

**INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014**

The University Faculty Senate will meet at 3:30pm, Thursday, November 14, 2013 in Dede III

**AGENDA**

I. Memorial Resolutions: Dr. Kukarisas, Dr. Mausel

II. Administrative Report: President Bradley, Provost Williams

III. Chair Report: Steve Lamb

IV. Support Staff Report: Karen Buchholz

V. SGA Report: Logan Valentine

VI. Part-Time/Temporary Faculty Advocate: Michelle Mohran

VII. Approval of the Minutes of October 17, 2013

VIII. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

IX. Proposed Revisions to the Masters in Athletic Training Program, Lindsey Eberman

X. Proposal for Doctorate in Athletic Training, Leamor Kahanov

XI. FAC Item, Voting Rights for Chair Removal, Darlene Hantzis

XII. AAC Informational Item, Change in Position Title: "Executive Director of Strategic Initiatives and Director of Enterprise Services," Nora Hopkins

XIII. Degree Maps, Susan Powers

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

Thursday, November 14, 2013, 3:30pm, Dede III

**Minutes**

**Members Attending:** A. Anderson, C. Ball, K. Berlin, L. Borrero, S. Buchanan, J. Conant, R. Fairchild, R. Guell, M. Haque, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, N. Hopkins, B. Kilp, S. Lamb, K. Lee, R. Lugar, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, M. Miller, A. Morales, C. Olsen, C. Paterson, R. Peters, M. Schafer, R. Schneirov, V. Sheets, E. Strigas, C. Tucker, B. Yousif, K. Yousif

**Members Absent:** C. Fischer, E. Hampton, D. Richards

**Ex-Officios Present:** D. Bradley, R. Williams, J. Boyd, L. Maule, B. McLaren, Y. Petersen, R. English, D. Collins, G. Youngen, J. Waldron for L. Valentine

**Visitors Present:** L. Eberman, D. Hantzis, L. Kahanov, R. Perrin, S. Powers, J. Powers, R. Stafford

1) Memorial Resolutions:

- a) Ada Kukurisas, written by Robert Perrin
  - i) Ada Kukurisas completed an AB in English in 1965, with minors in History and Latin; an MS in English in 1970; and a sixth-year certificate, all at Indiana State University.

Kukurisas began work at ISU at the Laboratory School in 1965. While there, she taught classes at all levels—from seventh to twelfth grades—and proved herself equally adept at teaching disadvantaged students in the regular curriculum and gifted students in the humanities curriculum. In 1978, she transferred from the Laboratory School to the Department of English, where she taught composition and children’s literature classes until her retirement in 1988. Her teaching was honored with a Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award in 1980.

During her twenty-three years at ISU, Kukurisas served on the Faculty Senate for three terms (including membership on the Executive Committee), was a member of the Board of the University Club (serving one term as President), was a member of the Faculty Women’s Club (also serving one term as President), and a member of ISU’s chapter of AAUP (serving one term as Treasurer). In her ten years in the Department of English, Kukurisas served on the Composition Committee and the English Education Committee. Kukurisas was also a long-standing and active member of the National Education Association, National Council of Teachers of English, Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Sigma Tau Delta (the English honorary society), Phi Delta Kappa, and Delta Kappa Gamma.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to her family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which she gave to her students, the Department of English, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

- b) Paul Mausel, written by Russell Stafford
  - i) Paul W. Mausel joined Indiana State University's geography faculty in 1971. He completed his bachelor's degree in geography from University of Minnesota in 1959 and earned his master's degree (geography) from Minnesota in 1948. He received his doctorate (geography and soils) from University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill in 1966.

After teaching at the Eastern Illinois University (1965-1971), he joined the faculty at Indiana State University where he taught in the Department of Geography and Geology (later the Department of Geography, Geology, and Anthropology) from 1971-2001. A pioneer in the field of remote sensing, Paul was the founding director of ISU's Remote Sensing Lab in 1973, and served in this capacity until 1998. He retired from ISU as Professor Emeritus in 2001.

His teaching and research specialties included remote sensing and soil science. He was the chairperson of 11 completed M.A.'s, served on 55 PhD dissertation committees, and was chairperson of 37 doctoral committees during his tenure at Indiana State University. He was concerned about his student's success and was respected by them.

Dr. Mausel was principal investigator or co-principal investigator on approximately 50 externally funded projects that collectively brought more than \$2 million of external funds to ISU. Of particular note was his work on deforestation and human impacts on land cover in the Amazon rainforest, a project sponsored by NASA. He continued to be a productive researcher after his retirement as evidenced by two of his most recent grants totaling more than \$500,000 from NSF and NASA. He published more than 150 articles and book chapters in national and international journals, such as *The Professional Geographer*, *Soil Science Society of America*, *Geocarto International*, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, and *Human Ecology*. Paul also made more than 100 presentations at professional meetings.

He was an avid golfer and tennis player. Paul is survived by his wife, Jean; a daughter, Catherine Herrin of Terre Haute; two sons, Brandon Mausel of Newark, Del., and Justin Mausel of Washington, D.C.; and five grandchildren.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further expresses its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of Earth and Environmental Systems, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

2) Administrative Report: President Bradley, Provost Williams

- a) D. Bradley:
  - i) The Senate has been very interested in the change in health insurance rates coming up; Human Resources and Staff Benefits are working directly with employees to continue to encourage screening as well as the Tobacco Affidavit. Two new screenings have been scheduled for December. We have encouraged more people to apply for the subsidy as well. The plan today is that in the January/February time frame we would analyze the data and the committee will look at it and see if there is some need for a change in the way it's done. We won't wait a full year to analyze it. I hope that gives people some confidence about affordability of health insurance.
  - ii) Normal Hall and the Track and Field projects are on next week's ICHE agenda, however the Downtown Housing project is delayed; hopefully it will be added to December's agenda.

- iii) Finally, a decision has been made that December 23<sup>rd</sup> will be added to the Holiday Break.
- b) R. Williams:
  - i) The Biennial Review project is complete. There are 43 individuals that received Exceeds Expectations and they will receive \$1,500 added to their base salary along with their two percent across-the-board raise. With regard to the raises for faculty, if they Meet Expectations, they will receive two percent starting in December but it will be reflected on the January paycheck. A few Deans are still getting their data back to us.
  - ii) We have welcomed two candidates for the position of Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies, and we have two more coming next week. We realize that the time they are to be here makes it hard for faculty to show up, but please do so if you can and tell us what you think. Please also encourage your colleagues to do so.
    - (1) C. Tucker: Is there any way the Open Forums can be held in technology-wired rooms so we can review those if we have class during the time of the open meeting ?
    - (2) R. Williams: That is an excellent suggestion and we will do that for future searches if we can. For this one, though, we won't be able to accommodate that.

3) Chair Report: S. Lamb

a) S. Lamb:

- i) I have added to your agenda today FAC's response to HJR 6, and we will be discussing it directly after the Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion if there are no objections. .
- ii) Dear Colleagues;

I have very short comments to make and they are concerned with the biennial review. Each of the colleges finally submitted about 15% of their eligible faculty for the meritorious portion of the raise. And a very small number were submitted as not meeting expectations. This has been a learning process. I do think that we better understand that for the faculty to have the input necessary into the process, that they are well served by not putting more than 15 % forward. The Provost is morally obligated to set a reasonable limit for each unit in order than one unit does not submit 50 percent of their faculty, and another 20. How we would scream then.

When the departmental units as a whole in the college submit 30 percent of their faculty, it behooves the Dean and the College Committee to pare that number down to 15 percent. This results in more authority/responsibility imposed upon the dean than was desired when the process was designed.

Concerning the very lower number of individuals in the overall below expectations category, I personally believe we have set the bar for failure to high. It is nearly impossible to achieve. An individual has to flunk in two of the three categories in order to be placed in that domain. Frankly, you have to be close to dead to achieve that notoriety.

I do believe we should alter that criteria.

If we flunk in the classroom, if we damage the future of our students by not showing up for class, by not significantly covering the material in the classroom, we have immediately damaged the reputation of the University and more importantly failed our students.

The Ex. Committee has asked FAC to consider new criteria, that would state if you achieve below expectations in teaching, (if you are damaging our students and our reputation) that would be sufficient to achieve overall below expectations. And still if you are below expectations in the other two categories, you would achieve overall below expectations.

Certainly, it is the responsibility of FAC to examine the process at the end of every cycle and make improvements.. We have very good leadership in that group. I would like them to consider suggestions from all those involved with the process. Darlene, Please be inclusive.

Frankly, I have never been in favor of this binary process , ( A continuous scale worked extremely well in my unit) but that is what we have. I think we must stay with it and modify it, until the outcomes are satisfactory in the Senates mind. It is the senate that will either accept or reject changes.

- 4) Support Staff Report: K. Buchholz: Absent
- 5) SGA Report: J. Waldron for L. Valentine:
  - a) J. Waldron
    - i) We are promoting the Indiana Lifeline Law Program which will take place on Monday, November 18<sup>th</sup>.
    - ii) We had a successful Letters for Larry Campaign. This gave the students the opportunity to write letters for Larry Bird that we hung up in Hulman Center. We ended up getting over 800 letters from students.
    - iii) We are currently working on a Study Tip video for students to have during Study Week.
    - iv) This week SGA is co-sponsoring Heritage Week. There are events every night until Saturday, November 16.
    - v) We are also currently working on Spring Schedules for everyone in the office.
  - 6) Part-Time/Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Morahn: Absent
  - 7) **Approval of the Minutes of October 17, 2013: A. Anderson-N. Hopkins; Vote: 31-0-0**
    - a) S. Buchanan requested minutes be changed to reflect his absence from meeting.
  - 8) Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion:
    - a) N. Hopkins:
      - i) I want to return to the Provost with a question about the lines. According to my chair you have allocated lines to colleges but it was not indicated which lines were Tenure-Track. Did you have the lines in certain pools? Is there certain criteria?
      - ii) R. Williams: I left it to the Deans to have those conversations with their chairpersons. They are to get back to me, and most of them have. We are going to balance that on a case-by-case basis.
      - iii) N. Hopkins: So they have to have your approval once they tell you what they think is right?
      - iv) R. Williams: Yes.
    - b) S. Buchanan: I would like to ask an opinion mainly from L. Maule or the SGA representative. I have real concerns about our fall schedule. We go 13 weeks without a break. In my experience, last year they were not prepared for finals after Thanksgiving Break.
      - i) J. Waldron: We actually brought that up recently. For students who live farther away, they have the chance to go home with a full week off, and they enjoy that. We are going to come up with a survey soon.
      - ii) N. Hopkins: We [in the Administrative Affairs Committee] were meeting on this today. Our idea is to still have the whole week off for Thanksgiving but have classes start on Monday of the first week. That would allow us to restore the day we lost plus have a Fall Break day in October.
      - iii) R. Guell: We would have to move the opening day for faculty reporting ahead two days as well.
      - iv) N. Hopkins: That also came up.
      - v) D. Bradley: Since we have lots of time before it comes up again we should deliberate.
      - vi) N. Hopkins: Deliberation, yes, and due caution, but not dropped.
      - vii) D. Bradley: I am concerned that students come back from break and they have finals one week later, though it only happens once every five or six years.
      - viii) L. Maule: I can tell from our students that they're exhausted. No matter what they're going through, it's a real exhaustion. They needed a break earlier and they too are concerned about coming back to Study Week.

c) R. Guell:

The Value of Shared Governance

Last year around this time I was charged with writing and giving a fire-breathing statement at the Senate on the issue of shared governance. At that time we were talking about the policy on policies. This month has re-enforced my belief in the value of shared governance and re-enforced my fear that we, the faculty, are sometimes greater threats to its continued existence than the administration.

Let me explain by starting with a few things that have transpired on the health insurance front. As you are well-aware the ISU health insurance premium scheme is changing and in a way that may severely hurt those at the lower end of the income scale. The Executive Committee has repeatedly raised requests for modifications that would ease that potential burden on our less-fortunate staff and colleagues. To date the administration has responded by opening up more screenings, extended the date for subsidy applications and tobacco affidavits, and agreed to liberal instructions to staff benefits regarding qualifying for the subsidy. This has placed a burden on Diann McKee's people in Business Affairs. Candy Barton and her staff will be working harder and longer to deal with their usual year-end issues because the President has agreed to these extensions. The weekly Exec meetings with the administration, the opportunities to question, grill, request, and cajole on subjects well outside the typical purview of faculty wouldn't exist without shared governance's "advisory authority." We are able to perform constituent service because the administration shares governance with us.

Now there are times when the administration has threatened shared governance and when they have we have gone appropriately ballistic. In particular, I have directed sometimes profanity-laced rants at the administration and, while later apologizing for the incivility, have stuck by the underlying message.

However, this fall the greater threat to share governance came when we didn't live up to our end of this shared governance bargain. That is, we did not sufficiently and rigorously judge ourselves during the biennial review. One college originally nominated more than a third of its faculty as exceeding expectations. Only one college nominated anyone for failing to meet expectations, and even then it was only 3. Lake Wobegon may be a fictional Minnesota town but it must have a real-life university faculty: ISU. The Provost quite rightly sent several college recommendations back to their colleges. Still, in too many cases that left the Dean and the Dean alone to make the hard calls. If we had wanted to create a more Dean-dependent performance evaluation system, we couldn't have. Moreover, had we submitted a recommendation three years ago that Deans would have nearly unilateral authority to choose those performing above expectations, it would have been sounding and justly defeated by this body. We didn't create such a system, de jure, but we allowed it to occur de facto because we, the faculty, didn't judge ourselves against the words or spirit of the policy we created. We intentionally created a system by which we could ensure that our students would not be perpetually subject to unacceptable instruction and persistent unavailability without those faculty being appropriately addressed with improvement plans. What we got fell far short of that. In falling short, and in a political environment when university faculty are not the automatically trusted species we once were, we threatened something we cherish the most, shared governance.

d) T. Hawkins:

i) I want to comment on the Biennial Review. I have been involved in its construction for a number of years and we should all provide faculty with our perception of the process. I think that would be the dominant issue FAC will deal with in the spring. My belief is that we have created a monster, and with all due respect to S. Lamb, we should dismantle it and start from scratch. Please send your comments to FAC, D. Hantzis, and myself so we may have these discussions.

e) N. Hopkins:

- i) I have to follow up on what R. Guell said—specifically he referenced Colleges and Departments that didn't send forth anyone who was below standard. I would hope that he would also thank those that did.
  - ii) S. Lamb: Before, when we were operating on continuous scale, we had a range of two to ten and we had better raises for those who achieved greatly as well as minimal raises for those who hit bottom. There was a great difference between those who did well and those who didn't. In my mind this present process did not work very well. I understand that we wanted a process that was “simple.” That was the goal—three pages—and that portion did work well, it is sustainable, but I am of mixed mind with T. Hawkins’ position. I believe we badly need an evaluation process. I believe that is critical to the health of the University. We need to reward those who are meritorious. My empathies are with T. Hawkins, But please, let's continue with modifying this present process until we have a replacement that is fully ready to go. I know that no process is perfect. There are improvements but there will never be a process that will be seen as fair to every individual. That doesn't exist. We can modify it, change it entirely, but don't give up the process of evaluating your peers. It was once in the purview of Deans and Associate Deans, and it was divisive. Hold on to that peer evaluation component. Let us attempt to modify that which we have.
- f) R. Lugar:
- i) I had a question about the expectations of the next round: we should root out those who don't meet expectations, but could Colleges have faculty who all achieve expectations?
  - ii) S. Lamb: People are looking at the process and saying, “What do I need to do to make a good contribution?” I still feel that with this given process we can improve upon it. We are damaging our students, if faculty are being unreasonable with our grades and if faculty are effectively “retiring early.”
  - iii) R. Lugar: If those are the circumstances within a College, if the expectations are being met, will it be acceptable the next round?
  - iv) S. Lamb: That's our goal, but I don't think we're there now. I don't agree with the Deans' perception that we have a much higher number that fall in the Below Expectations category. It's hard, very hard, to meet the present criteria of failure. That is the problem. The problem is the instrument.
  - v) C. Paterson: I understand your perspective, but I do have a reflection: people are “retiring early,” but is it the place of the Biennial Review to discipline them? To me that's a lot of burden to place on a process that only happens once every two years.
  - vi) S. Lamb: Frankly there have been dismissals for behavior that is most inappropriate. Frequently, there is an agreement between the faculty member and the administration so that the details never reach the public. Situations like rampant plagiarism, for instance, have happened here. I think we do take it upon ourselves to be part of the process to identify those who are not doing well and it is our goal to modify and improve, but there are different scenarios, individual cases, etc. Let us, though, do as much as we can to be part of the process of improving ourselves.
  - vii) R. Schneirov: In response to R. Guell, maybe we were undermining this sense of accord that we have in shared governance. The question I have is, what criteria are we using to say that a number of faculty is a good number for being Below Expectations?
  - viii) S. Lamb: I think, again, given the criteria that are specified in this document, three individuals is the correct number. It is as I predicted. It is very hard to be a failure in two categories. Research is a challenge for many of us, but being responsible in the classroom, being able to contribute service in one way or another...we have only truly carried out the process one time. I do think we did end up identifying a quality set of those who should be recognized. We had success in that domain. In

answer to the question, yes, three was the correct number given this specific flawed process.. But the document, the process, needs to be changed. We need to be more accountable to perform reasonably acceptable in the classroom. I also feel we need to recognize a larger percentage of our faculty for contributing exceptionally.

- ix) R. Schneirov: I agree with a lot of what you are saying, but I do think the process we have now is not the kind of process that will improve teaching, for example. If we need to improve and everyone needs to be constantly working in teaching, we need a process that all are invited into and all of us need to commit to improvement. If you use a punitive approach, for example like in industry, they recommend that it does not work—and this is what it is. This is not the way to do it.
- x) M. Schafer: I agree that teaching should be a primary factor, but I see it as a problem because I see over the years we have faced problems with teaching as a primary factor.
- xi) N. Hopkins: R. Schneirov here is saying the punitive approach doesn't work, but for some of those who are doing a poor job in the classroom that's the only approach that works.
- xii) S. Lamb: I agree. There are a very small set of faculty that we should say goodbye to. If they modify their behavior, then fine.
- xiii) R. Schneirov: We went through this a couple of years ago and one thing brought up then still applies today: there are other ways besides putting a punitive tag on someone. We have a better process. We made a distinction back then.
- xiv) S. Lamb: All evidence should be part of the process you describe. If you have an individual that you are trying to get to go to class, for example, and teach effectively—if you have that body of evidence, I think that is sufficient to act upon already. This would be additional evidence. It would also prove that they didn't respond to criticism.

**9) Motion to Approve FAC Recommendation in Response to Charge to Review Indiana Public Policy HJR 6 and Consider Recommending Institutional Action: A. Anderson-K. Yousif; Vote: 23-6-1**

- a) D. Hantzi:
  - i) We didn't include in the motion the joint resolution itself. It states, "Only a marriage between one (1) man and one (1) woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Indiana. A legal status identical or substantially similar to that of marriage for unmarried individuals shall not be valid or recognized." We were asked to meet about this approximately 10 days ago, and FAC was pleased to be asked to make this our priority. We took up this issue and did our research, and we're charged ourselves with three questions: Is it appropriate and reasonable for public institutions to pronounce a position on public policy initiatives? Is it appropriate and reasonable for the Faculty Senate to offer a statement on behalf of the faculty in matters such as these? What is an appropriate response to the proposed constitutional amendment? Each motion was approved unanimously. Dr. Bradley thinks our response was long, I don't disagree with that. In any case Ball State's Faculty Senate is voting on that as well today. An explanation follows after our decision to vote unanimously. The language was drafted very hurriedly and there are several paragraphs addressing the three issues circulating in the public domain. Freedom Indiana is raising the economic issues, and educational institutions are addressing issues as well. We decided we should take a stance and oppose.
  - ii) R. Schneirov: We should have the ability to take these stands on policy issues, but we should have taken stands on two other things that are going to gut our Foundational Studies program. The statement is too long, because they're busy and there are many statements about these issues coming to the fore. It should be short and it should be hard-hitting. I am also concerned that there are many times in here where our points are overstated. Some things are overstated in my view.

- iii) S. Lamb: It is the case that there is more than one body that is going to submit statements to our President on this issue. The President is not bound to respond, and I would be very surprised if he would present the statement in its entirety to any legislators. I'm sure he will effectively determine the essence of our position to the legislators. I know some of you don't paint pictures like I do, you related word by word.
- iv) B. Yousif: Is this the one offering benefits to same-sex couples?
- v) D. Bradley: There are already statutes that, if not verbatim, are very close. In essence this is symbolic. Why they want to move forward on this is beyond my understanding in and of itself. They would have to pass another law that says we can't offer benefits to same-sex partners. If nothing is added or substituted it would be on the 2014 ballot.
- vi) A. Morales: I think the answer to number one is "no." Not because it's morally and ethically reprehensible, but because it's necessary that we do address all bills in some fashion that are going to affect us as an institution as opposed to the moral stance. I would like to take a stand on things that do affect them directly.
- vii) N. Hopkins: I think this is not something this body should do. I find the current law in Indiana reprehensible, as an individual, not as a faculty member at ISU. I feel we are overstepping our bounds by doing this.
- viii) D. Malooley: I have a statement prepared that I would like to add. To express a position as being the position of the Faculty of the University implies that all Faculty, or their elected representatives, do indeed hold this position. Having polled as many of the faculty from my College I could, they either express a position that the University should not be involved in such matters or expressed disagreement with the stated position of this proposal. Again, one cannot say "the faculty" without knowing the will of "the faculty." What evidence could possibly exist to say invention and discover thrive only in this or that environment? I would dare to say that throughout history many inventions and discoveries have been successfully made in just the opposite environment. Again, a sweeping generalization without evidence or documentation. We will very likely fail in our efforts to continue to recruit and retain excellent faculty and staff committed to professional achievement, student success, and community service if we are unable to provide an environment that respects and support them and their colleagues. This statement makes a value judgment on any faculty, staff, or student who may disagree or hold any other position as not being committed to professional achievement, student success, etc. I would propose that those individuals would be greatly offended at being judged in this manner. In my experience I have never witnessed any candidate choosing not to come to ISU as a result of the laws already in place in the State of Indiana. If this statement had merit, then institutions in this and a majority of the United States would be failing to attract and keep faculty, staff, or students. If such a document was presented as a Masters or Doctoral thesis or project containing such broad unsupportable statements, I would hope that it would be immediately returned to the student as being unsupported and/or hearsay.
- ix) D. Hantzis: There are lots of voices out there. Today Purdue is the only university out there that didn't make a statement stating "we shouldn't do this." The Executive Committee wanted you to see this unedited so you may decide for yourselves what should be said. Nothing prevents us from doing anything against our own will. I hope we disagree with each other on the way to achieving a consensus. If a statement can be made public, I'm sure we can say "most of the faculty" or "a majority of the faculty."
- x) S. Lamb: If you think the majority of them think this way, you should endorse this statement. It is our responsibility to act as a representative government.

**10) Proposed Revisions to the Masters in Athletic Training Program, as merged with the Proposal for Doctorate in Athletic Training, N. Hopkins – C. Patterson; Vote: 28-2-0**

- a) S. Lamb:
- i) I wanted us to deal with both the Masters and Doctorate programs at the same time. Motion to approve both:
  - ii) L. Eberman: We are wanting to merge these two initiatives. Essentially in our profession we are seeing a shift to the Masters level. With it we cannot have two Masters Programs with the same name, and as such, the proposal for the Doctorate came about. We are essentially shifting what happens at the Baccalaureate level to the Masters, and the Masters to the Doctorate. We created it with an emphasis on clinical outcomes research which is the culminating experience. With this change essentially what we are doing is not eliminating a graduate degree program but a concentration at the Baccalaureate level. We will maintain medical at the Baccalaureate level and will essentially move into the applied medicine concentration. The shift of the profession to the Masters will likely occur nationwide by 2020. If we do not initiate this program we will eliminate the most professional program we are capable of doing, losing money in contracts as well as affiliation with agencies we currently work with.
  - iii) N. Hopkins: For the proposed Masters, you have some courses that are listed two to six hours, but you say six hours are required. Are these courses used in other programs as well?
  - iv) L. Eberman: We are not modifying that course number, but the idea is that it's research that they would take for two credits three separate times.
  - v) N. Hopkins: Also, are you proposing a Masters and a Ph.D.?
  - vi) L. Eberman: Not a Ph.D., a Clinical Doctorate.
  - vii) N. Hopkins: Why would an employer want someone with a Doctorate? Is there a market?
  - viii) L. Eberman: Seventy to eighty percent of trainers pursue an advanced degree. The proposed program is unique. Our students would leave with marketable skills. Once the program moves up the need occurs simply because that's the only way one would get specialized training.
  - ix) N. Hopkins: And employers do want this?
  - x) L. Eberman: Seventy to eighty percent require advanced specialized training for employment.
  - xi) L. Kahanov: There's going to be a need for those at the Doctoral level to teach the Masters level students. The specialty here is education. We're the only one with that distinction out of 16 programs.
  - xii) N. Hopkins: Are your students taking other things at that accelerated level?
  - xiii) L. Eberman: It's not a dual degree. Likely part of the Applied Medicine concentration will be at the undergraduate level. There are several prerequisites in the Applied Medicine concentration.
  - xiv) S. Buchanan: Does this have to go through an accrediting body?
  - xv) L. Eberman: It's an abbreviated self-study. It's naturally occurring. Right now we have the maximum accreditation on both programs so we don't anticipate any problems there.
  - xvi) R. Schneirov: Will the changes being discussed require new faculty lines?
  - xvii) L. Eberman: No.

**11) Motion to Approve FAC Recommendation Extending Voting Rights for Chair Removal to Instructors  
B. Kilp-J. Conant 12-16-0**

- a) M. Harmon:
- i) D. Hantzis is no longer here, but I was involved in this as well, on whether Instructors should be able to vote for chair removal. We didn't find any evidence to believe they should be excluded since they

are Instructors. We were afraid the chair might influence their vote. We rejected it because others feel that way as well.

- ii) R. Guell: If you remember the long, torturous process by which we did this for the past two years, you will remember that S. Lamb and I believe the issue of chair removal and appointment ought not be allowed by Instructors. We clearly lost that issue and this fixes a piece of the issue but does not fix it in its entirety. The FAC motion fixes the removal but not the selection. I would like to offer the changes in 350.1, 350.5, and 350.5.3.1 (document after minutes). I would like to change these phrases to reflect “regular” faculty only.

**(1) Motion to Amend the motion to extend to Instructors Voting Rights on Chair Selection. R.**

**Guell-A. Anderson. Vote: 27-1.0**

- (a) R. Peters: Would that also mean that a multi-year faculty member could also be a Chairperson? In all of this we're also saying that too. Is there anything that precludes a Chairperson from being a multi-year contract faculty member? It's not precluded in the Handbook.
- (b) R. Guell: Hypothetically, practically, what does it matter?
- (c) B. Kilp: The Instructors are hired by whom? Whom do they answer to?
- (d) S. Lamb: They are evaluated every year by the faculty.
- (e) B. Kilp: So is it the same kind of status?
- (f) R. Guell: That is what was developed last year. Steve and I raised that part concerning that K. Yousif and B. Yousif said, “Why don't you fix the system that outlines reviews by peers?” The whole thing failed in August of last year. Simultaneously FAC put in the effort of the nontenured evaluation system. It mimics that of tenured faculty.
- (g) S. Lamb: It passed in part due to the great effort put forth by V. Sheets and J. Conant for having the vote for multi-year faculty. We're going to change the Handbook if this thing passes.
- (h) B. Kilp: The reason we were concerned is that we were fearful that Instructors would be so concerned about voting against the Chair it would put their job in jeopardy. My second point is, when, if this is passed, would it go into effect?
- (i) S. Lamb: Today. Not retroactively.
- (j) D. Malooley: R. Guell, your three amendments here need to say regular in addition to these others, so we would be modifying four sections of the Handbook?
- (k) R. Guell: Yes.
- (l) N. Hopkins: There is a difference even with what we passed last year. For the Tenure-Track faculty they don't need to be rehired by the Chair. The presumption is the faculty committee in the department says they're doing okay, and the Chair, the Dean, they will continue, whereas the others, even if the others say they are doing okay, they are still at risk.
- (m) S. Lamb: It is true—other institutions are going this route and removing this individuals from second-class citizenship.
- (n) R. Schneirov: Looking for protections when it comes to the vote. For example, a party other than the Dean should be charged with conduct investigations. I would like to see another protection put in, and I think we should stipulate that the vote itself be by secret ballot.
- (o) R. Guell: A signed letter is required by the petitioning faculty.
- (p) R. Schneirov: Shouldn't the vote be by secret ballot?
- (q) R. Guell: I believe that's the Dean trying to bounce the Chair. When the faculty do it, they do it by letter, and that triggers an investigation. It's reported by the Dean to the Provost, and the

- decision is made there. When the Dean does it he must solicit a vote. That isn't being addressed here.
- (r) S. Lamb: Right now we're concerned with R. Guell's amendment. We will get back to the following revisions in the Handbook.
  - (s) D. Bradley: I think that for clarification, just because someone is making good progress toward tenure, that doesn't mean they will automatically be renewed. A Tenure-Track faculty member could also be removed if they are not making progress. Continuation is not only due to competency.
  - (t) B. Yousif: What is the rationale behind having something besides just regular faculty members? A situation could occur that this is not reflective of a department. The majority could not be tenured. The composition could not be accurately represented.
  - (u) R. Guell: I originally did that without it, and D. Hantzis expressed that the parentheticals are that if it was entirely Instructors, though we are attempting to raise them to a higher level, I don't think we are raising them to the pinnacle. A professor who has a 30-40 year life expectancy with a department should have more than an Instructor with a 3-4 year life expectancy.
- iii) J. Conant: I would like to remind my colleagues that I don't like to make policy on special cases, but we are talking about a department asking for a different chair. There is not a more dangerous situation in higher ed for non-tenure track than this one. We should make the best efforts we can. I've been here 33 years and have seen 3 or 4 situations like this and they are nasty inside and outside the department. There is no place for an Instructor that has to be rehired by that chair or that replacement to hide. There is a difference. As a long-term chair, without having to get into it all, I know this is very dangerous for these people. We have to find every way in these rare situations to protect them.
- iv) S. Lamb: I have been asked to have a secret ballot on this. Motion to table: 6 for, 21 opposed.
- v) B. Kilp: I believe we already have a couple of departments who have nontenured faculty.
- vi) B. Yousif: What if you don't have Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty in the department?
- vii) R. Guell: You don't have to have them; there are other provisions in the department.
- viii) B. Kilp: So they can't even vote on the most important thing in their department?
- ix) S. Lamb: I have been a long-time chair as well, and J. Conant's argument has hit hard.
- x) R. Guell: That's why we made the amendment.

## **12) Motion to Approve SAC Proposal for the Composition of the Student Success Council: A. Anderson-**

### **J. Conant Motion to Table 21-4**

- a) S. Lamb:
  - i) Both SAC and FAC reviewed this. Article 7c in front of you garnered a vote of 4-4 in Executive Committee and so it did not pass. The SAC motion agreed with the language proposed by the SSC and passed unanimously. It has been put forward for your consideration. A. Anderson, J. Conant.
  - ii) **Motion to Table 8-20-0** A. Morales- N. Hopkins
  - iii) S. Lamb: Any discussion?
  - iv) N. Hopkins: This may seem like beating a dead horse, but it seems like an awfully large group. While what they do is relevant to student success, I don't know why certain administrators need to be on the group.
  - v) J. Powers: It has been a working group for four years now. As we've grown and matured, there was a desire that it should be represented by more faculty. To move from one to two and a third would be from the Foundational Studies Council, which by definition would be a faculty member. There were

many conversations about size, and what you see before you is what seemed like the right placement.

- vi) M. Haque: FAC of course thought we needed one person from every unit which would bring us to six. It was apparently a concern in Executive Committee that the same office would be represented multiple times, and we wanted to keep it at a smaller size, but we wished to still have all six faculty represented.
- vii) J. Conant: My understanding is that this is not a policy-making body. I don't understand—why not more faculty?
- viii) S. Lamb: In defense of having additional working members and administrators on the body, it is because it's not a policy-making body and those individuals that have to deal with the nuts and bolts of student success needed that number to bounce ideas off of. Why did the FAC motion fail? I think perhaps it was comments made by B. Kilp who said we're down to smaller faculty every year and our goal is even smaller. We have so many committees now that we're chewing ourselves up. J. Powers said to let him have a year to see how this new SAC proposition works out.
- ix) J. Powers: I guess the other piece is that we recognized that faculty should have a voice in these things. We have just developed a subcommittee structure where other faculty will be able to participate in the process.
- x) N. Hopkins: Given the size of this committee as it is being proposed, how do you find the time to all meet, and how often?
- xi) J. Powers: There are those in this room who can share; we meet once a month for 90 minutes and the subcommittees would be an additional 90 minutes for their work. We have good attendance.
- xii) C. MacDonald: It's a standing time, and we are well aware of the meeting times for the entire year. It works out well.
- xiii) J. Conant: When you're dealing with a complex topic as this that has so many important aspects to it, I'm not sure I can represent what is and isn't important to those of health sciences, education, etc. We make many mistakes because we haven't thought about those aspects before, and have to go back and clean them up. I don't see what the problem is with having those extra voices.

**(1) Motion to Substitute the FAC recommendation J. Conant-K Yousif**

- (2) S. Lamb: Discussion?
- (3) R. Guell: I believe one of the other key voices in the room of the 4-4 Executive Committee who voted against it was the President, who said he wouldn't take it to the Board of Trustees. I'd like to hear from him.
- (4) D. Bradley: The Provost and I will discuss it and get back to you about what we think about it.
- (5) S. Lamb: So pull the first one and put in the second one?
- (6) R. Lugar: I'm new, so take this as a novice comment, but if this is an advisory committee, why would this group determine how many would sit on it? I don't understand why we would vote on the number.
- (7) S. Lamb: It's a Handbook language change.
- (8) D. Malooley: What is the motion?
- (9) S. Lamb: To substitute the FAC motion for the SAC motion. The FAC motion concerned is the membership part of it.
- (10) R. Guell: Substantively it is to add representatives from each College and remove duplicate reporting lines such as Director of Housing, Transportation, etc.
- (11) J. Conant: I just want to add the faculty.
- (12) R. Guell: You want to bring it to 29?

(13) J. Conant: As many as possible. Why do they have to do something to change based on our advice?

(a) T. Hawkins: I think tabling it would be the best thing.

**13) Motion to Adjourn 5:23pm**

**Motion in response to charge to review Indiana public policy initiative HJR 6 and consider recommending institutional action.**

Members of FAC reviewed HJR 6 and related legislation, statements in response from public and private Indiana universities and colleges and from other sectors. We discussed several questions:

1. Is it appropriate and reasonable for public institutions to pronounce a position on public policy initiatives?
2. Is it appropriate and reasonable for the Faculty Senate to offer a statement on behalf of the faculty in matters such as these?
3. What is an appropriate response to the proposed constitutional amendment?

By consensus, members of the committee found that it is appropriate and reasonable that the institution state a position on public policies that clearly impact the work and the character of our institution. We also agreed that the Faculty Senate can offer a viewpoint on behalf of the faculty on such matters, as it does on most matters of primary concern to the faculty. Finally, members agreed that the statement offered by ISU should oppose adoption of HJR 6.

The following motion was approved unanimously:

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate recognizes the authority and the responsibility of the elected body of the faculty to offer a statement in response to public policy initiatives that directly and significantly impact our ability to fulfill our mission. Therefore, we recommend that the Executive Committee present to the Senate a statement opposing HJR 6 and that the statement be conveyed to President Bradley as an expression of the position of the ISU Faculty, as determined by the elected representatives of that body. FAC further offers to the Executive Committee the following statement, which reflects the response of members of FAC to the proposed amendment and may serve in the crafting of a statement by the Senate:

The faculty of Indiana State University join colleagues from across Indiana in stating our opposition to the adoption of HJR 6 as an amendment to the Indiana Constitution. The legislation directly violates the primary values of educational institutions that recognize invention and discovery thrive only in environments that privilege inclusiveness and the diversity of ideas and identities it welcomes, protects, and promotes.

We conclude that adoption of this legislation will harm our workplace environment. Individuals will be negatively impacted by the resulting nullification of provisions previously determined by a majority of the faculty and the leadership of the institution to be both right and good. Institutions strive to create and sustain work environments that attract the best and the brightest professionals at every level and that foster their continuing allegiance to the institution. We will very likely fail in our efforts to continue to recruit and retain excellent faculty and staff committed to professional achievement, student success, and community service if we are unable to provide an environment that respects and supports them and their colleagues.

We have no doubt that our ability to serve the best interests of our students--which is in the best interest of the institution and the State--will be compromised by the impacts of the proposed amendment. Not only will we lose students who choose to earn their degrees elsewhere, but we are certain that undergraduate and graduate students who choose to pursue their education at ISU will seek employment opportunities in places that do not similarly restrict basic human rights and impact the quality of life of their peers, colleagues, and fellow community members.

We reject the effort to intervene in the ability of strong, proven public and private institutions to make decisions in service to the goals, missions, and values that make those institutions effective stewards of human and material state resources. We reject arguments that suggest the proposed legislation meets a need not met sufficiently by existing legislation.

We urge state legislators to consider the unarguably negative impacts on the ability of our institutions to serve our populations, to further the work of discovery that will shape our shared futures and those of the next generations, and to provide the basic needs and rights due to all members of our democracy.

**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.

**Department:** Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation

*Click [here](#) for flow diagram*

*Click [here](#) for a sample timeline*

**College:** NA

**Degree Level:** M.S. **CIP Code:** 51.0913 **Major Code:** A173

**Contact Person:** Lindsey E. Eberman

**Program Title:** Athletic Training M.S.

**Phone:** x7694 **Email:** leberman@indstate.edu

**Proposed New Program Title:** Athletic Training

**Track or Concentration Area, If Applicable:** \_\_\_\_\_

**F-2 PROGRAM PROPOSAL FORM**

**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 Appendix III of the CAPS Manual.)**

**Brief Summary:**

Due to the evolution of Athletic Training and the academic requirements within an accredited program, we have voted to transition the BS in Athletic Training, Clinical Concentration to an Entry-Level MS in Athletic Training. Accreditation guidelines, articulated by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) allow entry into the profession at both the bachelors and masters level. With the transition of most other health care professions to a masters or doctoral entry-level degree, we are trying to become consistent with those programs (Physician Assistant Studies, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, etc.). As such, we are transitioning both the BS in Athletic Training, Clinical Concentration, and the MS in Athletic Training to an entry-level MS in Athletic Training and a doctorate in Athletic Training (DAT), respectively.

Beyond maintaining consistency with other health care professions, this transition will allow us to recruit focused individuals with a desire for the Athletic Training credential. Under the current paradigm, we have several students enrolled in our programs that desire advanced degrees in other professions and do not wish to carry an Athletic Training credential, but choose this as a means to acquire pre-requisites for those advanced degrees.

With our current undergraduate enrollment and the number of students that are acquiring advanced degrees in Athletic Training (>80%), we do believe that we will have competitive entry with 15-20 full-time students per year within this cohort model. Further, in the last 3 years, the number of entry-level MS programs has doubled (13 to 25), yet approximately 350 programs remain at the BS level. As one of the few entry-level MS programs, particularly one of only three programs in the mid-west, we will likely exceed in applicants for our enrollment capabilities.

**Student Learning. How have the results of student outcomes assessment and program or accreditation review been used on the proposed change? How will this change increase student learning and program effectiveness?**

The curriculum of the BS in Athletic Training, Clinical Concentration to MS in Athletic Training degree is relatively similar. We used both certification exam results and exit/alumni data to support changes in the curriculum.

1. We added a Functional Movement Lab to distribute curricular content evenly between courses early in the sequence. In the Clinical Concentration this content would have been included in the Clinical Kinesiology course work; however, the practical component exceeds a typical 3 credit course. As such, we added a lab to assume this content.
2. We added a third orthopedic diagnosis course (with lab) to our curriculum. Students consistently report that they feel least confident in the mastery of the evaluation and diagnosis domain of Athletic Training upon graduation ( $2.9 \pm 0.6$  on a 4 point Likert scale), although that confidence improves within 6 months as alumni ( $3.4 \pm 0.5$ ). More telling, students report that the most important courses in the curriculum are the orthopedic diagnosis classes (6/9 responses, 66.7%). We feel this data supports the addition of a

third course to allow students more time to learn and practice the information prior to applying the content to patients in the clinical setting.

3. Current student feedback suggested that there is a disconnect between the Pathophysiology and Pharmacology courses. To resolve this concern, we have combined the course content to improve continuity and added a lab course to practice the psychomotor physical examination skills.

We consistently achieve a higher first-time passing rate (2010-2011= 62.5%, 2011-2012 = 87.5%) than the national average (2010-2011= 60.7%, 2011-2012 = data not yet available). However, we score lower than the national average in the Clinical Evaluation and Diagnosis domain. These curricular changes should help to resolve the gap between the national average (raw average score= $20.0\pm3.5$ ) and our program performance (raw average score= $18.6\pm3.5$ ).

## **Old Catalog Copy:**

### **Athletic Training M.S.**

---

(37 credits)

#### **Research (12 credits):**

---

- [ATTR 691 - Research Methods in Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation](#) 3 credits
- and
- [ATTR 698 - Research Project](#) 2-6 credits (6 credits required)
- or
- [ATTR 699 - Master's Thesis](#) 2-6 credits (6 credits required)

#### **Choose one from the following:**

---

- [EPSY 612 - Statistical Methods](#) 3 credits
- [HLTH 604 - Research Design and Data Analysis in Health and Human Performance](#) 3 credits
- [PE 605 - Quantitative Analysis and Application to Exercise and Sport Science](#) 3 credits

#### **Major (25 credits):**

---

- [ATTR 625 - Athletic Training Educator](#) 3 credits
- [ATTR 626 - Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation Leadership Administration](#) 3 credits
- [ATTR 655 - Clinical Experience in Athletic Training I](#) 0-2 credits (2 credits required)
- [ATTR 656 - Clinical Experience in Athletic Training II](#) 0-2 credits (2 credits required)
- [ATTR 660 - Environmental Illnesses](#) 3 credits
- [ATTR 661 - Evidence Based Rehabilitation of the Kinetic Chain](#) 3 credits
- [ATTR 662 - Evidence Based Diagnosis of Orthopedic Injuries](#) 3 credits
- [ATTR 675 - Therapeutic Modalities](#) 3 credits
- [ATTR 676 - Manual Therapy](#) 3 credits

#### **Culminating Experience:**

---

Successful completion of thesis or research project, prepared abstract to be submitted for presentation at a professional conference, and development of an oral and poster presentation.

## **Proposed Catalog Copy:**

# **Athletic Training M.S.**

---

(54 credits)

The entry-level masters of science degree Athletic Training is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education. Successful completion of the entry-level masters of science degree qualifies students to sit for the Board of Certification Examination. Emphasis of this curriculum is to provide students with classroom knowledge and clinical experiences that are appropriate for entry-level preparation as a certified athletic trainer. Course work in the program emphasizes strong theoretical foundations within the domains of athletic training, as well as critical thinking and problem solving skills associated with obtaining clinical proficiency. Students benefit from hands-on clinical education experiences with healthcare professionals.

Program eligibility includes successful completion of the Prerequisite Courses, a baccalaureate degree, and a preferred grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or better.

### **Research (5 credits):**

---

- PASS 635 – Applied Research Methods 2 credits
- [ATTR 698 – Research Project](#) 2-6 credits (3 credits required)

### **Major (36 credits):**

---

- ATTR 540 – Special Topics in Athletic Training 1-3 credits (3 credits required)
- ATTR 562 – Foundations of Therapeutic Interventions 3 credits
- ATTR 572 – Applied Therapeutic Interventions 3 credits
- ATTR 575 – Applied Therapeutic Rehabilitation 3 credits
- ATTR 612 – Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries & Illnesses 3 credits
- ATTR 612L – Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries & Illnesses Lab 1 credit
- ATTR 613L – Functional Movement Lab 1 credit
- ATTR 663 – Diagnosis & Immediate Care of the Spine 3 credits
- ATTR 663L – Diagnosis & Immediate Care of the Spine Lab 1 credit
- ATTR 665 – Diagnosis & Immediate Care of the Upper Extremity 3 credits
- ATTR 665L – Diagnosis & Immediate Care of the Upper Extremity Lab 1 credit
- ATTR 667 – Diagnosis & Immediate Care of the Lower Extremity 3 credits
- ATTR 667L – Diagnosis & Immediate Care of the Lower Extremity Lab 1 credit
- ATTR 673 – Pathophysiology & Pharmacological Interventions 3 credits
- ATTR 673L – Physical Exam Lab 1 credit
- ATTR 685 – Administration of Health Care Systems 3 credits

### **Clinical Experience (13 credits):**

---

- ATTR 601 – Athletic Training Practicum I 3 credits
- ATTR 602 – Athletic Training Practicum II 3 credits
- ATTR 603 – Preseason Athletic Training Internship 1 credit
- ATTR 604 – Athletic Training Practicum III 3 credits

- ATTR 605 – Athletic Training Practicum IV 3 credits

**Prerequisite Courses (30 credits):**

---

- ATTR 110 – Introduction to Health Professions 3 credits
- ATTR 202 – CPR for the Professional Rescuer 1 credit  
OR

CPR and AED Certification for the Professional Rescuer

- ATTR 210 – Human Anatomy for Allied Health Professions 2 credits
- ATTR 210L – Human Anatomy for Allied Health Professions Laboratory 1 credit  
OR
- BIO 231 – Human Anatomy 2 credits
- BIO 231L – Human Anatomy Laboratory 1 credit
- ATTR 225 – Medical Terminology for Allied Health Professions 3 credits
- ATTR 280 – Clinical Kinesiology 3 credits
- AHS 201 – Fundamentals of Nutrition 3 credits
- CHEM 103 – Elementary Chemistry 3 credits (or higher)
- CHEM 103L – Elementary Chemistry Laboratory 1 credit (or higher)
- PE 220 – Human Physiology for Allied Health Professions 2 credits
- PE 220L – Human Physiology for Allied Health Professions Laboratory 1 credit  
OR
- BIO 241 – Human Physiology 2 credits
- BIO 241L – Human Physiology Laboratory 1 credit
- PE 381 – Physiology of Exercise 3 credits
- PE 381 – Physiology of Exercise Lab 1 credit
- PSY 101 – General Psychology: Understanding Human Behavior 3 credits

**Please Insert a Side-by-side Program Comparison.**

OLD PROGRAM		NEW PROGRAM	
Course Prefix and number	Credit hours	Course Prefix and number	Credit hours
ATTR 625	3	ATTR 540	3
ATTR 626	3	ATTR 562	3
ATTR 655	2	ATTR 572	3
ATTR 656	2	ATTR 575	3

ATTR 660	3	ATTR 612	3
ATTR 661	3	ATTR 612L	1
ATTR 662	3	ATTR 613L	1
ATTR 675	3	ATTR 663	3
ATTR 676	3	ATTR 663L	1
ATTR 691	3	ATTR 665	3
ATTR 698 or ATTR 699	6	ATTR 665L	1
EPSY 612 or AHS 604 or PE 605	3	ATTR 667	3
		ATTR 667L	1
		ATTR 673	3
		ATTR 673L	1
		ATTR 685	3
		ATTR 601	3
		ATTR 602	3
		ATTR 603	1
		ATTR 604	3
TOTAL HOURS	37	ATTR 605	3
		PASS 635	2
		ATTR 698	3
TOTAL HOURS	37	TOTAL HOURS	54

**Please insert any important and pertinent minutes/notes from committee meetings about this proposal.**

The Department of Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation voted 10-0-1 on 8/19/11 to accept updating the BS in Athletic Training, Clinical Concentration to an Entry-Level MS in Athletic Training. This curriculum meets CAATE accreditation standards.

| Approval/Review Signatures

Date    Vote

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

1. Department/unit curriculum committee \_\_\_\_\_
2. Department chair \_\_\_\_\_
3. Dean's Office, College of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
(Programs that lead to educator licensure)
4. College Representative \_\_\_\_\_
5. Academic Dean \_\_\_\_\_
6. Associate VP for Academic Affairs \_\_\_\_\_
7. Teacher Education Committee \_\_\_\_\_  
(Programs that lead to educator licensure)
8. Dean, College of Graduate and Professional Studies \_\_\_\_\_
9. CAAC or Graduate Council \_\_\_\_\_
10. Senate Executive Committee \_\_\_\_\_  
(New programs, major revisions so program is substantially new, or proposals with major policy implications. Determined by CAAC or Graduate Council.)
11. Faculty Senate \_\_\_\_\_  
(New programs, major revisions so program is substantially new, or proposal with major policy implications. Determined by CAAC or Graduate Council.)
12. Provost \_\_\_\_\_

Publication Dates:

Proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

## F-3 DARS REPORT FOR PROGRAMS

**Note: Doctoral Programs do not require DARS report**

**Must be completed before dean's approval so changes can be made.**

Attach this form to the program proposal form and submit to the Office of Degree Audit and Transfer, Erickson Hall 235.

(Completed by the Unit)

**Department:** Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation

**Contact Person:** Lindsey E. Eberman

**Course/Program:** Athletic Training

**I. DARS** (Completed by Office of Degree Audit and Transfer)

**Completed**

Transfer articulation

(If present, detail sent to dean and attached to proposal) \_\_\_\_\_

Degree Audit

Includes major/minor/other requirements/general education

(If present, detail sent to contact person and attached to proposal) \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

---

DARS Director

---

Date

## **F-4 Program/Course Consultation Form**

The proposing unit is required to provide evidence that it has consulted with all units that would be affected by a course or program change or would have a logical interest. The DARS office will provide a list of all programs that require or recommend a course. Please attach this sheet to a copy of the proposal when it is forwarded to the dean's office. If no response is received within 14 days, send an email message to the chair(s) of departments that would logically have an interest in this change and attach a copy of the email message and consultation form with the proposal.

**To:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program/Course Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

***Attach a complete proposal.***

This form serves the purpose of providing information as a courtesy and avoiding duplication. Please take this opportunity to review the enclosed curriculum proposal and to comment upon it in view of your unit's offerings.

**Have no reservations concerning this course or program:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Have the following reservations/suggestions concerning this course or program:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Chairperson:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Responses from proposing unit:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**F-6 Unit and Deans' Office Review for Completeness and Accuracy**

## PROGRAMS: REVISED, REACTIVATED, OR NEW

**Department:** Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation

**Contact person:** Lindsey E. Eberman

**Telephone:** x7694      **E-mail address:** leberman@indstate.edu

**It is the department's responsibility to consult with the dean's office prior to development of the proposal to determine whether the proposed change is feasible.** Failure to do so is likely to result in a proposal that is not able to go forward or that will be sent back to the department for revision.

Units should make sure that all information below is included with their proposal. Incomplete proposals or those with issues that must be addressed will be returned to the department, curriculum committee, or dean's office within four weeks of receipt of the proposal. Specific feedback will be given on what needs to be addressed. Subsequent modifications will follow a similar four-week interval for review and response.

Provided/    NA

completed

- Proposal clearly related to the results of assessment, program review, and accreditation.
- All required signature(s) obtained.
- All required votes obtained.
- Number of credit hours reported accurately.
- All proposals for new and/or modified courses including syllabi submitted and in good order.
- Executive summary or abstract included.
- Clear and concise rationale for non-specialists included.
- Proposed new catalog copy incorporating the changes and side-by-side comparison included.
- Signed DARS Report attached.

- Copies of the Program and Course Change Consultation Form are included from any departments/units that are affected or logically have an interest in the change.
- Financial/Staffing Resource Review Checklist included.
- Library Report attached, if needed.
- All documents referenced in the proposal included.
- Guidelines for Undergraduate Curricular Changes followed for undergraduate programs.
- Other

Returned to: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Rationale for proposal status:

## F-7 LIBRARY REPORT

Required for new and substantially changed programs, new and substantially changed graduate courses, and courses in which the University may not have adequate library resources (new topics, varied formats).

**Department:** Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation

**Course Prefix:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Number:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Credit Hours:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Title:** Athletic Training

**Course Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Attached to this report is a:**

- Bibliography completed by the department that identifies the critical books, journals (including electronic journals), multimedia (including videotapes, CD's, DVD's, computer simulations, etc.), research resources, and databases essential to support the curricular changes for this course/program. After reviewing this bibliography, the Library and the Department will develop a plan for obtaining future resources.

If distance education (course, program, or part of a unit)

- Plan for meeting the library needs of distance education students (including searching databases, delivery of materials, library tutoring, etc.)

---

Dean, Library Services

---

Date

**Comments:**

A library report was not conducted because the research courses are not additions to the MS in AT program. These courses already exist and function effectively. In addition, we are working with the library to ameliorate their concerns for the new doctoral degree.

Revised March 1, 2007

## F-8 FINANCIAL/STAFFING RESOURCES REVIEW CHECKLIST

This form must be completed for new courses and for program revisions (not for elimination, banking, or suspension). Attach additional information if needed.

New program proposals must be submitted using *Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures for Developing New Academic Program Proposals from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education*, available at [http://www.che.state.in.us/academics/program\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.che.state.in.us/academics/program_guidelines.pdf).

Proposed Course/Program Title: Athletic Training

Department: Applied Medicine and Rehabilitation

1. Will the proposal require additional faculty, including special purpose or temporary faculty?

No       Yes

If yes, indicate the source of funds

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Department reallocation <input type="checkbox"/> College reallocation	\$_____	\$_____

<input type="checkbox"/> External funds, specify source	\$_____	\$_____
---	---------	---------

<input type="checkbox"/> Other, describe	\$_____	\$_____
--	---------	---------

2. What additional supplies and expenses are required?                          \$\_\_\_\_\_                          \$\_\_\_\_\_

No       Yes If yes, what is the source of funds?

Department     College     External funding (specify)

3. Will additional equipment and/or space be required?

No       Yes

If yes, indicate the source of funds

Department     College     External funding (specify)

4. Will it require additional undergraduate and/or graduate assistant(s)?

No       Yes

If yes, indicate the source of funds

Department     College     Graduate Studies     External funding (specify)

5. Will it require additional computer equipment, software, or classroom technology?

No       Yes

If yes, state what and indicate the source of funds

Department       College       Office of Information Technology

External funding (specify)

6. Will it require additional classrooms, remodeling, or other space?

No       Yes

If yes, indicate the source of funds for laboratories and specifics on space needs and how this will be met.

7. Provide projected enrollments by year 3 and year 5.

What are your plans for student recruitment? *Recruit within current ISU student population, identifying students desiring a credential in Athletic Training. Based on current undergraduate enrollment, we should seat 15-20 students per class with ease (60-75 students currently enrolled in the professional component of the BS in AT program).*

Describe additional resource needs and implications: *none*

If external funds will be used, describe and specify how long funds are available: *N/A*

The signatures below confirm that sufficient resources to support the proposal will be committed by the department and college.

---

**Department Chairperson**

---

**Date**

---

**Dean**

---

**Date**