### **GAME PLAN: Tackle college in the classroom.**

- Coach your students to college-readiness by incorporating **college-focused lessons and activities** into your regular teaching plans.
- The **LEARN MORE Educator Guide** included in your school's College GO! Week shipment (also available online at [LearnMoreIndiana.org/Print](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org/Print)) contains three lesson plans and nine grade-appropriate student worksheets, ready for game time!
- Use the College GO! Week **student contest activities** as part of classroom lessons. See [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) for contest details. Entries are due October 25, 2013.

#### **TOUCHDOWN TIME: Cheer for college in your school.**

- Decorate your school with **college pennants** (available at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)) and encourage teachers, students and staff to wear college gear.
- Ask local college students and staff to visit your school and talk with your students. Be sure to ask them what students need to know before they enter high school to be on track for college.
- Make a slide show presentation with photos of Indiana college campuses. Most colleges have photos available online.

#### **WINNING PLAY: Match college with careers.**

- Have a college gear dress-up day, followed by a career dress-up day.
- Play college- and career- matching trivia games. Where did your principal and teachers go to college? What about the President, a famous athlete or the CEO of a popular company? What were their college majors?
- Check out the online career exploration resources, including the **Hoosier Hot 50 Jobs** and the **Indiana Career Explorer** at [LearnMoreIndiana.org/Careers](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org/Careers).

**WIN \$1,000**  
for your school  
Visit  
[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)



**NOTE:** Beginning as sixth graders, Indiana students are required to create a high school graduation plan under state law. Learn more at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org).

**Plan for your future now.**



**[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)**



## College GO! Week 2013 MIDDLE SCHOOL IDEAS

### Kick off College GO! Week at your middle school with these fun ideas:

#### **GAME PLAN: Get Grad Plans ready for primetime.**

- Introduce sixth graders to the Indiana high school **Graduation Plan** (required by state law). Printer-friendly plans are available at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org).
- Make sure all eighth-graders have a high school Graduation Plan (required under state law) that matches their college and career goals.
- Sign your students up for the online version of the Grad Plan using the **Indiana Career Explorer** at [LearnMoreIndiana.org/CareerExplorer](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org/CareerExplorer). (NOTE: The Career Explorer also includes free career interest inventories, career profiles and other features for your students.)

#### **TOUCHDOWN TIME: Host a virtual campus visit.**

- Decorate your school with **college pennants** (available at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)) and encourage teachers, students and staff to wear college gear.
- Ask local college students and staff to visit your school and talk with your students. Cover the basics: dorm life, favorite classes, what they do on the weekends and career goals.
- Host **college trivia contests** with general questions like: "Which high school diploma type is required by most Indiana colleges?" as well as college-specific questions.

#### **WINNING PLAY: Plan for college now.**

- Use the **College GO! Week student contest** in classroom lessons. See [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) for contest details. Entries are due October 25, 2013.
- Have students take a **career interest inventory** at [LearnMoreIndiana.org/Interests](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org/Interests). Then, ask them to research the college options that would lead to their suggested careers.
- Sign up eligible seventh- and eighth-grade students for the **21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars** program. Invite a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Outreach Coordinator to hold an evening info session for parents, or put one on yourself. Learn more at [LearnMoreIndiana.org/Scholars](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org/Scholars).

WIN \$1,000  
for your school  
Visit  
[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)



Plan for your future now.



[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)



# College GO! Week 2013

## HIGH SCHOOL IDEAS



# Kick off College GO! Week

at your high school with these fun ideas:

WIN \$1,000  
for your school  
Visit  
[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)



### MONDAY: Kickoff Day

- Use morning announcements, school newsletters and email reminders to spread the word to students and parents that College GO! Week kicks off the last full week in September (Sep. 23-27, 2013).
- Decorate your school with College GO! Week materials, college pennants (available at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)) and photos of teachers in their college days.
- Host a College GO! Week pep rally! Involve your band and cheer squad, and invite a local mayor or business leader to talk about why college matters.

### TUESDAY: Grad Plan Day (focus on freshmen)

- Make sure **freshmen** have a **Graduation Plan** (required by state law) and understand the diploma requirements for Core 40 and Core 40 with Academic or Technical Honors.
- Tell students to compare college admissions requirements at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) and make sure they're on track to earn the diploma required by their college of choice.
- Encourage teachers to use the College GO! Week contest activities in their classroom lessons. See [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) for contest details. Entries are due October 25, 2013.

### WEDNESDAY: Career Day (focus on sophomores)

- Have **sophomores** take a **career interest assessment** with the Indiana Career Explorer at [LearnMoreIndiana.org/CareerExplorer](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org/CareerExplorer).
- Host an in-school career fair with area professionals, so students can learn about their options.
- Ask teachers to assign an in-class research project based on students' career interests. Ask them which colleges and majors match their career aspirations.

### THURSDAY: Campus Tour Day (focus on juniors)

- Take **juniors** on a college **campus visit** or host a **virtual college tour** in your computer lab.
- Host a college fair during school hours with representatives from Indiana colleges.
- Invite area professionals and college alumni to speak about how college prepared them for their careers.

### FRIDAY: College Application Day (seniors only)

- Ask **seniors** to **apply to at least one college** (list of fee waivers at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)).
- Open up computer labs and invite local college representatives to help students fill out college applications.
- Make college essays a classroom assignment and offer to review essays for students.

Plan for your future now.



[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)

# College GO! Week Indiana ONLINE RESOURCES



## Take the College Completion Challenge

Have your students take the College Completion Challenge at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) and enter to win cash for college and special prizes from the Indianapolis **COLTS**.

### Touchdown at [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)

- Info on student contests, school grants and other special opportunities
- Up-to-date Indiana college admissions and fee waiver information
- College search tools, application videos and tips
- Student checklists for each grade level
- Printer-friendly college pennants to decorate your school
- More college- and career-planning activities for K-12
- A statewide events calendar with college open houses and more

### Score more resources at [LearnMoreIndiana.org](http://LearnMoreIndiana.org)/Print

- Printer-friendly versions of our *LEARN MORE* and *NEXT* student success guides.
- Info on how to use student success guides in alignment with Indiana guidance standards
- *LEARN MORE* Teacher Guide for grades K-5 and parent handouts for grades 6-12



Join the team at  
[CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org)!



1.800.992.2076



[Twitter.com/LearnMoreIN](https://twitter.com/LearnMoreIN)



[Facebook.com/LearnMoreIN](https://facebook.com/LearnMoreIN)





# COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

## **BUSINESS ITEM A-2:**

### **Guided Pathways to Student Success Study**

#### **Staff Recommendation**

For discussion only.

#### **Background**

Indiana’s higher education attainment rate lags behind the national average at a time when postsecondary credentials are nothing short of necessary for success in our 21st-century economy. As a result, Indiana and other states are making a concerted effort to understand student progression overall and to create “structured pathways”—clear-cut road maps and guidance that helps students better navigate the college experience and complete their educational goals in a timely fashion.

Evidence suggests that clearer pathways with a more sensible “choice architecture” may empower students to make better decisions, which can save time, reduce frustration and encourage persistence. The research also suggests that information alone is not enough to ensure good decision making, and that arbitrary and sometimes irrational decision-making processes often prevail when people are given a wide-open field of options and asked to make decisions.

In partnership with the state’s colleges and universities, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (CHE) is exploring policies and practices that would support guided student pathways as a means to improve outcomes for Hoosier students. Through 11 focus groups with current students, non-completers, faculty advisors and professional advisors at public two- and four-year colleges across Indiana, CHE sought to explore the role of advising practices in the college completion puzzle. The study was also informed by a related project on barriers to seamless transfer, for which more than 50 focus groups with students at two- and four-year institutions across Indiana were conducted.

Designed to inform state policy and institutional practices, the resulting study, titled “*Guided Pathways to Student Success: Perspectives from Indiana College Students & Advisors*,” had three goals: 1) understand perceptions of the obstacles to timely college completion; 2) probe responses to a set of potential policy proposals; and 3) review promising practices based on national literature.

#### **Supporting Documents**

*Guided Pathways to Student Success: Perspectives from Indiana College Students & Advisors, Executive Summary*

# Guided Pathways to Student Success

*Perspectives from Indiana College Students & Advisors*

## Executive Summary

Indiana's higher education attainment rate lags behind the national average at a time when postsecondary credentials are nothing short of necessary for success in our 21st-century economy. To support the Indiana Commission for Higher Education's (ICHE) efforts to address this problem, Public Agenda held 11 focus groups with current students, non-completing students, professional advisors and faculty advisors and also reviewed literature on pathways.

The study had three goals: (1) understand perceptions of the obstacles to smooth degree pathways and timely college completion; (2) probe responses to a set of policy proposals being explored by ICHE; and, (3) review promising practices based on national literature.

### Obstacles to smooth pathways and timely completion

<b>Poor initial selection of degree programs</b>	Many students initially select programs for which they are not suited. As a result, they frequently take courses that will not count towards their eventual degree, fail or drop courses they do take, and sometimes stop-out of education altogether. Advisors complain that their caseloads are too large to be able to help students make better initial program choices.
<b>Poor student selection of courses once in a degree program</b>	Once they are in their programs, students often select courses that will not count toward completion, or fail to select courses that must be taken as prerequisites, further slowing their progress. Sometimes students are unable to take the courses they need because of conflicts with the demands of work and family; often they make poor selections because they self-advise, based on inadequate information.
<b>Advisors who lack adequate information</b>	Advisors report that they lack adequate information, citing frequent and rapid curriculum changes (which are often not communicated in a timely fashion) and poor communication between professional advisors and academic departments.
<b>Problems with transfer courses</b>	Transfer students have particularly daunting challenges. Communication between two and four year institutions is fragmented. Students (and advisors) complain that it is difficult to determine which courses will successfully transfer. Courses that do transfer are often counted only as electives, further slowing progress.

## Executive Summary *(continued)*

### Summary of Promising Practices for Guided Pathways

State- and institution-level practices for guided pathways fall into two broad categories:

1) strategies for accelerating completion and 2) strategies for preventing wasted credits.

Strategies for accelerating completion	Strategies for preventing wasted credits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encourage students to take more credits, especially in their first year of college.</li> <li>▪ Make the long-term consequences of course withdrawal apparent to students and alert them to courses that are high risk for failure or withdrawal.</li> <li>▪ Alert students to relevant transfer and articulation information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supplement advising capacity with structured degree maps.</li> <li>▪ Use degree milestone systems to ensure completion of courses that all students must take to progress in a major or program of study.</li> <li>▪ Build the infrastructure for students to change course without having to backtrack or get off track entirely.</li> </ul>

### Summary of Reactions from Indiana Students & Advisors

<b>Proactive Advising and Informed Choice</b>	Shows promise if the technology is carefully implemented. Advising resources should supplement rather than replace in-person advising and ideally should also provide information about transfer articulation.
<b>Degree Maps and Guaranteed Courses</b>	Draws support from those who recognize the need for students to complete degrees efficiently and cost-effectively but met with hesitation by those who prioritize open exploration through the college experience. Guaranteeing courses may be a challenge for smaller programs. Two-year programs may not be long enough to permit a process of exploration.
<b>Block Schedules and Structured Cohorts</b>	Controversial. While advisors express concerns that students with complex lives need more flexibility, students and non-completers express enthusiastic support because predictability of schedules are viewed as helpful to managing complex life obligations. Implementation concerns center around the feasibility of offering required courses for multiple cohorts.

### The Importance of Authentic Stakeholder Engagement

Successfully implementing guided pathways requires engaging Indiana colleges as true partners:

- Communicate consistently and clearly about the goals and the relationship between structured pathways efforts and other initiatives or state priorities.
- Create meaningful opportunities for institutional stakeholders to discuss concerns about policy proposals and implementation obstacles, and respond to those deliberations.
- Treat institutional stakeholders as vital partners in the work by including them early, often and authentically in the planning, design and implementation process.



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

**BUSINESS ITEM A-3:**                    **Release of 2013 Improving Teacher Quality Program Request for Proposals (RFP)**

**Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission authorize staff to release the *2013 Application for Competitive Grants under Indiana's Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program (Public Law 107-110) CFDA 84.367A* and subsequently accept proposals to be funded.

**Background**

The Indiana Commission for Higher Education in cooperation with the Indiana Department of Education under the Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund provided by the United States Department of Education, is responsible for conducting a competitive Improving Teacher Quality state grant process to fund partnerships.

The program funds partnerships minimally comprised of a post-secondary school of education, a post-secondary school of arts and sciences and one or more "high need" k-12 schools and school corporations.

The partnership must use the funds to conduct professional development activities in core academic subjects in order to ensure highly qualified teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects they teach.

It is estimated that the Commission will receive \$966,000 to fund partnerships for 2013. The 2013 Request for Proposals has an anticipated release date of September 16, 2013. The deadline for proposals to be received by the Commission is October 16, 2013.

**Supporting Document**

*2013 Request for Proposals*



INDIANA COMMISSION  
*for*  
HIGHER EDUCATION



# IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

---

2013 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE

All proposals must arrive at the Indiana Commission for  
Higher Education office by  
5 p.m. EST on Wednesday, October 16, 2013

Contact: Sara Appel  
Academic Programs Manager  
Indiana Commission for Higher Education  
317.464.4400  
sappel@che.in.gov

Revised 9.4.13



INDIANA COMMISSION  
for  
HIGHER EDUCATION

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your interest in the *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* administered by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education with funding from the U.S. Department of 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 2013 *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* will bring Indiana's colleges and universities together with the 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 two years.

The package contains all the information, instructions, and forms that applicants will need to apply for a 2013 *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* 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 5 p.m. on Wednesday, October 16, 2013.**

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

---

## DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

---

### 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 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** - 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:

- A. 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 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
- C. a middle school or secondary teacher who is new to the profession, 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:
    - is set by the State for both grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge and teaching skills;
    - 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;
    - provides objective, coherent information about the teacher's attainment of core content knowledge in the academic subjects in which a teacher teaches;
    - is applied uniformly to all teachers in the same academic subject and the same grade level throughout the State;
    - takes into consideration, but not be based primarily on, the time the teacher has been teaching in the academic subject;
    - is made available to the public upon request; and
    - 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** - Means an elementary school or secondary school that is identified under Section 1116 of ESEA.

**Paraprofessional** - 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** - includes an assistant principal [Title II, Part A, Section 2102 (6)]

**Professional Development** - Includes activities that:

- improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subjects the teachers teach, and enable teachers to become highly qualified;
- are an integral part of broad school wide and district wide educational improvement plans;
- 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;
- improve classroom management skills;
- 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;
- support the recruiting, hiring, and training of highly qualified teachers, including teachers who became highly qualified through State and local alternative routes to certification;
- advance teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies that are:

- based on scientifically based research (except that this sub-clause shall not apply to activities carried out under Part D of Title II); and
- strategies for improving student academic achievement or substantially increasing the knowledge and teaching skills of teachers;
- are aligned with and directly related to state academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and assessments; and the curricula and programs tied to the standards described in sub-clause (a) [except that this sub-clause shall not apply to activities described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of Section 2123(3)(B)];
- are developed with extensive participation of teachers, principals, parents, and administrators of schools to be served under this Act;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- provide instruction in methods of teaching children with special needs;
- include instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform and instruct classroom practice; and
- include instruction in ways that teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, and school administrators may work more effectively with parents; and may include activities that:
- 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;
- 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
- 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** - 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 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

**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; 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.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Section A: Application Narrative.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background.....	1
Objective.....	1
Eligibility.....	1
Determining if a LEA Meets the High-Need Eligibility Requirement.....	2
Participation of LEAs that Do Not Meet the High-Need Requirement.....	4
Fiscal Agent of the Partnership.....	4
Project Duration and Amount of Awards.....	4
Deadline.....	4
Project Activities.....	4
Preferences.....	5
Selection Criteria.....	5
Need for the Project.....	6
Quality of the Project.....	6
Quality of Project Services.....	7
Quality of Project Personnel.....	7
Adequacy of Resources.....	7
Quality of the Management Plan.....	7
Quality of the Project Evaluation.....	8
Due Process.....	8
<b>Section B: Budget and Accountability.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Budget and Budget Summary.....	9
Special Note.....	9
Example: Correct Use of Funds.....	9
Example: Incorrect Use of Funds.....	9
Budget Limitations.....	10

Use of Funds.....	10
Matching Funds.....	11
Accountability Requirements.....	11
<b>Section C: Proposal Instructions and Forms.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Cover Page (Form A100).....	14
Collaborative Agreement (Form A101).....	15
Budget Summary (Form A102).....	16
Use of Funds (Form A103).....	17
Statement of Assurance (Form A104).....	18
Assurances (Standard Form 424B).....	19
Certifications Lobbying; Debarment; Suspension; and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (Form ED 80-0013).....	21
Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transactions (Form ED 80-0014).....	23
Disclosure of Lobbying Activity (Form SF-LLL).....	24
<b>Section D: Transmittal Instructions and Application Checklist.....</b>	<b>26</b>
Transmittal Instructions.....	26
Application Checklist.....	27
<b>Section E: Timeline.....</b>	<b>28</b>

# IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHP PROGRAM

2013 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

---

## SECTION A: APPLICATION NARRATIVE

---

### Background

The *Title II, Part A Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* operates under the federal legislation known as the *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (CFDA 84.367)* and represents the largest federal initiative that supports professional development projects for teachers and principals. The purpose of the *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* is to increase the academic achievement of students by schools and districts improve K-12 teacher and principal quality and helping to ensure that all K-12 teachers are highly qualified. Through this legislation, state education agencies (SEA), local education agencies (LEA) and state agencies for higher education (SAHE) receive funds on a formula basis.

The Indiana Commission for Higher Education (ICHE) receives federal funds annually to administer a competitive grants program that benefits students and members of partnerships, with a focus on high-need school corporations and higher education institutions.

The ICHE will use Indiana's *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* fund to focus on using practices grounded in scientifically-based research to prepare, train, and recruit high quality teachers and principals and ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified.

### Objective

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 an Indiana:

1. private or state institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals,
2. school of arts and sciences, and
3. high-need LEA (Elementary Secondary Education Act, Title II, Part A, Section 2131).

A high-need LEA is defined as one:

- (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% 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 (ESA, Title II, Part A, Section 2102).

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

Use the following guidelines to establish whether a specific LEA is of high-need.

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 website at <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/data/interactive/#view=SchoolDistricts> . This site reports the number of children in poverty for every school district in the United States. Locate the file for Indiana 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 corporations have been posted by the Indiana Department of Education Division of Professional Standards at <http://www.doe.in.gov/student-services/licensing>; and/or
  - b. Each LEA may be able to more clearly address Part B of the definition ad such information should be provided in your proposal narrative.

The following school districts meet both the poverty and teacher certification requirements for the FY 2013 program. ***All eligible partnerships must include a school from:***

- ⊕ Indianapolis Public Schools
- ⊕ 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

The school districts listed below, and any school within these districts, are eligible for statutory partnership in FY 2013 of the ICHE *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program*. Please note that

federal data is subject to change. If awarded a multi-year project, the partner districts may remain partner districts, even if they are not listed in the following year's RFP as a high-need district.

- Adams Central Community Schools
- Alexandria Community School Corporation
- Anderson Community School Corporation
- Argos Community Schools
- Barr-Reeve Community School Corporation
- Beech Grove City Schools
- Blackford County Schools
- Blue River Valley Schools
- C.A. Beard Memorial School Corporation
- Cannelton City Schools
- Caston School Corporation
- City of East Chicago School District
- City of East Chicago School District
- Clarksville Community School Corporation
- Clarksville Community School Corporation
- Cloverdale Community Schools
- Cloverdale Community Schools
- Concord Community Schools
- Crawford County Community School Corporation
- Crawfordsville Community Schools
- Crothersville Community Schools
- East Allen County Schools
- East Washington School Corporation
- Edinburgh Community School Corporation
- Elkhart Community Schools
- Elwood Community School Corporation
- Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation
- Fayette County School Corporation
- Fort Wayne Community Schools
- Frankfort Community Schools
- Gary Community School Corporation
- Goshen Community Schools
- Greensburg Community Schools
- Hammond School City
- Jay School Corporation
- Knox Community School Corporation
- Kokomo-Center Township Consolidated School Corporation
- Lafayette School Corporation
- Lake Ridge Schools
- Lake Station Community Schools
- Lawrence Township Metropolitan School District
- Logansport Community School Corporation
- Manchester Community Schools
- Marion Community Schools
- Medora Community School Corporation
- Merrillville Community School District
- Michigan City Area Schools
- Mishawaka School City
- Mitchell Community Schools
- Muncie Community Schools
- Nettle Creek School Corporation
- New Castle Community School Corporation
- New Prairie United School Corporation
- North Daviess Community Schools
- North Judson-San Pierre School Corporation
- North Knox School Corporation
- North White School Corporation
- Northeastern Wayne Schools
- Oregon-Davis School Corporation
- Orleans Community Schools
- Paoli Community School Corporation
- Perry Township Metropolitan School District
- Peru Community Schools
- Pike Township Metropolitan School District
- Prairie Heights Community School Corporation
- Randolph Central School Corporation
- Randolph Eastern School Corporation
- Richmond Community School Corporation
- River Forest Community School Corporation
- Rochester Community School Corporation
- Rockville Community Schools
- Salem Community Schools
- Scott County School District 1
- Scott County School District 2
- Shelbyville Central Schools
- Shoals Community School Corporation
- South Adams Schools
- South Bend Community School Corporation
- South Ripley Community School Corporation
- Southwest Parke Community School Corporation
- Southwest School Corporation
- Speedway School Town
- Switzerland County School Corporation
- Taylor Community 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 Corporation
- West Washington School Corporation
- Western Wayne Schools
- Westview School Corporation
- White River Valley School District
- Whiting School City

## **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) such as charter and private schools, an elementary or secondary school, an educational service agency, nonprofit educational organizations, other IHEs, schools of arts and sciences within the IHE, the division of the IHE that prepares teachers and principals, nonprofit cultural organizations, an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, teacher organizations, principal organizations, or businesses (ESA, 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 districts are not eligible to apply directly for funds, IHEs may not receive an award without collaborating fully with LEAs. ICHE strongly encourages teachers and local school districts to initiate conversations with college and university faculty about proposal ideas and in-service needs.

### **Project Duration and Amount of Awards**

Proposed projects may last up to not to exceed twenty-four (24) months. The 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. Projects may have activities from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2016.

The amount available for FY 2013 new projects in Indiana is approximately \$966,000. Large scope projects are encouraged. However, no one proposal will receive the total funds available.

### **Deadline**

Proposals are due on or before 5 p.m. EST, Wednesday, October 16, 2013. Proposals postmarked after October 16, 2013 will not be considered. Successful applicants will be notified that their proposals have been selected for funding on or before Wednesday, November 20, 2013.

### **Project Activities**

The ICHE 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 rooted in "scientifically-based research."

Note: The law requires any partnership receiving both a sub-grant from the ICHE 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. aligning Indiana high school curricula with the first-year of study at Indiana's colleges and universities;
6. teaching of scientifically-based reading instruction; and
7. 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 ICHE in collaboration with the Indiana Department of Education 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 *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* Director.

Projects may not begin until:

1. they have been approved by the ICHE,
2. their budgets have been satisfactorily negotiated with ICHE staff, and
3. the ICHE's award contract has been signed by the appropriate institutional officer and returned to the ICHE. If due process procedures are invoked (see next Section), the ICHE'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:

- the status of the partner LEA as a high-needs LEA;
- the local or state needs being addressed and how these needs were determined;
- 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);
- the magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or activities to be carried out by the proposed project;
- the extent to which proposed activities meet the needs identified in the participating LEA(s) Local Improvement Plan(s); and
- 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 (25 points)**

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

- the extent to which the program focuses on the preferred project activity areas for Indiana;
- the extent to which the program and programmatic activities are clearly defined;
- the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;
- the extent to which program operations are clearly defined (who will do what, when and where);
- the extent to which program participants are defined and selected;
- the number of teachers to be supported and the impact on classroom instruction;
- the extent to which specific dates and times of proposed project activities are defined;
- the number of days in which there will be interaction with participants;

- 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 Partnership Program* financial assistance;
- the extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for improving teacher quality;
- the extent to which the proposed project serves multiple school districts and/or geographic areas within the state; and
- 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 ICHE considers:

- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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
- 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 ICHE considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience of:

- the project director;
- key project personnel; and
- project consultants or subcontractors.

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

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

- the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization;
- the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project; and
- 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 ICHE considers:

- 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;

- the adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project; and
- 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 ICHE considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation:

- are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project;
- provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies; and
- 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 decision not to recommend its proposal for funding must contact ICHE 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 the final award recommendations to the ICHE. The ICHE will consider the recommendations of the Commissioner and make all final award decisions.

---

## SECTION B: BUDGET AND ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS

---

### Budget and Budget Summary

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% of the sub-grant. 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 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 than 50% of the funds for its own benefit.

### Example: Incorrect Use of Funds

Jefferson University, its College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences will 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.

### Use of Funds

- *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 % of total budget.
- *Fringe Benefits*. These should also be consistent with institutional policies and regulations. Indicate each type of benefit (i.e. retirement, social security, and medical) separately.
- *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.
- *Supplies and Expenses*. Identify each general category of expendable supplies and their estimated costs. Customary categories include printing, postage, classroom supplies, and software.
- *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.
- *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.
- *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).
- *Other Direct Costs*. These should be itemized. Examples include space rental and computer time.

- *Indirect Costs.* Indirect cost for activities supported by *Improving Teacher Quality Partnership Program* funds should be calculated at a maximum of 8% for federal direct cost.

Excluded from payment are:

- Meals and refreshments for meetings
- Planning costs
- Individual capital equipment items costing more than \$500
- Salary payments for faculty and staff overload
- 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 % 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 C: PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMS

---

The proposal must include the following eight parts in this order:

1. **Cover Page (Form A100)**

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.

2. **Table of Contents**

3. **Collaborative Agreement (Form A101)**

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.

4. **Abstract**

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

5. **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 7 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 5 of this RFP) for each Section.

6. **Budgets and Budget Summary (Form A102 and A103)**

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

- Budget summary using form provided (Form A102)
- A descriptive, itemized budget narrative that explains and justifies the requested amounts for individual cost categories.
- Use of Funds (Form A103)

7. **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.

8. **Statements 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 Assurance (Form A104)
- Assurances – Non-Construction Programs (Standard Form 424B)
- Certifications Lobbying; Debarment; Suspension, and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (Form ED 80-0013)

- Certification Regarding Debarment; Suspension; Ineligibility Voluntary Exclusion- Lower Tier Covered Transactions (Form ED 80-0014)
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activity (Form SF-LLL)

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



---

## COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT (FORM A101)

---

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.

---

Name, Title, Organization/Corporation  
(Official of Partnering LEA)

Signature

Date

---

Name, Title, Organization/Corporation  
(Official of Partnering School/Department of Education/Teacher Prep Program)

Signature

Date

---

Name, Title, Organization/Corporation  
(Official of Partnering School/Department of Education/Teacher Prep Program)

Signature

Date

## BUDGET SUMMARY (FORM A102)

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

Lead Higher Education Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

	Title II Funds	Matching Funds/In-Kind Services	Total Project Expenses
Salaries:			
• Professional	\$	\$	\$
• Non-professional	\$	\$	\$
• Fringe Benefits	\$	\$	\$
Consultants	\$	\$	\$
Supplies	\$	\$	\$
Travel	\$	\$	\$
Equipment	\$	\$	\$
Participant Costs	\$	\$	\$
Other Direct Costs	\$	\$	\$
Indirect Costs	\$	\$	\$
Total	\$	\$	\$

---

## USE OF FUNDS (FORM A103)

---

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% of the sub-grant. 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. Please attach additional pages as needed.

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:

**TOTAL:** **100%**

---

## STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE (FORM A104)

---

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 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 Act*;
3. enter into formal agreement(s) with school corporations to be served by the proposed in- service training program; and
4. submit to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education an appropriate A-133 for the fiscal years covered by the project.

---

Institution

---

Name of Authorizing Official and 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 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 (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean 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. §§1271 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.
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 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
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 the original 02

(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; (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

**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-

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, 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.

**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)

## 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 follow-up 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 20503.**

# DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352

Approved by OMB  
0348-0046

<b>1. Type of Federal Action:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input type="checkbox"/> b. grant c. cooperative agreement d. loan e. loan guarantee f. loan insurance	<b>2. Status of Federal Action:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input type="checkbox"/> b. initial award 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>4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Subawardee Tier _____, if known:  Congressional District, if known:	<b>5. If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is a Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:</b>   Congressional District, if known:	
<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> (if individual, last name, first name, MI):	<b>b. Individuals Performing Services</b> (including address if different from No. 10a) (last name, first name, MI):	
<b>11.</b> 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 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.	Signature: _____ Print Name: _____ Title: Telephone No.: _____ Date: _____	
<b>Federal Use Only:</b>		Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form LLL (Rev. 7-97)

---

## SECTION D: TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS AND APPLICATION CHECKLIST

---

### 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 to:

Indiana Commission for Higher Education  
Attn: Sara Appel  
101 W. Ohio Street, Suite 550  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

**Proposals must be postmarked on or before Wednesday, October 16, 2013.**

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 note 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 be aware 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 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 Wednesday, October 16, 2013. No applications will be accepted after the deadline.

## Application Checklist

Does your application include each of the following?

- Cover Page (Form A100)
- Collaborative Agreement (Form A101) and a list of potential participants
- Abstract
- Project Narrative
- Budgets and Budget Summary (Form A102)
- "Use" of Funds (Form A103)
- Statements of Assurances
  - Statement of Assurances (Form A104)
  - Assurances--Non-Construction Programs (Standard Form 424B)
  - Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment; Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (Form ED 80-0013)
  - Disclosure of Lobbying Activity (Form LLL)
  - Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion- Lower Tier Covered Transactions (Form ED 80-0014)

Did You –

- Include all required forms with original signatures and dates?
- Adhere to the page limit?
- Consecutively number all pages in your application package?

### Assistance

Questions regarding these proposal guidelines or potential professional development projects should be directed to Sara Appel at the Indiana Commission for Higher Education by email [sappel@che.in.gov](mailto:sappel@che.in.gov) or telephone 317.464-4400 x125. Limited assistance and guidance on specific plans for a project are available.

---

## SECTION E: TIMELINE

---

September 16, 2013	2013 Request for Proposals Released
October 16, 2013	2013 Proposals due by 5 p.m.
November 18, 2013	Award Notification of 2013
November 25, 2013	2013 Grant Award Contact Due
December 9, 2013	2013 Grant Contract Due
December 11, 2013	First Year of 2012 Report Due
January 1, 2014	2012 Projects Continue 2013 Projects Begin
April 15, 2014	First Quarter Invoices Due
June 16, 2014	Second Quarter Invoices Due
September 15, 2014	Third Quarter Invoices Due Request for Proposals for 2014 Released (contingent on funding)
October 16, 2014	2014 Proposals due by 5 p.m.
November 18, 2014	Award Notification of 2014
November 25, 2014	2014 Grant Award Contact Due
December 9, 2014	2014 Contract Due
December 31, 2014	2012 Final Report Due First year of 2013 Report Due
January 1, 2015	2013 Projects Continue 2014 Projects Begin
January 15, 2015	Fourth Quarter Invoices Due
April 15, 2015	First Quarter Invoices Due
June 16, 2015	Second Quarter Invoices Due
September 15, 2015	Third Quarter Invoices Due Request for Proposals for 2015 Released (contingent on funding)
December 15, 2015	2013 Final Report Due First year of 2014 Reports Due
January 1, 2016	2013 Projects Continue 2014 Projects Begin
January 5, 2016	Fourth Quarter Invoices Due



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

**BUSINESS ITEM B-1:**                    **Master of Jurisprudence To Be Offered by Indiana University at the Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis Campus**

**Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission for Higher Education approve the Master of Jurisprudence to be offered by Indiana University at the Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis campus, in accordance with the background discussion in this agenda item and the *Program Description*.

**Background**

The Academic Affairs and Quality Committee discussed the Master of Jurisprudence (M.J.) program on August 26, 2013, and although there was not unanimity with respect to the merits of the proposal, the Committee and staff felt it appropriate to bring the program to the Commission for action as a regular agenda item.

**Similar Programs in Indiana.** According to the Independent Colleges of Indiana (ICI) web site, there are no similar programs at the master's level in the **independent** or private not-for-profit sector.

The Indiana Board for Proprietary Education (BPE) data base indicates there are no similar master's-level programs in the **proprietary** or private for-profit sector.

Within the **public** sector, there are no similar programs at the master's level.

**Related Programs at IUPUI.**

The two principal degree programs offered by the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law at IUPUI are the Doctor of Jurisprudence (J.D.) and the Master of Laws (LL.M.).

Between FY2010 and FY2012, annual enrollments in the J.D. program have averaged 962 headcount or 851 FTE students, and during this same period, an average of 289 students graduated annually with a J.D. However, these numbers are expected to decline in coming years, since the School of Law has reduced the number of students in the entering class from approximately 275 last year to 220 in the coming year, with the likelihood that the lowered class size will be the norm in future years.

The LL.M., which the Commission approved in September 2001, is primarily intended to introduce foreign law graduates and foreign lawyers to American law. This program has averaged an annual

enrollment of 173 headcount or 77 FTE students between FY2010-FY2012; during this same period, an average of 76 students have graduated with an LL.M. each year. At the time the program was approved by the Commission, the University projected annually to produce 60 LL.M. graduates.

In May 2004, the Commission also approved a third degree program for the School of Law – a Doctor of Juridical Science (S.J.D.), which is a highly selective, research-based degree that requires entering students to have already completed a J.D. and an LL.M. and requires successful completion of a dissertation to earn the degree. Always envisioned as a miniscule program, the S.J.D. was projected to enroll five students per year, which was, indeed, the average headcount enrollment between FY2010-FY2012.

**IWIS Analysis.** Since no similar programs are offered in Indiana within the public sector, no relevant wage data can be extracted from the Indiana Workforce Intelligence System (IWIS).

**Unique Focus of Program.** This program is intended to attract students who are interested in learning about the law and the American legal system, but who do not wish to earn a three-year J.D. or become licensed to practice the law. The University believes that because the law intersects with so many other parts of the economy, students with careers or career interests in a variety of areas – including human resources, quality assurance and risk management, real estate development, law enforcement, copyrighting, technology, health care, the environment, and social work – will benefit from completing this degree.

The majority of students (a little over 60 percent) are expected to pursue their studies on a part-time basis, with many working in jobs that relate in some way with the legal system. Many of the full-time students are expected to be pursuing joint graduate degrees offered by other Schools on the IUPUI campus, such as Business, SPEA, Medicine, Science, Liberal Arts, Nursing, Philanthropic Studies, Education, Social Work, and Engineering and Technology. Individuals who work with foreign companies doing business with U.S. entities are also expected to enroll in the program.

Of the 212 accredited law schools in the U.S. that offer the J.D. degree, the University has identified 16 that offer a similar master's degree; of these, six are in the twelve-state Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) – three in Illinois and three in Ohio. The University points to the Master in the Study of Law offered by the Ohio State University Moritz College of Law as the program that most closely resembles the proposed Master of Jurisprudence.

**Standard Credit Hour Expectation.** N/A.

**Exception to the Standard Credit Hour Expectation.** N/A.

**Articulation Agreement.** N/A.

**Concluding Points.** The University has indicated that the School of Law has existing capacity to offer this program, with existing courses having space to enroll additional students and with no need to add faculty.

**Supporting Document**

*Program Description* – March 29, 2013.

New Degree/Certificate Cover Sheet

Date: 3/29/2013

Institution: Indiana University

Campus: Indianapolis

School or College: Robert H. McKinney School of Law

Department: Law

Location: On Campus      50% or more online: Yes  No  \*If yes please send to Office of Online Education

County: Marion

Type: Degree Program      Financial Aid Eligible: Yes  No

Degree/Certificate name: Master of Jurisprudence

Graduate/Undergraduate: Graduate

Degree Code: Other

Brief Description: This Master of Jurisprudence degree will be offered at the law school to those students who are interested in learning about the law as it relates to their chosen non-legal profession but are not interested in receiving a Juris Doctorate or in practicing law. It is the first non-J.D. degree offered at a law school in the state (while there have been similar degrees identified at twenty-one law schools across the U.S.). The degree will be based on a thirty-credit hour curriculum that will be designed individually depending on the candidate's specialized area of interest. Students may attend full time and acquire their degree in one full academic year plus a summer or they may attend part time over a period of two to four years.

Rationale for new degree:

This degree fulfills the purpose of the law school's mission which is to "advance the understanding of the law" and to prepare "students to be excellent, ethical professionals and leaders." This mission extends beyond the J.D. student to all who desire knowledge about the law, including students who will be able to acquire a Master of Jurisprudence (MJ). The legal environment is changing and is likely to continue to change. While the number of students desiring to practice law is decreasing, the number of those professionals in tangential fields who desire to be knowledgeable about legal issues as they relate to their specialized professions is increasing. This degree is designed for those professionals within the State as well as those working around the world whose knowledge about the law will enhance and potentially advance their legal professions. The MJ may also appeal to those acquiring a graduate degree in their specialized non-legal field and would be interested in a dual degree in law.

CIP Code: 22.0101

Name of Person who Submitted Proposal: Deborah B. McGregor

Contact Information (phone or email): 317/274-2608

**Proposal for a Master of Jurisprudence Law Degree for Non-J.D. Students**  
**March 4, 2013**

This proposal is for a Master of Jurisprudence (M.J.) degree at Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law.

**1. Characteristics of the Program**

- a. Campus Offering Program: Indianapolis
- b. Scope of Delivery: This new Master of Jurisprudence degree will be offered at the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law.
- c. Mode of Delivery (Classroom, Blended, or Online): The initial program will include primarily classroom courses only; however, the school hopes to develop a blended or online component within five years after the program's inception.
- d. Other Delivery Aspects (Co-ops, Externships, Clinicals, Practica, etc.): This non-Juris Doctorate (J.D.) degree will not include experiential courses. Because the primary candidates will be those individuals who are already working in a profession that does not require a legal license, M.J. students may not enroll in experiential courses. This degree will not be available to anyone holding a J.D. or equivalent law degree.

**2. Rationale for the Program**

**a. Institutional Rationale**

The law school's mission statement sets out as a goal to "advance the understanding of the law" and to prepare "students to be excellent, ethical professionals and leaders."<sup>1</sup> This goal extends beyond the J.D. student to all who desire knowledge about the law.

The legal environment is changing and is likely to continue to change in the future. The law school anticipates fewer graduates requiring a license to practice law, in large part due to the downturn in the economy. At the same time, there is an increasing need for those professionals in tangential fields to be knowledgeable about legal issues as they relate to their individual professions.

The new M.J. degree is designed to attract professionals from within the State of Indiana as well as those individuals working around the world who are interested in learning about the law as a way to enhance and potentially advance their non-legal professions. The M.J. may also appeal to those seeking career opportunities where knowledge about the law would be beneficial but a full J.D. degree is not required, such as individuals seeking a dual graduate degree.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://indylaw.indiana.edu/news/StrategicPlan.pdf>

Knowledge about the law intersects logically with a wide variety of fields, among those health and science; law enforcement; social work; business and corporate affairs; human resources; engineering; real estate; the environment; and foreign companies doing business with U.S. entities.

The mission of IUPUI is to provide students with the intellectual background and skills necessary to be productive members of society and good citizens.<sup>2</sup> This program would further the mission of IUPUI by expanding the availability of law-related degrees to those either presently working or intending to work in the State of Indiana. The degree would also provide new opportunities for international professionals whose jobs require them to interact with U.S. professionals and businesses and whose own profession will benefit with an understanding of the U.S. legal system.

The M.J. degree is the first degree the law school would offer to a non-lawyer. Both degrees presently available at the law school, the J.D. and the LL.M., require that candidates have a law degree either from an accredited law school in the United States or from a school outside the United States. This new degree is on the cutting edge of legal education, and Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law will be considered among those law schools leading the way as the legal environment changes and legal education follows suit. This degree will naturally result in further interaction with professionals in other disciplines, which will inevitably raise awareness about and reputation of the law school.

A review by a member of the faculty from the IU Mauer School of Law, requested by the IUPUI Graduate Affairs Committee, is provided in Appendix D.

**b. State Rationale** (How does this program address state priorities as reflected in *Reaching Higher, Achieving More?*)

In the Commission on Higher Education's March 2012 announcement of Indiana's *Reaching Higher, Achieving More*, it was announced that Indiana presently places forty-second in the nation with individuals with post-secondary education degrees. According to the statistics, thirty-three percent of Indiana citizens have post-secondary education credentials. The Commission's goal is to raise that number to sixty percent by the year 2025. While the M.J. degree comprises candidates who already have completed their undergraduate education, this program would further the State's overall goal in

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.iupui.edu/about/core.html>

improving the education level within the State and creating higher qualified, more competitive professionals in the marketplace.

Finally, as part of the development of this program the law school has discussed the possibility of eventually creating online courses specific for the M.J. program. This new endeavor would fit nicely with IU Online, the online education initiative that has a specific focus on the development of graduate degree programs.

**c. Evidence of National, State, or Regional Labor Market Need**

Since there are very few similar programs across the country, as noted in Section 4.b., and those that are in existence are relatively new, published statistical data is unavailable on both the student demand and the employment possibilities for graduates. The best evidence of potential student demand is based on the change in the legal profession and its impact on related fields. The need for licensed attorneys is declining, and predictors in the field are suggesting that this change is not temporary. The change is reflected not only in the decreasing number of attorneys being hired at law firms across the country but also in the number of individuals taking the LSAT (the law school entrance exam) and the number of individuals subsequently applying to law school.

However, in many professions individuals are in positions that do not require a license to practice law but the individual and the employer would benefit from a strong legal foundation, which the M.J. degree can provide. A wide variety of individuals who do not wish to be licensed by the Bar, for example, would not require the ninety-credit J.D. but may still find an advantage in learning about the law and how it intersects with other disciplines. The law school is in the best position to provide that education through a M.J. degree, either on its own or as part of a dual graduate degree course of study.

The M.J. candidate will most likely be drawn from the ranks of professionals from a variety of backgrounds, including those in government positions, in private business, and in nonprofit companies, both here in the United States and from throughout the world. Professionals who are involved in regulatory work would benefit by an understanding of how our legal system works and, in particular, the regulatory process. These professionals may include the individual who desires utility or communication licensing to those with banking and investment interests. Law enforcement specialists who otherwise do not have a J.D. degree may better understand the roles of those with whom they relate, including criminal prosecutors and defense attorneys. Those involved in the legislature as well as those who are interested in legislative initiatives would benefit

through an intense study of broader issues of public policy and theoretical studies, as well as a critical review of how the three branches of government intersect. Those individuals are represented, for example, by the legislator, the lobbyist, and the philanthropist. Those in private business who might benefit from further knowledge about the law include the human resources specialist, who addresses employment issues on a daily basis; the business person who would benefit from an understanding of corporate law, including international transactional law; and those involved in other specific areas of interest, such as health, environment, and intellectual property. The possibilities are endless.

Further, the international M.J. candidate will likely be the non-lawyer professional working in international business, perhaps in engineering, real estate development, sales and distribution, and other international transactions where a deeper understanding of U.S. law would create an advantage for the international business person.

The law school is poised to respond to these individual interests. It presently offers students the opportunity to focus on a wide variety of legal fields through its attractive Centers and Programs or the law school's Certificate programs in areas such as Environmental and Natural Resources Law, International and Comparative Law, and Intellectual Property. The areas of concentration of our Centers and Programs presently include international and comparative law, intellectual property and innovation, international human rights, and law and state government, and will likely expand to include other areas such as criminal law. These particular areas would be especially attractive and suitable for the M.J. candidate since the courses are already in place to ensure specialized knowledge within each field. Further, curricula is in place to support acquiring extensive knowledge about those areas that are part of one of our dual degree programs, including business, library science, social work, medicine, public affairs, health administration, and philosophy.

Five letters of support are attached in Appendix E.

### **3. Cost of and Support for the Program**

#### **a. Costs**

##### **i. Faculty and Staff**

The Master of Jurisprudence program will be funded through the reallocation of existing resources. The law school employs more than fifty full-time faculty and more than twenty full-time senior administrative staff members. No additional faculty or staff will be needed to administer and market this degree.

Administration of the program will be achieved by reallocating present responsibilities to address the additional work required during the program's implementation and initial growth, including issues related to admissions, placement, and advising. At the point where the size of the M.J. program requires more specialized attention, the increased tuition dollars of the students enrolled in the program would enable the law school to create where necessary new staffing to support the expanded program and to provide the best experience possible for the M.J. candidates.

**ii. Facilities**

The administration foresees no necessary expenditures toward the cost of maintaining the law school for use by candidates in the M.J. program. The program requires no additional space through capital expenditures or leasing, and will not require maintenance support beyond what is already required for the law school's optimal use.

**iii. Capital Costs**

The administration also foresees no expenditures for additional equipment to be used in this program.

**b. Support**

**i. Nature of Support (New, Existing, or Reallocated)**

This program will not force any downsizing of existing programs; instead, it is responsive to the shift taking place in legal education, resulting in a downturn in the demand for the J.D. degree as well as an increase in international dealings requiring knowledge about the intricacies of U.S. law. Support for this program will be provided through the reallocation of existing funds.

**ii. Special Fees above Baseline Tuition**

No additional costs or special fees are involved in implementing the M.J. program.

**4. Similar and Related Programs**

**a. List of Programs and Degrees Conferred**

**i. Similar Programs at Other Institutions Within Indiana**

The M.J. degree at Robert H. McKinney School of Law would be the first in the State to offer the opportunity for non-J.D. candidates to take classes in a pure legal education environment alongside students who have the same interest in

the law and from those professors whose life's work is to know about and teach legal doctrine. M.J. students will have a vast array of courses from which to choose; one of the strengths of the proposed program is in its individualized curriculum, as discussed above. M.J. candidates will be able not only to acquire the foundational legal courses they need but also choose those courses that best meet their specialized needs. M.J. students can develop an individualized curriculum that enables them to acquire specific knowledge in their fields of interest without course limitations.

**ii. Related Programs at the Proposing Institution**

This new degree is designed for individuals who are not interested in acquiring a full law degree and practicing law but are interested in developing a better understanding of the law either as it affects their non-legal professional careers or as part of their educational process in developing their professional careers. All present programs at the law school focus either on those students desiring a J.D. degree or those students with law degrees and interested in either a certificate or a Master of Laws (LL.M.) degree. Both the LL.M. program and the proposed M.J. program market to international students, but international LL.M. students usually seek to enhance their legal position in their native country, while the focus of the M.J. program is to provide candidates with an opportunity to enhance their non-legal position in their native country.

**b. List of Similar Programs Outside Indiana**

The programs outside Indiana similar to the proposed M.J. program are relatively new.<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, all noted programs are offered at law schools found in large metropolitan areas, likely due to the greater pool of professionals who might be interested in the advanced degree.

**Midwest Schools:**

Non-J.D. programs exist at Loyola University Chicago School of Law; John Marshall School of Law in Chicago; the University of Dayton School of Law; Cleveland State University College of Law; and IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law. The program most similar to the IU Robert H. McKinney Law School program is the Master in the Study of Law at Ohio State University Moritz College of Law. The Ohio program requires thirty credit hours; allows students to develop their

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on a November 2012 review of non-J.D. graduate programs at thirteen law schools (out of 203 law schools).

own curriculum with the help of an advisor; requires first-year courses; and can be completed as a full-time or part-time program. All Master of Jurisprudence students choose courses offered in the J.D. or Master of Laws program (which requires students to hold a J.D. or international equivalent degree).

**Non-Midwest Schools:**

Examples of other law schools with a master's degree for non-J.D. students include Arizona State Sandra Day O'Connor School of Law; Emory University School of Law; Pepperdine University School of Law; University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Seton Hall University School of Law; University of California Hastings College of the Law; University of Denver Sturm College of Law; University of Nebraska College of Law; University of San Diego School of Law; Wake Forest School of Law; and Yale University School of Law.

**c. Articulation of Associate/Baccalaureate Programs**

There are no Associate/Baccalaureate Programs involved in this proposal.

**d. Collaboration with Similar or Related Programs on Other Campuses**

The M.J. degree should enhance the graduate programs available at IUPUI by providing new opportunities for dual master's degrees. Those candidates from the professional ranks would be new to the university, likely acquiring their M.J. on a part-time basis while working. The international M.J. candidate, however, is more likely to attend the program on a full-time basis.

Other M.J. candidates who are more likely to attend school full time might find particular interest in conducting interdisciplinary research requiring knowledge of the foundations of the legal system. Sample areas where dual degrees might be attractive include dual degrees in the following:

**Within the Kelley School of Business:**

M.J. and Accounting  
M.J. and Business Administration  
M.J. and Entrepreneurship  
M.J. and Finance  
M.J. and Supply Chain Management  
M.J. and Business Law

**Within SPEA:**

M.J. and Criminal Justice (IU)  
M.J. and Nonprofit Management (IU)

M.J. and Public Management (IU)

Within the IU School of Medicine:

M.J. and Medical Science (IU)

M.J. and Pathology (IU)

Within the Purdue School of Science:

M.J. and Computer and Information Science (Purdue School of Science)

M.J. and Forensic and Investigative Sciences (Purdue School of Science)

Within the School of Liberal Arts:

M.J. and Philosophy (IU)

M.J. and Political Science (IU)

Within Other Schools:

M.J. and Nursing

M.J. and Philanthropic Studies (IU School of Philanthropy)

M.J. and Curriculum and Instruction with a Focus on Technology (IU School of Education)

M.J. and Social Work (IU School of Social Work)

M.J. and Technology (Purdue School of Engineering and Technology).

**5. Quality and Other Aspects of the Program**

**a. Credit Hours Required/Time To Completion**

The M.J. degree requires thirty hours of credit. M.J. candidates may acquire the required thirty hours full-time within one full academic year plus one summer term or on a part-time basis over approximately two years (since most candidates will likely be professionals currently working in the field and taking courses on a part-time basis). Each candidate will discuss with the advisor the practicality of completing the degree within one academic year, considering issues such as the availability of the courses in which the candidate is interested and the candidate's outside responsibilities.

*See Appendix A.*

**b. Exceeding the Standard Expectation of Credit Hours**  
[Not applicable to the Master of Jurisprudence program]

**b. Program Competencies of Learning Outcomes**

By providing a master's degree in law to individuals working in areas tangential to the law, the law school will be promoting "the intellectual growth of its citizens to the highest levels national and international."<sup>4</sup> Specifically, the M.J. degree is designed to enable M.J. candidates to think critically about public policy and the law as it relates to their area of interest; to better consider the legal and ethical implications of their actions; and to understand how the law influences not only everyday decisions but those affecting the public interest.

**c. Assessment**

The graduate degree will not be reviewed as part of the American Bar Association's accreditation process.

Internal reviews will be scheduled on a bi-annual basis, through the use of student evaluations, peer reviews of classroom instruction, and administrative oversight of the grading system to ensure that the program is sufficiently rigorous and meets the needs of the students through appropriate advising. The law school will also put in place a means of assessing its admission and retention rates as well as the job placement of its M.J. graduates, where needed. Following a reasonable period of time, the law school will administer an alumni survey.

Additional detail on assessment may be found in Appendix C

**e. Licensure and Certification**

Graduates of this program will earn a Master of Jurisprudence degree with no accompanying license or certificate.

**f. Placement of Graduates**

Since this degree focuses primarily on individuals already in their chosen profession, no separate and defined need for a placement program will be necessary. However, those M.J. candidates needing assistance in acquiring employment following graduation will be able to receive guidance and

---

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

assistance and resources from the Office of Professional Development at the law school.

**g. Accreditation**

The American Bar Association presently does not require approval or accreditation for non-J.D. programs offered at U.S. law schools. However, the proposal will be submitted to the ABA Council on Legal Education for its acquiescence.<sup>5</sup>

**6. Projected Headcount and FTE Enrollments and Degrees Conferred**

The projected headcount and FTE Enrollment Table is provided below.

---

<sup>5</sup> ABA Standard 308

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6	Institution/Location:	Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis										
7	Program:	Master of Jurisprudence										
8	Proposed CIP Code:	22.0201										
9	Base Budget Year:	2012-13										
10												
11				Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5
12				2014-15		2015-16		2016-17		2017-18		2018-19
13												
14	Enrollment Projections (Headcount)											
15	Full-time Students			3		8		14		16		22
16	Part-time Students			5		13		20		30		36
17				8		21		34		46		58
18												
19	Enrollment Projections (FTE)											
20	Full-time Students			3		8		14		16		22
21	Part-time Students			3		7		10		15		18
22				6		15		24		31		40
23												
24	Degree Completion Projection			3		13		22		28		40
25												
26												
27	CHE Code:											
28	Campus Code:											
29	County Code:											
30	Degree Level:											
31	CIP Code:											
32												
33												

NEW ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Table of Enrollments

## Appendix A

(Course-level detail on the program curriculum, including how long it will take to complete the program assuming full-time study)

### **General requirements:**

The M.J. degree is designed for working professionals who seek additional knowledge in a specific field. M.J. students will enroll in existing law school classes with J.D. students. Due to the importance of the J.D. ranking system, however, the grades of the M.J. students will be separately assessed. M.J. students must achieve a minimum 2.3 grade-point average to graduate. All M.J. students will be assigned a faculty advisor in their area of interest who will assist in designing and must approve the course of study.

### **1. Required Courses (5-8 credit hours, depending on the selected first-year courses):**

- A. All M.J. candidates must complete as their first course a two-credit hour course, Legal Process. The Legal Process course will provide an overview of the U.S. legal system, the case method study of law, and coverage of constitutional, statutory, common, and regulatory law.
- B. All M.J. candidates must also complete at least one of the first-year courses that are presently part of the J.D. first-year curriculum. The present first-year courses include Contracts and Sales (6 credit hours); Torts (4 credit hours); Property (4 credit hours); Criminal Law (3 credit hours); and Constitutional Law (4 credit hours).

### **2. Elective Courses (22-25 credit hours):**

The remaining courses will be selected by the M.J. candidate in consultation with the candidate's designated advisor and will be based on the candidate's area of interest. A thesis is not required, although individualized M.J. degrees, upon student and faculty collaboration and consideration, may include a substantial written project. M.J. candidates may elect to take any first-year or upper-level doctrinal course, but M.J. candidates may not enroll in any experiential courses such as externships and clinics.

### **3. Design and Administration Based on Areas of Concentration:**

- a. To further the M.J. candidate's pursuit of legal knowledge relevant to the candidate's present or future profession in a non-legal field, will

be developed in those specialized areas of interest where sufficient courses exist to provide a strong curriculum for M.J. candidates focusing on that area of interest.

- b. The purpose of creating specialized areas of concentration is to enable potential candidates to review and consider the master's program in their area of interest and to serve as the basis for their curricular choices, in consultation with their designated faculty advisor.
- c. Any area of concentration focusing on a specialized area of interest must be approved by the Academic Affairs Committee in consultation with the Vice Dean.
- d. Any curricular amendments to a M.J. area of concentration must be approved by the Academic Affairs Committee in consultation with the Vice Dean.
- e. Any student who wishes to pursue a general course of study in the master's program for which no area of concentration has been approved may do so by working with a designated advisor to create an individualized curriculum. The individualized curriculum will be established prior to the candidate's matriculation and subject to adjustment during the candidate's course of study in consultation with the academic advisor, so long as the course of study does not require the creation of any new courses and the M.J. candidate understands that the master's degree is not meant to prepare the candidate for the practice of law.

Appendix B includes two illustrative examples of areas of concentration in Intellectual Property (IP) and Environmental, Energy, & Natural Resources (EENR) Law. It also includes one example of a proposed outline for a dual degree with a Master of Science in Natural Resources and Environmental Science.

## Appendix B: Illustrative Areas of Concentration

### **M.J. –Intellectual Property (IP) Area of Concentration**

Four required courses, 30 credits total

This area of concentration includes one required core first-year law course and one introductory course (Contracts & Sales I and Legal Process, respectively) as foundational for an understanding of the U.S. legal system as well as intellectual property assets and their value.

#### **Required Core Courses (13 credits)**

- Legal Process (2 cr.) (summer of year 1)
- Contracts & Sales I (3 cr.) (fall of year 1)
- Two of the following courses:
  1. Intellectual Property (3 cr.)
  2. Patent Law (3 cr.)
  3. Trademark Law (3 cr.)
  4. Copyright Law (3 cr.)
    - One of the following courses:
      1. IP Transactions and Licensing (2 cr.)
      2. Intellectual Property Law Litigation (2 cr.)
      3. Intellectual Property Valuation (2 cr.)

#### **Approved Elective Courses (17 credits)**

Administrative Law (3 cr.)\*  
Antitrust Law (3 cr.)\*  
Art, Museum, and Publishing Law (2 cr.)  
Biotechnology Law  
Civil Procedure I & II (3-6 cr.)\*  
Closely Held Business Organizations (3 cr.)\*  
Contracts & Sales II (3 cr.)\*  
Copyright Law (3 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)  
Drug Innovation and Competition Law (2 cr.)  
Entertainment Law (2 cr.)  
Food and Drug Law (2 cr.)  
Income Taxation of Individuals, Fiduciaries and Business Associations (4 cr.)\*  
Intellectual Property Law (3 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)  
Intellectual Property of Pharmaceutical Products and Medical Devices (3 cr.)  
Intellectual Property Transactions and Licensing (2 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)  
Intellectual Property Law Litigation (2 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)  
Intellectual Property Valuation (2 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)

International Business Transactions (3 cr.)\*  
 International Intellectual Property Law (2 cr.)  
 International Law (3 cr.)\*  
 International Trade Law (2 cr.)\*  
 Internet Law (2 cr.)  
 Seminar in Law and Technology  
 Music Law  
 Patent Law (3 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)  
 Patent Prosecution (2 cr.)  
 Patent Litigation (2 cr.)  
 Property (4 cr.)\*  
 Remedies (3 cr.)\*  
 Right of Publicity (2 cr.)  
 Secured Transactions (3 cr.)\* *or* Commercial Paper (3 cr.)\*  
 Sports Law: Individual, Amateur and Olympic Sports (2 cr.)  
 Sports Law: Professional League Sports (2 cr.)  
 Trademark Law (3 cr.) (if not taken to fulfill Required Core Course credit)  
 Unfair Trade Practices  
 World Trade Organization (WTO) Law (3 cr.)\*

\*The area of concentration may include a limit on the number of credits that may be taken in courses in which intellectual property law is not the main focus.

\*\*\*\*\*

**J.M – Environmental, Energy, & Natural Resources (EENR) Law Area of Concentration**

4 required courses, 30 credits total

This area of concentration includes two required core first year law courses (torts, property) that are foundational for any understanding of EENR law plus the legal process course.

**Required basic courses** (10 credits):

Legal Process (2 cr.) (summer of year 1)  
 Property (4 cr.) (fall of year 1)  
 Torts (4 cr.) (fall of year 1)

**Required EENR basic course** (3 credits) (at least one of two)

Environmental Law (3-4 cr.)  
 Natural Resources Law (3 cr.)

**Elective courses (17 credits):**

Administrative Law (3 cr.)  
Agriculture and Environmental Law (2 cr.)  
Animals and the Law (2 cr.)  
Bioethics and Law (3 cr.)  
Constitutional Law (4 cr.) (spring of year 1)  
Energy Law and Regulation (2 cr.)  
Environmental Law (3-4 cr.)  
Environmental and Toxic Tort Law (2 or 3 cr.)  
Environmental Justice (3 cr.)  
Food and Drug Law (2-3 cr.)  
Law of Hazardous Waste Regulation (2 cr.)  
International Environmental Law (3 cr.)  
Land Use (2 or 3 cr.)  
Natural Resources Law (3 cr.)  
Public Utilities Regulation (2 cr.)  
Special Topics in Environmental Law (2 cr.)  
Water Law (2 cr.)  
Advanced Field Research (AFR) (variable cr.) [EENR topic]  
Supervised Research in EENR topic (variable cr.)

# COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

## **BUSINESS ITEM C-1: 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 Arts in English to be offered by Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis at its Columbus Campus
- Bachelor of Art in Central Eurasian Studies to be offered by Indiana University Bloomington at Bloomington
- Master of Arts in Teaching in Mathematics to be offered at Indiana University East at Richmond

### **Background**

The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed these three programs at its August 26, 2013 meeting and concluded that these programs could be placed on the agenda for action by the Commission as expedited items.

With respect to the B.A. in English to be offered by IUPUI at its Columbus campus, an updated articulation agreement has not yet been reached, although one is expected to be concluded by the date of the Commission meeting. Recommended action on this program is contingent upon an agreement being in place.

The B.A. in Central Eurasian Studies builds on the extraordinary, nationally recognized strengths of the IU Bloomington campus in world languages and area studies. Bloomington, for example, is the only campus among the two dozen campuses in the nation to have three Flagship Centers (in Chinese, Swahili, and Turkish), which are funded through the National Security Education Program. In FY2013, IU Bloomington received over \$6.1 M in federal funding for Critical Foreign Language and International Studies.

The M.A.T. in Mathematics will help to address a shortage of high school and community college teachers in STEM fields.

### **Supporting Document**

- (1) Academic Degree Programs on Which Staff Propose Expedited Action, September 4, 2013

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

September 4, 2013

CHE 13-08 Bachelor of Arts in English to be offered by Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis at its Columbus Campus

Proposal received on July 17, 2013  
CIP Code: Federal – 230101; State – 230101  
Eight Year Projected Headcount: 56; FTEs: 57  
Eight Year Projected Degrees Conferred: 20

CHE 13-11 Bachelor of Art in Central Eurasian Studies to be offered by Indiana University at Bloomington

Proposal received on July 17, 2013  
CIP Code: Federal – 050120; State – 050120  
Five Year Projected Headcount: 52; FTEs: 53  
Five Year Projected Degrees Conferred: 13

CHE 13-12 Master of Art in Teaching in Mathematics to be offered at Indiana University East at Richmond

Proposal received on July 17, 2013  
CIP Code: Federal – 131311; State – 131311  
Five Year Projected Headcount: 22  
Five Year Projected Degrees Conferred: 10

**COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Thursday September 12, 2013

**BUSINESS ITEM D-1: 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:

- \*Vincennes University – Aviation Technology Center \$6M
- Purdue University – Harrison Residence Hall Bathroom Renovation Phase III - \$4.8
- Indiana University – Wells Library Learning Commons \$4M
- Indiana University – Eigenmann Restroom Renovations Phase II \$1.8M

**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 Project on Which Staff Proposes Expedited Action, September 12, 2013*

*\*Recommended by ICHE in 2013-2015 Biennial Budget*

**Background Information on Capital Projects on Which Staff Proposed Expedited Action**  
September 12, 2013

**E-1-13-2-01**

**Vincennes University: Aviation Technology Center – \$6,000,000**

The Trustees of Vincennes University respectfully request authorization to proceed with the special repair and rehabilitation of the 90,922 square foot Aviation Technology Center located at the Indianapolis International Airport. The facility is in need of significant repairs and upgrades that are beyond typical repair and rehabilitation in order to provide a quality, safe and educational environment. The renovation of this facility will include a complete upgrade of the HVAC and electrical systems, a new roof, repairs to the exterior concrete and parking lot, repairs and cleaning of the exterior skin and an upgrade of the interior finishes. The infrastructure upgrades will increase the energy efficiency of the building, providing a cost savings of 15-20%. This project will ensure that Vincennes University can meet the growing demand as the Aviation Maintenance and Aviation Flight programs have experienced a 65% increase in the number of applicants in the past year. This special repair and rehabilitation was recommended by the CHE in the 2013-15 biennial budget and cash funded by the General Assembly.

**B-1-14-2-01**

**Purdue University: Harrison Residence Hall Bathroom Renovation Phase III \$4,800,000**

The Trustees of Purdue University respectfully request the approval to proceed with the third phase of the Harrison Hall residence bathroom renovation. The project will complete the reconfiguration and renovation of the bathrooms on floors 1-8 of the north tower in order to provide greater privacy, updated appearance and improve marketability. The restroom renovation includes a complete gutting and replacement of all infrastructures and finishes on floors 1-8. The overall restroom space on each floor will be enlarged by 25%. The existing restroom finishes and infrastructure are original to Harrison Hall which was built in 1964. After nearly 50 years of use, the finishes and infrastructure are at the end of their useful life, while the size of the existing restrooms is too small by current standards. The renovation will provide the new electrical, plumbing, and exhaust to serve a larger restroom, with more showers, greater privacy for residents, and updated finishes. The renovation will also meet current requirements for accessibility. This renovation is funded entirely by housing and food services reserves including no state money.

**A-1-14-2-02**

**Indiana University: Wells Library Learning Commons \$4M**

The Trustees of Indiana University request approval to proceed with renovating approximately 29,000 gsf of existing space and repairing three (3) elevators located in the west wing of Wells Library on the Bloomington campus. The existing Information Commons was conceived as a technology-rich study environment primarily focused on individual study. This new Learning Commons will continue to offer a technology-rich environment, but with an expanded focus on using mobile technology and student/faculty preferences for group study. This change is in response to the way today's students use technology to communicate and define their world view. The Learning Commons staff will support this change in technology use by providing a Tech GenIUs "information center" that will unify Library and Information Technology Support Services to assist students in taking maximum advantage of the entire Learning Commons environment. The cost of this project is estimated to be \$4,000,000 and will be paid for with campus repair and rehabilitation funds; project includes no state money.

**A-1-14-2-09**

**Indiana University: Eigenmann Restroom Renovations Phase II \$1.8M**

The Trustees of Indiana University request approval to proceed Phase II of renovating restrooms in the south wing of Eigenmann Residence Hall located on the Bloomington campus. Work consists of replacing the main plumbing piping, plumbing fixtures, and toilet stalls on all floors; replacing existing shower valves/heads and tub units on three residential floors only; and performing general construction and electrical work. Restrooms will be constructed to meet accessibility requirements. The total cost of this project is estimated to be \$1,800,000 and will be paid for using residential services and program funds; project includes no state money.



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

### INFORMATION ITEM A: Proposals for New Degree Programs, Schools, or Colleges Awaiting Commission Action

	<u>Institution/Campus/Site</u>	<u>Title of Program</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Status</u>
01	Indiana University – Northwest	M.S. in Nursing	4/29/2013	Under CHE review.
02	Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis	Master of Jurisprudence	7/17/2013	On September agenda for action.
03	Indiana University Purdue University Columbus	B.A. in English	7/17/2013	On September agenda for action.
04	Indiana University – South Bend	Bachelor of Art Education	7/17/2013	Under CHE review.
05	Indiana University – Bloomington	B.A. in Central Euroasian Studies	7/17/2013	On September agenda for action.
06	Indiana University – East	M.A. in Teaching, Mathematics	7/17/2013	On September agenda for action.
07	Indiana University – Bloomington	B.S. in Animal Behavior	7/17/2013	Under CHE review.
08	Ball State University	Master of Science in Software Engineering	8/22/2013	Under CHE Review.



**COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Thursday, September 12, 2013

**INFORMATION ITEM B: Requests for Degree Program Related Changes on Which Staff Have Taken Routine Staff Action**

	<u>Institution/Campus/Site</u>	<u>Title of Program</u>	<u>Date Approved</u>	<u>Change</u>
01	Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	Master of Library Science	8/21/2013	Extension to online environment
02	Indiana University Bloomington	BS in International Studies	8/21/2013	Addition of BS to an existing BA



## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

### **INFORMATION ITEM C: 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

A-1-14-2-06      *Indiana University Bloomington  
Jordan Avenue Safety Improvements Phase II  
Project Cost: \$2,500,00*

*The Trustees of Indiana University request authority to proceed with the safety improvements on the Jordan Avenue and Third Street intersection to the traffic island west of the Jordan Avenue Parking Garage. Pedestrian safety will be improved through the introduction of curbed landscaped median and related crosswalks. The existing width on Jordan Avenue allows for both a median and north and south bike lanes to be added; thus creating a safety area for those students who choose to use a bicycle as their mode of transportation. This project is funded by campus repair and rehabilitation funds; there are no state funds included.*

A-1-14-2-05      *Indiana University Bloomington  
Swain Hall West – Lecture Hall Renovation  
Project Cost: \$1,200,000*

*The Trustees of Indiana University request authority to proceed with the renovation of Rooms 119 and 120 of Swain Hall West located on the Bloomington campus. The project will update lecture space in this 73 year old building with new finishes and furnishings while providing an appropriate environment for use of advanced instructional technology. This project is funded by campus repair and rehabilitation funds; there are no state funds included.*

A-1-14-2-03      *Indiana University Bloomington  
Woodlawn Avenue Railroad Crossing Phase I  
Project Cost: \$2,000,000*

*The Trustees of Indiana University request authority to proceed with the relocation and reconfiguration of utilities and other improvements, including electrical service and chilled water in the area near Woodlawn Avenue between 11<sup>th</sup> Street and 13<sup>th</sup> Street located in Bloomington. This is the first step in facilitating the future vehicular and pedestrian crossing at this location. The grading cannot be accomplished before the utilities are relocated. This area will become a major multimodal access point to and from the campus. This connection will allow buses to circulate more efficiently which will reduce the number of cars in the area. This project is funded by campus repair and rehabilitation funds; there are no state funds included.*

A-1-14-2-04      *Indiana University Bloomington  
School of Optometry Roof Replacement  
Project Cost: \$910,000*

*The Trustees of Indiana University request authority to proceed with the roof replacement on the School of Optometry located on the Bloomington campus. The project will remove the existing roof down to the decking and replace it with new insulation and a fully-adhered membrane roof complete with all the necessary flashings. Fall protection and access ladders will be installed as well as new overflow roof drains. The total roof area for the building is approximately 12,000 square feet. This project is funded by campus repair and rehabilitation funds; there are no state funds included.*

## NEW CONSTRUCTION

None

## II. LEASES

None

## III. LAND ACQUISITION

None

## COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thursday, September 12, 2013

### INFORMATION ITEM D: 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

A-9-09-1-12      Indiana University Southeast  
New Construction of Education and Technology Building  
Project Cost: \$22,000,000  
Submitted the Commission on January 19, 2010

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 expected cost of the project is \$22,000,000 and would be funded from 2009 General Assembly bonding authority. This project was not recommended by the Commission as part of the biennial budget recommendation.

**STATUS:** The project is being held by the Commission until funds are identified to support the project.

B-1-08-1-02      Purdue University  
Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory BSL-3 Facility  
Project Cost: \$30,000,000  
Submitted to the Commission on July 9, 2007

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 was not recommended by the Commission as part of the biennial budget recommendation.

**STATUS:** The project is being held by the Commission until funds are identified to support the project.

B-1-13-1-07

Purdue University  
Thermal Energy Storage Tank Installation  
Project Cost: \$16,800,000  
Submitted to the Commission on September 14, 2012

The Trustees of Purdue University seeks authorization to proceed with the installation of a thermal energy storage tank at the West Lafayette Campus. Based on the Comprehensive Energy Master Plan and demands on chilled water in the northwest area of the campus, the thermal energy storage tank will provide additional chilled water capacity to existing and future structures on campus. The project cost is estimated at \$16.8 million and will be funded through the Facility and Administrative Cost Recovery Fund.

**STATUS:** The project is being held at the request of the institution.

B-2-09-1-10

Purdue University Calumet Campus  
Gyte Annex Demolition and Science Addition (Emerging Technology Bldg)  
Project Cost: \$2,400,000  
Submitted to the Commission on August 21, 2008

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 was not recommended by the Commission as part of the biennial budget recommendation.

**STATUS:** The project is being held by the Commission until funds are identified to support the project.

## II. REPAIR AND REHABILITATION

None.

## III. LEASES

None.