

**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