File 1

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 28, 2014

3:30pm, HMSU 227

AGENDA

I. Administrative Reports: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams

II. Chair Report: S. Lamb

III. Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of January 14, 2014 **(File 2)**

IV. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

V. Proposal, CIMT and EESE Department Unification **(File 3, 3a)**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 28, 2014

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Minutes

Present: S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, R. Guell, A. Anderson, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, C. Olsen, V. Sheets, K. Yousif.

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley

Ex-Officio Absent: Provost R. Williams

Guests: K. Bolinger, S. Powers, C. Tillery

1. Administrative Report: President D. Bradley
    a. The Morocco visit was wonderful in terms of reception. They were very accommodating; we were even able to visit people in their homes. The Hassan I University people are very clear in their expectations. We have great hopes that we will see good things with them. They are interested in business or technology students coming for internship, and there also may be opportunities for French students as well.
    b. I sent to S. Lamb a copy of the Integrative Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) report comparing us to our peers. Some of the data seems skewed, especially in regards to salary. P. McClintock is going to look into it to see when the data was collected.
    c. The first Budget Committee meeting was last Thursday. Last year they set two-year targets for reallocation; we need to make sure it happens as well as talking about what will go on with the state budget. D. McKee and others have tried to get some comment from the state budget office about next year's appropriation, but today, nothing. We're not sure whether the two percent cut announced in December is actually going to happen or still be held in reserve. M. Alley says it appears they were very aggressive in their revenue forecast. The shortfall is real, but they are also building reserves. If we receive the two percent I know we will find something to do with it.

d. Regarding the Dean searches for the College of Technology and the Library, the candidates look very strong. The decision for Technology Dean could be made prior to the Board of Trustees meeting; the Library decision possibly in March.
e. In light of the recent shooting at Purdue University, we wish to invite Diann McKee and Joe Newport to speak to the Senate about similar emergencies and how to handle them on campus. I would like them to be available to answer questions as well as talk about what happened on the Purdue campus. One big negative that came out in the press was whether employees, specifically instructors, were responding appropriately to the announcement. I want everyone on our campus to respond appropriately to RAVE announcements and similar warnings; I want them to read the accompanying instructions and follow them without question.
    i. V. Sheets: The issue with people not doing what they were told, was it faculty not doing what they should have? I tell my students to turn off their phones in class, and I turn mine off as well.
    ii. D. Bradley: It was said that some Purdue professors told the students to ignore the warnings and do what the professors told them. I want people on our campus to do what RAVE tells them; if it says "cover in place," the onus is on them individually. Professors shouldn't act as if class is still in session. Some on the Purdue campus were probably a mile away from the incident and thought they were safe, but the reality is you can't know for sure.
    iii. R. Guell: If the next one includes a diversionary attack, resources could go to one end of the campus, and others are sitting ducks on the other side of campus.
    iv. V. Sheets: How are we supposed to know?
    v. K. Yousif: It will also come through on the computer in the classroom.
    vi. C. MacDonald: The siren will go off too.
    vii. D. Bradley: The phones in the classrooms will also ring.
    viii. A. Anderson: I actually heard a voice test through the phone during a tornado drill.
    ix. D. Bradley: I don't know that there were any complaints in the Purdue incident about not knowing what was going on.

2. Chair Report: S. Lamb
    a. L. Maurer, our new Graduate Dean, approached me after the last Senate meeting and told me of a rather unusual situation at Marian University; they have a PhD program in the Educational Administration department that was not approved by the Higher Learning Commission this year or last year. They appealed to our Educational Administration department to take these 18 students on, and the department was happy to do so. There are a few discrepancies with the

requirements of our Graduate School; instead of meeting the 30 hour requirement, they only have about 20 more hours to complete. There was not time to meet again with the Executive Committee to discuss this, but she had already talked with R. Gonser with the Grad Council and they were very supportive of the idea, and the department was also supportive. She wanted at minimum to enlist support of Senate leadership. The materials looked solid, and because of the timing of the situation we went ahead and approved it. This is a wonderful opportunity for the University and perhaps promises other things in the future. I was very pleased with Dean Maurer's desire to achieve as much governance buy-in as was possible.

b. CAAC wants to not count the uppermost Upper Divisional Integrative Elective courses as part of the major, and they did the same thing with the junior level composition course, not counting it against the major. The President is very interested in emphasizing the completion of the degree in six semesters or less. There will be some that won't be able to accomplish this but he doesn't want the process drug out over a long period of time. Also, he is concerned about incorporating career-level curriculum and experiential learning into our majors, maybe not through individual Foundational Studies courses, but rather embedded with the existing curriculum. The President is reasonably comfortable with the excusing of the UDIEs and with the English course as long as it doesn't create hardship with state criteria.

    i. D. Bradley: I think my concept for practically doing what you're suggesting is to go back into Foundational Studies. Instead of UDIEs or a course in writing, the outcomes and curriculum should be developed within the major to meet those goals. The same thing would be in regard to experiential learning or community engagement. Rather than Foundational Studies requiring a course, they require the major to verify that the major incorporates that knowledge within the curriculum.

    ii. S. Lamb: Thank you for your clarification. As we proceed with short deadlines, we need to make sure these courses would not count against the major; but the President wants us to proceed as stated. There is no reason why the President's possibilities can't be explored.

    iii. D. Bradley: I'm very willing to talk with the Board about the complexities that will slow things down. I would just like to see everybody buying into the principle to minimize gaming.

    iv. R. Guell: I have told CAAC that they can't waive everything. They have to do serious evaluations of those seeking exemptions from this policy, and the bar has to be high. If they waive everything you and the Board will return it to them. Many departments are engaged in time shrinking and course shrinking.

v. D. Bradley: Can we get a formal charge with regard to Foundational Studies to look at these issues of requiring the incorporation of experiential learning, career development, and upper level UDIEs into existing curriculum?

vi. *(A lengthy discussion ensued where questions were raised and concerns expressed. Any implementation of such an idea would be fully vetted by Foundational Studies and would take much discussion as it would entail a significant change to the program.) A charge will be designed.*

3. **Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of January 14, 2014 B. Kilp, A. Anderson; Vote 9-0-0**
4. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
   a. R. Guell: We had a discussion with R. Williams on Monday, but it is worth having in the minutes here that regarding the Three-Week Attendance Report, I understand what C. Baker's concerns are about the accuracy of data. I just don't see how making reporting more difficult will enhance its accuracy. For the last few years "Attending" has been the default. C. Baker has conveyed that we are on shaky ground regarding true attendance, so the default has changed.
      i. K. Yousif: There is no default now.
      ii. R. Guell: Not anymore. There is a "Select One." They have taken a process where if you honestly collect the data it now takes much longer, especially if you don't know about the keyboard shortcuts. It is my hope that there can be a single button on the screen that can convert all the options to "Attending" so that lying to the University would be an active function.
      iii. D. Bradley: R. Williams and J. Beacon and I will talk. S. Hunter did an audit of Financial Aid, and one of the things that's coming—and it's easier for face-to-face courses—but for Distance courses, we're going to have to prove there is a weekly faculty-student interaction with every student getting Federal Financial Aid. It's not just proving that students are doing work. It's an onerous process, and it's going to mean keeping much better records than we have. It's a measure of Congress not being hard enough on those who are really the bad actors.
      iv. K. Yousif: We're always talking about accurate data. We always have students who have come only once, and they're failing. It's never accurate. I think in terms of retention, etc., it proves nothing.
      v. D. Bradley: I would say that what you want to do in regards to that is use MapWorks. The report for the three-week attendance is solely for Title IV compliance and we don't want to record any more information there than what is asked for. It's not a retention tool.
      vi. V. Sheets: Do students see anything from the three-week report?

vii. S. Powers: On MySam it shows for the current term, the differentiation between attending and not attending. It directly says we are doing attendance on every student at every meeting.
viii. V. Sheets: Couldn't we report it in a different way?
ix. S. Powers: We are working on something possible with BlackBoard and the Banner upgrade that could feed into attendance reporting.
x. V. Sheets: So the data would dichotomize for the state?
xi. S. Powers: Yes.
xii. D. Bradley: But MapWorks is really the necessary one, in terms of being able to contact RAs, etc. It's going to be hard to get Banner and BlackBoard to use it that way. C. Baker wants to make sure we don't get in trouble. If we document that a student leaves prior to midterms then we have to return their Federal Financial Aid, and it's up to us to get the money back from the student. We have to look at Federal separately.
xiii. B. Kilp: I just received a message about a student who was repeatedly instructed to drop a class but didn't, and it's amazing what they're asking me to do. I didn't have any grades for her; there wasn't much to tell them. I think faculty should see this so you know you are going to be expected to prove this.
xiv. D. Bradley: I'm sure any staff member would be happy to talk to you about that. The bad actors are going to keep acting this way. Verifying that the students are learning, attending, and progressing is going to be an ongoing thing. For example, ITT is in deep trouble because they set up a financial operation that loaned money to students and they never got it back. In the Federal point of view they have been violating the 90-10 Rule that says a part of your money has to come somewhere other than the Federal Government. Hopefully we can come up with the tools to help, but it will get worse.

b. C. Olsen: I went to the Chairs Council meeting this morning and room schedules came up. There are 300 teaching spaces on campus and they can only schedule 109 of them?
    i. S. Powers: We have asked the Deans to look at the rooms they have control over and consider releasing some of them to us. In some cases we know which can be useful, what kind of specs to put on them, etc. We have yet to have those rooms offered up.
    ii. C. Olsen: They are Residential Life, dorm spaces—very usable spaces that are with them but we can't use them.
    iii. S. Powers: We occasionally can make some calls to see if we can use those spaces.

iv. D. Bradley: If that doesn't happen voluntarily then it will become a crisis. It would be in the best interest of Deans to be responsive.
v. C. Olsen: We were talking mainly about Tech spaces today.
vi. S. Powers: We could easily pick up about 30 between Residential Life and Technology. They have designated the rooms as not appearing to be schedulable. Some of them are very nice in size. We don't have a lot of those 45-seating rooms that we could use.

5. Proposal, CIMT and EESE Department Unification:
   a. *(This proposal was brought forward under a Policy on Policies request from J. Maynard to the Board of Trustees. The merger paperwork has not been completed and would have to be before a merger was finalized.)*
   b. K. Bolinger: I should probably start with a history of how this came about. For four years we were asked by the former Provost to merge. They always came back with a unanimous-minus-one vote against the merger. Last year Jack took it directly to the Board of Trustees and it came back here, which sent it to CAAC. We did end up voting for a merger. To some degree I engineered that on the premise that we could leverage that with some requisites to go forward along with the merger. The reason I want to go with that on CAAC's recommendation is after my conversation with R. Williams, after going that route and getting the votes and going with it, apparently the Board seemed urgent that it would be done by July. Resource requests were rather outrageous, but we will need time and money. I realize now one Chair can't do it all.
      i. T. Hawkins: I'm in an awkward position then; if you're suggesting that on its merits it would not have the support of FAC then that is problematic for me. I looked at these requests for resources and I don't have any experience with mergers and don't know if it's part of the practice, but I look at them and can't justify that.
      ii. K. Bolinger: The extra resources were to support planning and some to support buyouts.
      iii. V. Sheets: Don't you currently have program coordinators?
      iv. K. Bolinger: I just toned it down that we would like to see some support. We would like to have it happen in the fall of 2015. The idea that it would have to happen by July 1…I'd have to put all kinds of things on hold to get the merger done.
      v. D. Bradley: Isn't it true that all the graduate advisors are in the other department? The grad departments are very interdepartmental already. Am I wrong in that?
      vi. S. Powers: EESE faculty can now chair a Doctoral committee in CIMT.
      vii. K. Bolinger: Very few do. If you're going for a concentration in Elementary Education they do that. Many go for the Media Technology.

viii. S. Lamb: If we were to approve that, it is with the understanding that it's not with the funds requested.
ix. K. Bolinger: It's really because we need more time. It's more the fears related to the merger; people need more time. The minority faculty of CIMT feel that the majority faculty of EESE would become the trump vote on issues.
x. K. Yousif: Could you clarify our role?
xi. S. Lamb: That's what I'm trying to figure out.
xii. D. Bradley: My understanding, going back to the Board of Trustees position, they were asked to give reasons to not merge. The Trustees said there should be a merger. If the faculty don't agree, you have to tell us why.
xiii. S. Lamb: The murky thing at this point is the time deadline. Maybe there's a way around that.
xiv. C. Olsen: I would just weigh in that the request in terms of support staff and time are very reasonable. We merged one very tiny department into ours and that took two years. The time is unrealistic to try to do it in three months.
xv. R. Guell: This is unconventionally brought to us. We don't have the actual merger documents, the curriculum; this is simply a request to respond to the Trustees' request for information. Given that they have begrudgingly or otherwise said yes, that they would have to ultimately have to go and do the paperwork, and because it went through the Policy on Policies route, we can say yes we agree this is a reasonable merger, that the department is right on time, and the Provost is right on resources. The Board of Trustees is asking for input at this point.
xvi. B. Kilp: I haven't seen the rationale for anything against this. Essentially the Board is asking for reasons not to merge, and I don't see that.
xvii. D. Bradley: They don't have any. R. Guell has succinctly said it. What the department has asked for it two things: money and time.
xviii. T. Hawkins: But it is implied that there is opposition.
xix. K. Bolinger: It is unanimous-against-one for no merger. We voted for it with the expectation that we have time to plan and do it right and meet some of those expectations. I cited Jack's original statement to the Board.
xx. S. Lamb: The vote was 17 to 23 for the merger.
xxi. R. Guell: There is some useful context, but not in an open meeting.
xxii. B. Kilp: I was on the committee which designed the process for mergers. I don't see that we have the ability to approve or not approve a merger. We can say we have issues due to time.
xxiii. D. Bradley: There are merger, time, and resources to give an opinion on.

xxiv. B. Kilp: It would be prudent to split it into three sections.

xxv. D. Bradley: During an interim year you could have one chair, but the departments are allowed to operate independently. At the end of the year they would operate together.

xxvi. S. Lamb: We had program coordinators in the College of Business. They had stipends to assist. That disappeared after the work was over, taking six departments down to two.

xxvii. K. Bolinger: I would not endorse the one chair model in any case. They would see that as a ruse.

xxviii. C. MacDonald: It would just be a stepping stone towards that.

xxix. K. Bolinger: But if you do that prior, there would be issues.

xxx. D. Bradley: It seems most of the changes that need to happen in this process, they need to work together on, right? Continuing the idea that you're not together while that's going on seems counterproductive.

xxxi. S. Lamb: You might look at some of the work that was done in the College of Business, because each area had distinct areas within it and the way in which we fashioned our committee, it became one department. Personnel decisions are made across departments.

xxxii. K. Bolinger: You'd have to decide how that fleshes out, if it's proportional, etc. Going with a one chair model looks like a superficial attempt to make it look like one department. There's a lot of fear within smaller programs that they would lose autonomy. Most of them are probably unwarranted. That year would buy them time to ease their fears and allow them to relax. Dan is suggesting jumping right in and working for a unified department within a few months.

xxxiii. R. Guell: Should we fully side with fall of 2015? R. Williams has been extraordinarily rational and reasonable.

xxxiv. K. Bolinger: I would like to consider ourselves not merged until we decide what we want. People might not want to jump into that without moving too fast.

xxxv. **Motion to Send to the Senate the Following Recommendation: R. Guell-C. MacDonald; Vote: 9-0-0**

1. **The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, in response to the Board of Trustees' request for opinion on the merger of CIMT-EESE expresses the following:**
    a. **We agree with the vote of the faculty that they should merge.**
    b. **We agree with the department that they be allowed more time than the Provost has allowed for the execution of that merger with regard to bylaws,**

curriculum, promotion and tenure standards, and resource allocation.

c. **We agree with the Provost that some resources may be required to implement the merger and carry the new combined mission forward but that those specified in previous documents are not realistic. We will rely on the Provost and Dean to offer details when the formal merger paperwork is complete.**

Motion to Adjourn 4:44pm

Revised June 1, 2013

Proposers should consult with the dean's office prior to the development of the proposal. all proposals can be supported.

F-2 PROGRAM PROPOSAL FORM

Department: CIMT and EESE Department Unification **College:** Bayh College of Education **Contact Person:** _____ **Phone:** _____ **Email:** _____	*Click here for flow diagram* *Click here for a sample timeline* **Degree Level:** _____ **CIP Code:** _____ **M** **Code:** _____ **Program Title:** _____ **Proposed New Program Title:** _____ **Track or Concentration Area, If Applicable:** __
CHECK ALL THAT APPLY ☐ Graduate ☐ Undergraduate ☐ New Program ☐ Existing Program ☐ Change of Title ☐ Revision ☐ Suspension	☐ Elimination ☐ Reactivation ☐ Major ☐ Minor ☐ Certificate ☐ Licensure Only ☐ Other(specify)_____

1. **For revision, reactivation, and new programs submit all applicable forms in this packet. For suspension or elimination, complete the brief summary and submit F-3 only.**
2. **Proposals for new degree programs must include the application required by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.**
3. **All proposals should also be submitted via electronic media in Microsoft Word format, with signature page scanned.**

In the space provided, please insert your summary (abstract), information on student learning proposed catalog copy, and side-by-side comparison of the old and new programs (see Append III of the CAPS Manual.)

Brief Summary:

Rationale for Change (check all that apply and provide rationale):

☐ Outcomes assessment results
☐ Accreditation/licensure changes
☐ Other

Describe

Approval/Review Signatures | Date | Vote

If more than one unit is involved, signatures are needed from each unit.

1. Department/unit curriculum committee-CIMT _____ ~~9/23/13~~ 9/23/13 _____ 17-2-4 joint dept. vote
2. Department/unit curriculum committee-EESE _____ _____ _____
3. Department chair-CIMT _____ 12/3/13
4. Department chair-EESE _____ 12/3/13
5. College Representative Leah M Ellis _____ 10-14-13 9-0-0
6. Academic Dean Kandi Hill-Clarke _____ 12/2/13 _____
7. Associate VP for Academic Affairs _____ 1/14/13
8. Dean's Office, College of Education _____ _____
   (Programs that lead to educator licensure)
9. Teacher Education Committee _____ _____ _____
   (Programs that lead to educator licensure)
10. Dean, College of Graduate and Professional Studies _____ _____
11. CAAC or Graduate Council L. Rosenkoetter _____ 12/10/13 ~~5-3-1~~ _____ 5-3-1
12. Senate Executive Committee _____ _____ _____
    (New programs, major revisions so program is substantially new, or proposals with major policy implications. Determined by CAAC or Graduate Council.)
13. Faculty Senate _____ _____ _____
    (New programs, major revisions so program is substantially new, or proposal with major policy implications. Determined by CAAC or Graduate Council.)
14. Provost _____ _____

Publication Dates:

Proposal: _____ Approval: _____

12-10-13 CAAC

Rationale for support requests for departmental merger, CIMT/EESE

The departments of CIMT and EESE, in response to a merger request made to the Board of Trustees in May of 2013 would like the following conditions to be considered by faculty governance before recommendations are made to the Board of Trustees regarding the proposed merger of the two departments. Our initial request accompanying our positive vote in support of a merger included three areas of concern; (1) that the current administrative support given to each of the departments not be diminished within a larger combined department, (2) that adequate resources would be allocated for program support within a larger department, and (3) that the departments be given adequate time to restructure for a smooth transition to a single department. Provost Biff Williams has asked that we provide a stronger rationale for these requests.

First, our current administrative support structure includes three assistants with very distinct duties and skill sets. The current administrative assistant in CIMT has a well-developed understanding of the graduate programs that CIMT offers and is invaluable to the graduate faculty who work in the department. The two administrative assistants in EESE operate distinctly as well. One is the primary assistant to the chair, supporting faculty alike, in program and curricular issues as well as scheduling. The second administrative assistant in EESE manages both faculty travel for professional development as well as practicum visits for their many clinical experiences. EESE has clinical experiences in many of their courses and hundreds of students each semester which need to be placed in schools and managed in a departmental data base. She also supports the TOTAL semester program; managing applications.

Second, our requests for resources included extra monetary support for planning for the merger and supporting program continuity. Provost Williams has indicated that the initial requests were beyond what could be provided by the administration and we ask only that some funds be considered to support faculty buy-outs to help the new combined department chair manage the five distinct programs within the departments.

Third, our initial request for a merger date of fall of 2015 was based upon a careful consideration of the many tasks necessary to support a smooth transition to a single department. Given the additional departmental duties thrust upon all departments for the spring 2014 semester (dashboard reports, student retention plans, philanthropy case sheets, etc) it is unlikely that we can manage to develop a new department in one semester and be ready to function optimally by fall of 2014. Some of the things that must be worked out prior to a merger include:

1. Synchronization of promotion and tenure procedures. Each department has their own processes and procedures and these must be synchronized in a way that protects the interests of faculty in both departments. Similarly, it is important to establish how a P & T committee in a combined department be created so as to represent the interests of both departments.
2. Dashboard reports which have established separate metrics for the coming year will need to be adjusted to reflect one department.
3. Opportunities for shared k-12 courses and curricular changes need to be explored and developed. Point five of past Provost Maynard's request to the Board of Trustees establishes a

rationale based on the experiences of some of the EESE faculty related to middle and high school programs and possibility of the merger leveraging this resource. If we are to truly consider this option we will need time to discuss co-teaching models, new course development and possible curricular changes.

4. Point seven of past Provost Maynard's rationale to the board of trustees speaks to the combined department's ability to develop new and innovative approaches to graduate education. Currently CIMT is re-working their masters and doctoral programs; establishing different criteria for admission and developing at least one new online program. Additional time is needed to address some areas of concern in the existing programs; this time would be compromised by the need to quickly merge within one semester of planning.
5. EESE is in year two of a two year ICHE grant which has a buy-out for the chair and another faculty member through December 2014 and requires administrative work of the two assistants in the department.
6. Student faculty ratio targets for the two departments are discrepant and need to be aligned in careful consideration of the higher number of clinical experiences in EESE and the graduate program workload in CIMT. Point six of Provost Maynard's memo to the board of trustees cites the ability of EESE faculty to share the workload for doctoral student advising and committee chairing. Course scheduling and work load for EESE faculty who will be sharing in this duty needs to be considered as it is in CIMT currently.

If we move forward with a merger as soon as the fall of 2014 we will be one department in name only. Essentially it will be two departments with one chair. If the "synergies" that Dr. Maynard mentions in his rationale to the board are to be achieved, significant planning time is absolutely necessary. Along with the administrative reports due in the spring, the CIMT department is currently trying to develop at least one online master's program and develop and implement a marketing program for all of their graduate programs, while EESE is going to market a newly approved online master's program to over 30,000 teachers in a data base created last semester. These initiatives will be compromised by the additional need to merge the departments on a tight one semester time table.

12/10/13

Kevin Bolinger, Interim Department Chair CIMT

TO: CAAC

FROM: Elementary, Early, and Special Education Diana Lautenbach
Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology Kevin Boly

DATE: December 9, 2013

RE: Departmental Unification

EESE and CIMT concur with the request for a merger and are seeking approval from CAAC. The details for the merger will be worked out with the Dean of the Bayh College of Education, Dean Kandi Hill-Clarke, and Provost Biff Williams.

Indiana State University
More. From day one.

Department of Elementary, Early and Special Education

Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
812-237-2840
Fax: 812-237-8208

Date: October 3, 2013

To: Dr. Kandi Hill-Clarke
Dean, Bayh College of Education

Dr. Richard Williams
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Unification of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, & Media Technology with the Department of Elementary, Early Childhood, and Special Education.

A combined faculty meeting was held on Monday, September 23, 2013 to consider a merger of the departments of Elementary, Early Childhood and Special Education and Curriculum Instruction and Media Technology, as directed by Provost Williams and Dean Hill-Clarke. The departments were directed to review the previously presented proposal for merging as originally composed by then Provost Jack Maynard by October 15, 2013. Three options were considered and deliberated at this meeting. Those options were:

1. Forward a notice to the Dean and the Provost by October 15, 2013 that the departments were not in favor of a merger, with rationale.
2. Forward a notice to the Dean and the Provost by October 15, 2013 that the departments were willing to merge with a basic outline as to an administrative structure along with a statement of additional supports needed to facilitate the merger and a basic timeline through which tasks associated with the merger would be accomplished.
3. Forward a notice to the Dean and the Provost by October 2, 2013 that the departments would request an extension of time in order to consider the proposed merger with specific timelines through which the departments would accomplish specific tasks required for planning a successful merger.

Twenty-three faculty and staff, representing a majority of the faculty and staff from both departments, were in attendance. Seventeen of the twenty-three attendees voted to support option two above.

A Program Unification Committee consisting of faculty and staff representatives from both departments was created. This committee subsequently met on several occasions to respond to the outlining and drafting of information requested in option two above. The committee's efforts and recommendations were forwarded to all faculty and staff after each meeting with a request for response regarding the committee's work. Subsequent meetings of this committee considered each response received and modified previous work as deemed appropriate.

The Program Unification Committee is now providing you with the information outlined in option two above as attachment A. This document delineates the administrative structure and supports that will be required to facilitate a successful merger of the two departments. A timeline for the merger is also *specified,* concluding with a formal merger of the existing two departments to become effective at the beginning of the fall semester of 2015.

Additional planning work will begin after the departments receive confirmation that the Board of Trustees supports the proposed administrative positions; additional resources and merger timeline.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this matter,

For the Program Unification Committee

James A. Jacobs, Professor and Chair
Program Unification Committee
Department of Early Childhood, Elementary and Special Education and,
Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology
Bayh College of Education
Indiana State University
401 N. 7th Street
Terre Haute, IN 47809

CC: Chris McDonald
BCOE Congress Chair

Funding Request for Proposed EESE/CIMT Department Merger

Assumptions are based upon full operational merger to occur at the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year.

1. **Planning Resources**

One merger planning coordinator from each department with (1) course buyout in Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Fall 2015	$6000 per semester	$24,000
Stipends for faculty summer planning Summer 2014, Summer 2015.	$2000 per faculty per summer term	$24,000
Five combined faculty all day working retreats (each working retreat will be used to invest all faculty in the merger process and give feedback on planning committee's work).	$1800 per retreat	$9,000
Planning Resources subtotal		$57,000

2. **Operational Resources (Per academic Year)**

Three Administrative assistant upgrades to student services II	Avg increase, $1.50 per hour for a combined 5850 work hours annually	$8,775
Maintain 10 Graduate Assistantships in combined department (Graduate assistantships provided by School of Graduate Studies).	N/A	N/A
Five course buyout per semester for program coordination	$3000 per buyout	$30,000
Two student workers @20 hours each (Currently one student worker is employed, additional student worker represents an actual increase of $4800)	$2400 each student per semester	$9,600 ($4,800)
Chairperson Stipend Chair (stipend and buyout remain the same)	$8,000 per academic year	$8,000
Chairperson 2 course release	$6000 per semester	$12,000
Release of one chair position (one chair buyout added back into budget)	-$8,000 stipend -$12,000 release	($20,000)
Net funding increase annually		$23,575

Notes:

1. An additional one time budget request must be provided for anticipated expenses associated with the acquisition of supplies, material, printed material and related items associated with the change of the combined department name.

Bayh College of Education Congress

Monday, October 14, 2013

Unapproved Minutes

Members Present: W. Barratt, D. Quatroche, J. Jacobs, M. Howard-Hamilton, M. Nail, F. Lai, S. Davis, M. Hare, L. Nellis, Associate Dean Collins (ex officio), Dean Hill-Clarke (ex officio)

Members Absent: C. MacDonald

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm by S. Davis.

2. Minutes for September 9, 2013 were approved. Motion passed (Quatoroche, Jacobs; 8-0-0). ,).

3. New Business
   a) CDCSEP Program Proposal – Clinical Mental Health Counseling M.S.
   Dr. Catherine Tucker shared information regarding the proposal for revisions to the M.S. Clinical Mental Health Counseling program. Associate Dean Collins confirmed that all necessary consultation forms have been obtained and that needed syllabi have been submitted. The proposal was approved. (Barratt, Lai; 7-0-2).

   b) BCOE Scholarship and Awards Committee
   A motion was made (Quatroche, Jacobs) to review and discuss the proposed language regarding for the BCOE Constitution. M. Howard-Hamilton suggested adding a listing of awards/scholarships for which the committee is responsible. Associate Dean Collins requested that a general reference to any newly established awards also be included. A motion was made (Barratt, Quatroche) to table the discussion to allow expansion of the proposed language.

   c) Merger of EESE and CIMT Departments

   A motion to accept the presented letter from the EESE and CIMT Program Unification Committee passed (Howard-Hamilton, Nellis; 9-0-0). J. Jacobs provided a brief historical background of the proposed merger and the unificiation committee's decision. K. Bollinger clarified the role of the BCOE Congress and noted that Faculty Senate will also be revieweing the proposal before submitting for Board of Trustee approval at the December meeting.

4. Old Business
   None

5. Faculty Senate Representative Report
   None

6. Dean's Report
   No update from Dean Hill-Clark was provided. Associate Dean Collins requested that the Congress Secretary work with her to facilitate distribution of upcoming meeting agendas and materials and posting of approved minutes until a replacement for S. Weir is identified.

7. Chair's Report
   None

8. Open Discussion
   None

9. Meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m. (Jacobs, Howard-Hamilton; 9-0-0).

Respectfully submitted by,
Leah Nellis
Congress Secretary

Approved: 1-13-14 CAAC #10

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

CAAC 2013-2014
Larry Rosenhein, Chair
December 10, 2013
MINUTES #10

Members Present: D. Bolinskey, K. Bolinskey, S. Kiger, R. McGiverin, D. Malooley, L. Rosenhein, B. Skinner, K. Ward
Student members:
Ex-officio: L. Brown, D. Collins, K. Harris, L. Maule, S. Powers
Executive Committee Liaison: R. Guell
Absent: A. McLeod, E. Strigas
Guests: Kevin Bolinger

L. Rosenhein called the meeting to order at 12:33 PM.

1. A motion to approve the Minutes of Meeting #9 (12-3-13), as amended, was made and passed, 6-0-2, (Kiger/Skinner).

2. Merger of CIMT and EESE: L. Rosenhein distributed a written motion for discussion. K. Bolinger presented a rationale for support requests for departmental merger. (Dated 12-10-13, Attached). He stated that the members of the departments were sought for input and also expressed concern over the timeline especially the wording of "sufficient time." Following discussion, a motion to approve the following was made and passed 5-3-1, (Rosenhein/Bolinskey):
K.

   Motion: Approval of the proposal for merger of the CIMT and EESE departments, to be accompanied by the commentary below.
   The motion above should be considered an acceptance of the fact that the two departments involved have agreed to this change and that it is desired by the administration, rather than an endorsement of the plan. In evaluating program changes, considerations used by CAAC generally involve establishing whether the change is beneficial to the university, and whether proper procedures, as defined in the CAPS manual, have been followed. Due to the lack of detail about how the departments will be restructured (in particular, there is no MOU at this time), and the absence of faculty input as to the rationale for the change, it is difficult to judge the net benefit of merging the departments. Neither can we

validate the process, due to the unusual nature of the path that led to this proposal (section 226.2 of the Handbook) and the very short time we were given to act on it.

As this proposal moves through levels beyond CAAC, we urge that every effort be made to ensure that sufficient time and resources, as outlined in the December 9, 2013 "*Rationale for support requests for departmental merger, CIMT/EESE*" document from the departments, are granted to the departments to facilitate the most effective transition and the establishment of a well-functioning merged department.

We are pleased to learn that the administration agrees that section 246 of the Handbook will not be used in the future for externally-initiated restructurings since they more appropriately fall under the recently-approved section 352. CAAC and the Executive Committee should work to draft additional language for the CAPS manual to include a clearly-defined process when section 352 is used to effect structural changes.

3. The time for next semester for the committee to meet was determined to be on Monday, 3:30-5:00 PM in Myers Technology TC 101E. The next meeting will be on January 13, 2014.

4. Continuation of Senate Charge #3: Implement the high credit hour/long time to completion policy passed by the Faculty Senate in 2012-2013. S. Powers is compiling a spreadsheet of the responses from the departments. These will become a major task next semester.

5. Old Business: L. Rosenhein discussed the 30 Credit Core Transfer. It appears to be a block transfer without respect to grades. If a course by course transfer is used, then the grade policy of "C" or better will be applied. Should this difference exist or will it be a standard that grades will no longer count. It appears that if a transfer course is a prerequisite or a major requirement, the department can still require a grade standard.

6. The Committee adjourned at 1:34 PM

Respectfully Submitted
David J. Malooley, Secretary

Four Attachments: (Nine pages total)

Rationale for support requests for departmental merger, CIMT/EESE, 12-10-13 (2 pgs.)
Department Unification memo, 10-9-13 (1 page)
Letter, RE: Unification… 10-3-13 (4 pgs.)
BCOE Congress Minutes, 10-14-13, (2 pgs.)

12-10-13 CAAC

Rationale for support requests for departmental merger, CIMT/EESE

The departments of CIMT and EESE, in response to a merger request made to the Board of Trustees in May of 2013 would like the following conditions to be considered by faculty governance before recommendations are made to the Board of Trustees regarding the proposed merger of the two departments. Our initial request accompanying our positive vote in support of a merger included three areas of concern; (1) that the current administrative support given to each of the departments not be diminished within a larger combined department, (2) that adequate resources would be allocated for program support within a larger department, and (3) that the departments be given adequate time to restructure for a smooth transition to a single department. Provost Biff Williams has asked that we provide a stronger rationale for these requests.

First, our current administrative support structure includes three assistants with very distinct duties and skill sets. The current administrative assistant in CIMT has a well-developed understanding of the graduate programs that CIMT offers and is invaluable to the graduate faculty who work in the department. The two administrative assistants in EESE operate distinctly as well. One is the primary assistant to the chair, supporting faculty alike, in program and curricular issues as well as scheduling. The second administrative assistant in EESE manages both faculty travel for professional development as well as practicum visits for their many clinical experiences. EESE has clinical experiences in many of their courses and hundreds of students each semester which need to be placed in schools and managed in a departmental data base. She also supports the TOTAL semester program; managing applications.

Second, our requests for resources included extra monetary support for planning for the merger and supporting program continuity. Provost Williams has indicated that the initial requests were beyond what could be provided by the administration and we ask only that some funds be considered to support faculty buy-outs to help the new combined department chair manage the five distinct programs within the departments.

Third, our initial request for a merger date of fall of 2015 was based upon a careful consideration of the many tasks necessary to support a smooth transition to a single department. Given the additional departmental duties thrust upon all departments for the spring 2014 semester (dashboard reports, student retention plans, philanthropy case sheets, etc) it is unlikely that we can manage to develop a new department in one semester and be ready to function optimally by fall of 2014. Some of the things that must be worked out prior to a merger include:

1. Synchronization of promotion and tenure procedures. Each department has their own processes and procedures and these must be synchronized in a way that protects the interests of faculty in both departments. Similarly, it is important to establish how a P & T committee in a combined department be created so as to represent the interests of both departments.
2. Dashboard reports which have established separate metrics for the coming year will need to be adjusted to reflect one department.
3. Opportunities for shared k-12 courses and curricular changes need to be explored and developed. Point five of past Provost Maynard's request to the Board of Trustees establishes a

rationale based on the experiences of some of the EESE faculty related to middle and high school programs and possibility of the merger leveraging this resource. If we are to truly consider this option we will need time to discuss co-teaching models, new course development and possible curricular changes.

4. Point seven of past Provost Maynard's rationale to the board of trustees speaks to the combined department's ability to develop new and innovative approaches to graduate education. Currently CIMT is re-working their masters and doctoral programs; establishing different criteria for admission and developing at least one new online program. Additional time is needed to address some areas of concern in the existing programs; this time would be compromised by the need to quickly merge within one semester of planning.
5. EESE is in year two of a two year ICHE grant which has a buy-out for the chair and another faculty member through December 2014 and requires administrative work of the two assistants in the department.
6. Student faculty ratio targets for the two departments are discrepant and need to be aligned in careful consideration of the higher number of clinical experiences in EESE and the graduate program workload in CIMT. Point six of Provost Maynard's memo to the board of trustees cites the ability of EESE faculty to share the workload for doctoral student advising and committee chairing. Course scheduling and work load for EESE faculty who will be sharing in this duty needs to be considered as it is in CIMT currently.

If we move forward with a merger as soon as the fall of 2014 we will be one department in name only. Essentially it will be two departments with one chair. If the "synergies" that Dr. Maynard mentions in his rationale to the board are to be achieved, significant planning time is absolutely necessary. Along with the administrative reports due in the spring, the CIMT department is currently trying to develop at least one online master's program and develop and implement a marketing program for all of their graduate programs, while EESE is going to market a newly approved online master's program to over 30,000 teachers in a data base created last semester. These initiatives will be compromised by the additional need to merge the departments on a tight one semester time table.

12/10/13

Kevin Bolinger, Interim Department Chair CIMT

TO: CAAC

FROM: Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology

DATE: December 9, 2013

RE: Departmental Unification

EESE and CIMT concur with the request for a merger and are seeking approval from CAAC. The details for the merger will be worked out with the Dean of the Bayh College of Education, Dean Kandi Hill-Clarke, and Provost Biff Williams.

Indiana State University
More. From day one.

Department of Elementary, Early and Special Education

Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
812-237-2840
Fax: 812-237-8208

Date: October 3, 2013

To: Dr. Kandi Hill-Clarke
Dean, Bayh College of Education

Dr. Richard Williams
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Unification of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, & Media Technology with the Department of Elementary, Early Childhood, and Special Education.

A combined faculty meeting was held on Monday, September 23, 2013 to consider a merger of the departments of Elementary, Early Childhood and Special Education and Curriculum Instruction and Media Technology, as directed by Provost Williams and Dean Hill-Clarke. The departments were directed to review the previously presented proposal for merging as originally composed by then Provost Jack Maynard by October 15, 2013. Three options were considered and deliberated at this meeting. Those options were:

1. Forward a notice to the Dean and the Provost by October 15, 2013 that the departments were not in favor of a merger, with rationale.
2. Forward a notice to the Dean and the Provost by October 15, 2013 that the departments were willing to merge with a basic outline as to an administrative structure along with a statement of additional supports needed to facilitate the merger and a basic timeline through which tasks associated with the merger would be accomplished.
3. Forward a notice to the Dean and the Provost by October 2, 2013 that the departments would request an extension of time in order to consider the proposed merger with specific timelines through which the departments would accomplish specific tasks required for planning a successful merger.

Twenty-three faculty and staff, representing a majority of the faculty and staff from both departments, were in attendance. Seventeen of the twenty-three attendees voted to support option two above.

A Program Unification Committee consisting of faculty and staff representatives from both departments was created. This committee subsequently met on several occasions to respond to the outlining and drafting of information requested in option two above. The committee's efforts and recommendations were forwarded to all faculty and staff after each meeting with a request for response regarding the committee's work. Subsequent meetings of this committee considered each response received and modified previous work as deemed appropriate.

The Program Unification Committee is now providing you with the information outlined in option two above as attachment A. This document delineates the administrative structure and supports that will be required to facilitate a successful merger of the two departments. A timeline for the merger is also *specified*, concluding with a formal merger of the existing two departments to become effective at the beginning of the fall semester of 2015.

Additional planning work will begin after the departments receive confirmation that the Board of Trustees supports the proposed administrative positions; additional resources and merger timeline.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this matter,

For the Program Unification Committee

James A. Jacobs, Professor and Chair
Program Unification Committee
Department of Early Childhood, Elementary and Special Education and,
Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology
Bayh College of Education
Indiana State University
401 N. 7th Street
Terre Haute, IN 47809

CC: Chris McDonald
BCOE Congress Chair

Funding Request for Proposed EESE/CIMT Department Merger

Assumptions are based upon full operational merger to occur at the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year.

1. **Planning Resources**

One merger planning coordinator from each department with (1) course buyout in Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Fall 2015	$6000 per semester	$24,000
Stipends for faculty summer planning Summer 2014, Summer 2015.	$2000 per faculty per summer term	$24,000
Five combined faculty all day working retreats (each working retreat will be used to invest all faculty in the merger process and give feedback on planning committee's work).	$1800 per retreat	$9,000
Planning Resources subtotal		$57,000

2. **Operational Resources (Per academic Year)**

Three Administrative assistant upgrades to student services II	Avg increase, $1.50 per hour for a combined 5850 work hours annually	$8,775
Maintain 10 Graduate Assistantships in combined department (Graduate assistantships provided by School of Graduate Studies).	N/A	N/A
Five course buyout per semester for program coordination	$3000 per buyout	$30,000
Two student workers @20 hours each (Currently one student worker is employed, additional student worker represents an actual increase of $4800)	$2400 each student per semester	$9,600 ($4,800)
Chairperson Stipend Chair (stipend and buyout remain the same)	$8,000 per academic year	$8,000
Chairperson 2 course release	$6000 per semester	$12,000
Release of one chair position (one chair buyout added back into budget)	-$8,000 stipend -$12,000 release	($20,000)
Net funding increase annually		$23,575

Notes:

1. An additional one time budget request must be provided for anticipated expenses associated with the acquisition of supplies, material, printed material and related items associated with the change of the combined department name.

Indiana State University
More. From day one.

Bayh College of Education

Bayh College of Education Congress

Monday, October 14, 2013

Unapproved Minutes

Members Present: W. Barratt, D. Quatroche, J. Jacobs, M. Howard-Hamilton, M. Nail, F. Lai, S. Davis, M. Hare, L. Nellis, Associate Dean Collins (ex officio), Dean Hill-Clarke (ex officio)

Members Absent: C. MacDonald

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:03 pm by S. Davis.

2. Minutes for September 9, 2013 were approved. Motion passed (Quatoroche, Jacobs; 8-0-0). ,).

3. New Business
   a) CDCSEP Program Proposal – Clinical Mental Health Counseling M.S.
   Dr. Catherine Tucker shared information regarding the proposal for revisions to the M.S. Clinical Mental Health Counseling program. Associate Dean Collins confirmed that all necessary consultation forms have been obtained and that needed syllabi have been submitted. The proposal was approved. (Barratt, Lai; 7-0-2).

   b) BCOE Scholarship and Awards Committee
   A motion was made (Quatroche, Jacobs) to review and discuss the proposed language regarding for the BCOE Constitution. M. Howard-Hamilton suggested adding a listing of awards/scholarships for which the committee is responsible. Associate Dean Collins requested that a general reference to any newly established awards also be included. A motion was made (Barratt, Quatroche) to table the discussion to allow expansion of the proposed language.

   c) Merger of EESE and CIMT Departments

   A motion to accept the presented letter from the EESE and CIMT Program Unification Committee passed (Howard-Hamilton, Nellis; 9-0-0). J. Jacobs provided a brief historical background of the proposed merger and the unificiation committee's decision. K. Bollinger clarified the role of the BCOE Congress and noted that Faculty Senate will also be revieweing the proposal before submitting for Board of Trustee approval at the December meeting.

4. Old Business
   None

5. Faculty Senate Representative Report
   None

6. Dean's Report
   No update from Dean Hill-Clark was provided. Associate Dean Collins requested that the Congress Secretary work with her to facilitate distribution of upcoming meeting agendas and materials and posting of approved minutes until a replacement for S. Weir is identified.

7. Chair's Report
   None

8. Open Discussion
   None

9. Meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m. (Jacobs, Howard-Hamilton; 9-0-0).

Respectfully submitted by,
Leah Neills
Congress Secretary