The name of Russell Herman Conwell—a former newspaper editor, lawyer, minister, and college president—probably doesn’t ring any bells inside anyone’s mind. However, in pursuit of a single-minded goal, Dr. Conwell raised nearly $7,000,000, with which he founded Temple University. Conwell raised the money by giving more than 6,000 lectures across the United States. In each lecture, he told the story titled, “Acres of Diamonds.”

The story was about a wealthy, Middle-Eastern farmer who had heard stories of ordinary men who had discovered diamond mines. These stories so excited the farmer that he sold his farm rich with grain fields and orchards to search for diamonds himself. The farmer wandered the Middle-East and Mediterranean Basin to search for the lustrous stones which would secure his and future generations of his family. Finally—desolate, dejected, and failing in his quest for diamonds—the farmer “cast himself into an incoming tide, and he sank beneath its foaming crest, never to rise again.”

As the story goes, the man who bought the farm found an unusual stone in the stream which meandered through the property. The stone turned out to be a diamond of great value. Afterwards, his search revealed that—just a tad bit under the surface—the land was covered with these unusual stones. The once wealthy farmer had literally owned acres of diamonds, had sold them for practically nothing, and had paid for his decision with his life.

The thing about this story which so thoroughly intrigues me and inspires this article is one simple point: if the farmer had only thoroughly explored his land, chipped away all of the hard rock surrounding the precious stone, and had polished the stone to show its luster, he would have found the millions that he sought right on his own property. Like the man who discovered the
acres of diamond, three separate efforts within the Sullivan University System and Sullivan University require us to determine whether our own acres of diamonds can be discovered and mined:

- The Sullivan University System Strategic Plan—Thoroughly Exploring the Land: Led jointly by Dr. Hank Wagner, the former CEO of Jewish Hospitals, and Dr. Keith Bird, the former Chancellor of KCTCS, the Sullivan University System Strategic Plan represents the most thorough exploration of the landscape in which Sullivan University and our sister schools compete since the system’s founding in 1962. President Sullivan recently sent an electronic copy of the Sullivan University System Strategic Plan to every faculty and staff member of Sullivan University, Spencerian College, and the Sullivan College of Technology and Design. As is echoed throughout the strategic plan and has been at the system’s heart over the past 52 years, the Sullivan University System has long nurtured its reputation as a career-focused family of institutions; the SUS mission is to “… provide high quality, career-focused education and credentials…designed to empower its students to excel and enhance their potential for employment and career advancement.”

  In large part, the strategic plan dedicates Sullivan University and our sister schools to better explore the land in which we already compete. From an organizational perspective, many organizations often times have those acres of diamonds. If they would only have the foresight to effectively and thoroughly explore the depths of their missions, operations, resources, and distinctive competencies built over the years, they would likely find those untapped diamonds ready to mine. Well-known as a career university, the strategic plan requires us to till the ground a bit more, to explore the depths of our core mission, and enhance the value proposition built over the past six decades.

- The Quality Enhancement Plan—Chipping Away at the Edges: The Sullivan University Quality Enhancement Plan, tentatively titled Career Literacies & Career Competencies: Putting Care Back In Career, engages the entire university community. The QEP will take our associate-level and bachelor-level students—who come to us from widely varied social, ethnic, and economic backgrounds—and begin the chip away at the edges in ways which prepare our students, those diamonds in the rough, to better compete in the market for careers.

  Although still a proposal draft, “putting care back into career” speaks directly to our institutional identity as a career university and the vision and mission statements contained within the SUS Strategic Plan. Certain skills and abilities, as we very well know, oftentimes mark success of those who get the job versus those who simply apply: persuasive, evidence-based written and verbal communication; rapport-building skills like effective listening, teamwork and collaboration, conflict resolution, and negotiation skills; and the ability to effectively search and research using information technology. Many times, as sometimes noted by our career services staff, our students’ skills in those critical areas could be greatly improved. Chipping away at the edges to reveal the diamonds inside through implementation of the QEP should position our students better
when measured against competition.

- The Curriculum Committee—Polishing the Stone to its Reveal Real Value: The primary challenge for the Curriculum Committee will be to keep true to the basic value proposition extended to students as a “career university” and help revamp, when necessary, existing programs to include industry-recognized credentials and clearly establish the knowledge, skills, and abilities which will help our students better compete for jobs. In other words, the Sullivan University Curriculum Committee’s primary job is to help deans, directors and faculty members to mold and polish those precious gems in ways to reveal their true value to the market.

Guided by the *SUS Strategic Plan* and *Principle of Accreditation*, the SU Curriculum Committee will be essential to implementing several strategic goals and directions written in the strategic plan and holding programs responsible for proposing curricula changes consistent with the plan and the principles. More specifically, Sullivan University has been challenged by the SUS Board of Directors to make programs more competitive by incorporating industry-recognized certifications and their bodies of knowledge into our educational offerings. Each university program, when appropriate, should incorporate at least one industry-recognized certification and teach the knowledge and skills inherent in that professional organization’s body of knowledge.

A second challenge extended to Sullivan University by the Board of Directors is to re-examine programs to determine where efficiencies may be garnered. For instance, most colleges and universities award associate degrees based on a 60 semester hour (90 quarter hour) standard. Many of Sullivan University’s programs far exceed this standard and require up to 118 quarter hours to compete. Bringing programs more within the standard for completion is believed to position our university more strongly as a preferred career university of choice to potential students.

In the end, it takes some imagination to understand that diamonds do not look like diamonds in their rough state...just as a brick home does not look like a heap of clay or a table looks like a stack of lumber. Imagining how Sullivan University can continue to prosper by exploring the depths of our historic and recently reaffirmed mission as a career university can take on new energy. The *SUS Strategic Plan* and the proposed QEP are especially promising as Sullivan University enters into its 53rd year. However, without largely re-imagining ways to gain, retain, educate and place students, those diamonds which we seek may go largely unmined or be mined by others.

Sincerely—

Ken

Ken Miller
Provost, Sullivan University
An Overview of Career Services

By

Sam Mannino

Director, Career Services

The Career Services department at Sullivan University plays a major role in the successful employment of recent graduates and alumni. Sullivan’s focus on preparing students for careers in their selected programs of study goes hand-in-hand with the work that Career Services performs. The main focus of Career Services is to work with soon-to-be graduates who are in their last quarter of their degree, certificate, or diploma program, and any graduate, throughout their career, who has successfully completed one of these programs.

A highly trained and experienced staff works with each available graduate, who is in good standing, individually to determine the best use of his/her skills and abilities within their chosen career field. The Career Services staff assists available graduates with all aspects of the job search process through the following services:

- Résumé and cover letter critiques;
- Résumé referral;
- Mock interviews;
- Assistance with employer and salary research;
- Job search planning sessions; and
- Career workshops & class presentations

In addition to individual coaching, Career Services provides opportunities for graduates to interact with area employers through Career Expos (held twice per year) and networking events such as Resume & Interview workshops and LinkedIn training. Employers are regularly invited to speak to classes on campus, introduce their organization to graduates through information sessions, and hold on-campus interviews.

The Career Services office works to ensure graduates have opportunities for continued career advancement throughout their career fee-free nationwide. If, at any time, a Sullivan University graduate needs assistance with job search or training techniques, Career Services is ready to help. Graduates need simply to contact the Career Services office from the campus they graduated from to schedule an appointment to begin the search process. This service even applies when a graduate decides to leave and then later re-enter the job market.

Though the services that the Career Services department provides are highly-focused on employment assistance once a student graduates, many of the aforementioned services are also available to students currently in school. A stu-
and technology used by hiring managers changes often. Because of this, the Career Services staff must remain up-to-date with current hiring processes. By maintaining the relationships with our employers, as well as those with our graduates, this is much more manageable and the employers and our graduates receive the benefits from our efforts.

The Career Services department can be reached in a variety of ways, depending on which campus students currently attend or graduates previously attended:

**Louisville Campus and Fort Knox Extension**  
P: (502) 413-8600  
F: (502) 458-7467

Office located in the main hallway of the Sullivan Louisville campus.

**Lexington Campus**  
P: (859) 514-7680  
F: (859) 514-7675

Office located on the bottom floor of the Sullivan Lexington campus.

**Sullivan Online**  
P: (502) 489-1971  
F: (877) 455-4325

**Sullivan College of Pharmacy, Health Sciences, & Nursing**  
P: (502) 287-2394  
F: (502) 515-4669

Office located on the first floor of the Sullivan College of Pharmacy.

Students and graduates can also reach out to any of our campuses via social media sites, such as LinkedIn and Facebook. Career Services encourages any student or graduate with questions regarding services to reach out today!
I’m sure you’ve heard a lot of talk about the SACSCOC accreditation reaffirmation process and about the QEP. You may even have heard mention of “Literacy across the Curriculum” or “Career Literacies and Career Competencies” as potential QEP topics. Let me give you a little background and try to explain what’s going on.

The development of a substantial Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) with a significant institutional impact is an important requirement of the SACSCOC accreditation reaffirmation process. As Sullivan University undertakes this crucial reaffirmation process over the coming twelve months, it is imperative that we devise a Quality Enhancement Plan that will effectively improve and promote our institution in today’s competitive educational marketplace.

Commencing about a year ago, preliminary work on the 2015 QEP by the QEP Committee and other institutional constituencies had identified “Literacy across the Curriculum” as a tentative topic. While there was widespread agreement that such an emphasis was needed and laudable, the topic was also widely viewed as blandly generic. Comments from many quarters indicated a mild dissatisfaction with this topic, and a general desire was expressed for a topic that resonated more deeply with the unique identity of Sullivan University. Two nearly synchronous events presented a perfect opportunity to reconsider the QEP topic: A new Director of Institutional Research was hired (that would be me), bringing a fresh perspective on the QEP process, and the new Sullivan University System Strategic Plan was announced (Academic Illuminator, Spring 2014), offering clear and incisive guidance on the desired direction of institutional improvement.

The QEP Committee took advantage of these events to consider a change in direc-
cies and career competencies organized around two goals:

**Goal 1 (Career Literacies):** Through the development of multi-faceted career literacies, including expanded awareness and understanding of career fields and career options, students will be career-focused and engaged in a career-oriented, clearly-relevant program of study.

**Goal 2 (Career Competencies):** Students will develop a set of career-relevant ancillary skills, materials, and experiences, complementing their career-specific core education and enhancing their abilities to compete successfully in their intended careers.

Each of these goals will be elaborated into a small number of focused and assessable Student Learning Outcomes (more about that in my next “QEP Update”). The QEP Committee reviewed these ideas, and by unanimous vote on 21 May 2014, recommended the adoption of “Career Literacies and Career Competencies: Putting Care Back into Career” as Sullivan University’s 2015 QEP topic.

The QEP Committee feels that this topic is an ideal fit for Sullivan University at this point in its institutional development for a
number of reasons:

- Sullivan University has a long-standing and widely-recognized reputation as a pre-eminent career-focused institution.
- Sullivan University’s mission is to “provide high quality, career-focused education,” and its vision is to become the “preferred regional career university”.
- The new Sullivan University System Strategic Plan stresses career awareness and career-focused educational goals as an effective strategy in gaining, retaining, educating, and placing students.
- A QEP devoted to career literacies and career competencies will offer considerable brand differentiation, distinguishing Sullivan University from other institutions with more generic QEP topics.
- All important institutional constituencies are represented in the development and approval of this topic.
- Not only academic faculty, but also all major institutional service units (Admissions, Student Services, Career Services, Financial Planning, Enrollment Services, and the University Library) have participated in the consideration of this QEP topic, and all have important roles to play in its implementation.
- While the QEP topic had been presented in different terms in earlier drafts, an evolutionary process of questioning, reconsideration, refinement, and refocusing led to the focus on career literacies and career competencies.
- The inclusion of career-focused experiential learning opportunities ties this QEP (2015) to the previous Sullivan University QEP (2005) and leverages some of the outcomes of that initiative.
- And, finally, the focus on a “Care-ing” approach to career literacies and career competencies re-asserts and re-energizes Sullivan University’s hallowed “I Care” initiative.

The QEP Committee has a lot of work ahead of it over the next several months as it develops these ideas into a detailed, comprehensive QEP proposal. Your thoughts and suggestions are always welcome. Please send them my way at MWiljanen@sullivan.edu.
For this installment of “Five Questions For…,” we interviewed Misty Glin, an adjunct instructor in the Pharmacy Technician program at the Louisville campus. She has been with the program for over two years, where she teaches Pharmacy Law and Ethics, Sterile Compounding, Institutional Pharmacy Operations, and Health and Safety. She also provides the College of Health Sciences’ doctoral pharmacy students with CPR training prior to their graduation.

1. How did you originally get into education? What was your motivation?

Originally getting into teaching was a surprise. I was working in a pharmacy and the director called, needing someone to fill in for a quarter, I graciously accepted the offer, and have been here ever since. I feel like this is my calling and this is where I am supposed to be. This is the most rewarding career that I have ever had. It is so motivating to have a student graduate and thank you for their new job, or to have a student ask for advice on their clothes, resume, or attitude for an interview. I like knowing that I am a part of something really special here at Sullivan University. My motivation for teaching is to graduate the most successful students in the state.

2. What do you like the most about teaching? What do you find the most challenging?

It is so rewarding to discuss something in class, and have a student come to you and say "I got that!" "I understand." This makes me feel a part of something much larger than the classroom. I like Sullivan's diversity. I have met so many students that are so unlike myself; it really has been rewarding and it’s shown me the other parts of the education process. I really like teaching students that are motivated, and that set
goals. Diversity is a good thing: I have students from all cultures, races, genders, and ages. It makes teaching more challenging with the different levels of education and histories that the students have.

3. Do you have any heroes or role models in education or your field of study?

Actually I do! There were two very special people here at Sullivan University that were very good role models for me. The first is Miles Spalding. He was the program director when I was a student here at Sullivan. As an instructor, Miles took great pride in his program. He wanted all students to succeed and he was the type of person to give the shirt off his back. I remember when I first spoke to him about teaching here, he told me two things: the first, "the best students make the best teachers," and second, when I spoke to him of my concern that I would do a good job, he advised "they don't care how much you know, until they know how much you care."

My second role model would be Christen Schenkenfelder. She is the current director of the Pharmacy Technician Program. It is an absolute joy to work with such a bright, intelligent, young woman. I often look up to her. The things that she has done with the program have been AMAZING, and I think what a great program it is to be a part of. Christen has advanced the program in so many ways. She is an amazing person and an even better supervisor. She holds the students at such a standard that employers seek to hire our students.

4. What are your goals in your educational career?

My goal is to get my doctorate in Pharmacy and become a pharmacist. But I am enjoying the journey. Between now and then, I will be working on Sterile IV Certification, as well as Healthcare Administration, and a degree in sonography. I really like learning new things, and that in and of itself is my motivation for learning.

5. What hobbies or interests do you have in your off time?

I have a small son and an older daughter so much of my time is spent doing the things that they like. I do, however, like to get lost in a book over the weekend. I teach CPR for Louisville Metro EMS, so some of my time is training personnel in First Aid and CPR. I love to learn new things, so I am always a student of life, trying to learn new things. I am currently getting my certification in Sterile IV Technique and would love to continue to advance my educational career.
PREAMBLE

The other day I observed something I had never seen before: a driveway-friendly dumpster. From the fact that it was on wheels, I intuited that it was designed to prevent destruction of the remodeling homeowner’s driveway as so many of its wheel-less leviathan predecessors had done to my driveways. But – to confirm this intuition, the huge black dumpster saluted me with foot-high white-letters advertising the DRIVEWAY FRIENDLY DUMPSTER COMPANY. In the last issue, Dr. Miller alluded to Jack Trout, the marketing guru and author of the landmark book, “Differentiate or die,” and, as a former patents librarian, I am always on the lookout for new inventions or business models, such as TLC (Tires, Lube and Car care), a company that services your car at your home or office.

What, you may be asking yourself, does this have to do with SACS Matters? I will tell you....

I remember recently reading a business essay in which the author repined that travelers had for years lugged their vacation impedimenta onto countless planes, boats and trains, until someone thought to design luggage with wheels. To paraphrase the redoubtable Dr. Sheldon Cooper (from the hit sit-com Big Bang Theory), businesses’ slow dance to these transformative epiphanies provokes one to ask: why did it take so long for someone to put wheels on driveway-eating dumpsters or on back-straining luggage?

Similarly, I am reminded that - although commercially produced bread appeared in New York City in 1849 (Ward Baking Company), it was not until 1927 that Otto Rohwedder successfully designed a machine that not only sliced the bread but wrapped it. The first loaf of sliced bread was sold commercially on July 7, 1928, many years after the establishment of commercial bakeries. Subsequent sales of the machine to other bakeries increased and sliced bread became available nationwide.

I credit this slow dance mentality to a lack of assessment, which returns this discussion to our compliance report. To me, the “greatest thing since sliced bread” – as the post-Rohwedderian expression goes, is not the sliced bread itself, but the transformative idea of continuous improvement of the bread. Or – as the SACSCOC 2.5 standard puts it: “the institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in insti-
3.5.4 faculty standards’ NARRATIVE and EVIDENCE, the Xitracs™ credentialing module is also greatly assisting the university’s efforts.

Here is a projected overview of the schedule with which I have been working:

I. CONTENT PROVISION-REVIEW-REWRITE-COPYEDITING PHASE: August 2013 to February 2014: DONE;

II. CONTENT VETTING AND UPDATING PHASE: November 2013 to April 2014 (follow-on and coterminous with CB’s copyediting once a content critical mass is reached): DONE

III. SACSCOC STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW (SU senior management revetting) PHASE: April 2014 to June 2014; IN PROGRESS
- Work on QEP (due DEC14): Dr. Wiljanen is working on this project: IN PROGRESS

IV. CORPORATE COMMITTEE REVIEW (revetting) PHASE: mid-June 2014 to 31 July 2014:
- submit report to Xitracs™ for final PUBLICATION formatting; then, review for possible re—styling.

V. FINAL REWRITE/POLISHING/COMPLETION PHASE: August 2014.
NOTE: Xitracs™ will conduct an extensive “clean up” of the document’s formatting, fonts, tables, etc.

VI. SUBMISSION PHASE: September 2014.

VII. POST-SUBMISSION PHASE: September 2014 to February 2015 (continue to work on QEP submission):
- respond to any SACSCOC offsite committee and generate Xitracs™ FOCUS REPORT as needed; and, prepare for February 2015 onsite visit)

**VIII. POST-ONSITE VISIT PHASE:** February 2015 to June 2015: complete any post onsite-visit reports.

As this overview indicates, this project is now in phrase **III. SACSCOC STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW PHASE (April 2014 to June 2014).** The project is now approximately three months out from the September 2014 due date and – thanks to everyone’s kind and generous cooperation - very good progress has been made: copyediting has proceeded non-stop *pari passu* with updating (e.g. the new Sullivan University Catalog [Thank you, Dr. Daugherty!]), and potentially, the updating of some new SU web URLs. The next large-scale updating may be to swap out the 2013 Noel-Levitz® Student Satisfaction Inventory™ (N-L® SSI™) supporting EVIDENCE for the 2014 versions. The document has been repeatedly spell-checked and grammar-checked to ensure it does not break Priscian’s head. Likewise, in adherence to the my first assessment principle, i.e., “make it easy for them to say ‘Yes’,” the entire document has been repeatedly viewed in Xitracs™’s *Website Select Format* to ensure optimal operability of all components, e.g.: some potential access problems have been identified and corrected, i.e.: internal web-based evidentiary web files, which would not upload for any potential off-campus SACSCOC reviewer, have been converted from screenshots in Xitracs™ to quick-uploading PDFs. Additionally, to “make it easy for them to say ‘Yes’,” all evidentiary PDFs have been file-named using a consistent hierarchical (general-to-specific) taxonomy that is readily intuitive for non-Sullivan reviewers. Excerpta from the respective *SUS Faculty Staff Manual* and the *SU Faculty Staff Manual* have been systematically and methodically copied, accurately file named, and uploaded. The document has also been examined for semantical and syntactical discrepancies, as well as for stylistic, terminological and phraseological inexactitudes; and, it has been examined for internal consistency of responses, i.e.: it responds the same way to the same question against all standards. Consequently, some phrases, such as, “in the paper and digital versions of the annual *Sullivan University Catalog,*” take on mantra-esque evocations. End-notes, the in-NARRATIVE hyperlinks to the EVIDENCE documentation, have been re-checked for placement; and – just prior to being published, each end-note document will be checked for accuracy. (NOTE: with about 100 standards and 1658 total files, each EVIDENCE-rich standard features on average about 17 pieces of supporting EVIDENCE.) Lastly, formatting will be cleaned up by our Xitracs vendor in mid-July/August in order to generate perfectly formatted WEB page version, but also a perfectly page-broke PDF version, which can be printed as a PAPER version tabbed for ease of access.
In phrase III. SACSCOC STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW PHASE, the compliance report draft is now being qualitatively reviewed by the SU SACSCOC Steering committee (Dr. Marr, Dr. Miller, Dr. Swenson, Dr. Pina, Dr. Daugherty, Ms. Barbara Dean, Mr. Keene, Mr. Michael Johnson and others) and some in-NARRATIVE tables have been shifted to EVIDENCE. The famous Victorian poet, Oscar Wilde, said that “experience is the name everyone gives to their mistakes.” Sullivan hopes to minimize or eliminate any compliance mistakes by using assessment knowledge gained from our own SACSCOC experiences in combination with a compliance document-prep strategy that examines the generalizable mistakes of other universities. Ultimately, our iterative refinement process reviews the drafted NARRATIVE/EVIDENCE against the twice-or-more-vetted comments from:

- NARRATIVE/EVIDENCE from other universities’ Compliance Reports and Focus Reports;
- comments in the SACSCOC Resource Manual;
- comments in the SACSCOC Manual for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation.

Up to the last minute before the September 2014 deadline, these repetitive critical reviews will be continuously performed at the same time as other ongoing wheels-with-wheel copyediting, critiquing and vetting processes (checking for EVIDENCE over-linking, i.e., un-end-noted EVIDENCE, will also be performed just prior to submission). For example, while the Steering Committee members review the draft and feed their input back into the copyediting process, the draft is being collated against the 17 standards comprising the university’s 2010 SACSCOC. This collation is being performed to ensure our consistency with NARRATIVE/EVIDENCE that we successfully (except for the modest ding for 2.8, to which we subsequently successfully responded in our follow-up focus report) submitted five years ago. Also, I want to data mine any relevant-but-perhaps-overlooked nuggets of wisdom from those standards’ NARRATIVE/EVIDENCE (updated, of course) for use now. Once the Steering Committee review is completed and any ensuing mutatis mutandis adjustments made, Dr. Marr will review the pre-final draft for complianceworthiness before it is reviewed by corporate, or is—perhaps, reviewed by either our SACSCOC VP or/a third-party consultant. In reaction to all the vettings, the overall compliance document is being iteratively refined and polished.

At this time last quarter, Xitracs™ registered 1190 total items constituting 1019 total files (now 1658 total files, or a 63% increase; and 171 total URLs (now 234 total URLs or 37% increase). However, the corresponding overall size of the file, viz.: 632.4 MB of data has only increased to 726.5 MB, or 15% increase. So, metaphorically, the compliance report draft has functioned as a digital palimpsest, in which prior NARRATIVES have been overwritten by newer NARRATIVES. These aforementioned data illustrate that exten-
sive changes (63% increase in file size and 37% increase in URLs) have supervened in the document, but the overall size of the document has increased only 15%. This signifies that many MBs of data may also have been eliminated from the digital palimpsest as part of the editorial refinement process. Lastly, the Xitracs™ software tracks each revised version of each standard, some standards, such as 4.1 (Student Success) evince 123 different version. This degree of textual revisionism is the norm and not the exception. Also, this standard will ultimately features 86 supportive pieces of EVIDENCE. While most standards feature considerably fewer instances of EVIDENCE, EVIDENCE is used judiciously as prescribed by the SACSCOC Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation asserts: “Evidence should not be viewed simply as a mass of facts, data, or exhibits. Instead, it should be viewed as a coherent and focused body of information supporting a judgment of compliance.”

### Summary of all Evidence Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.28 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.08 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPG</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17.77 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>653.81 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF ALIAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.26 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.66 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPTX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.72 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.55 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLSX</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.34 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total files:** 1424  **Total items:** 1658

This submission will require approximately 726.5 Megabytes of storage space.

### Summary of other Collateral Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total files:** 1  **Total items:** 235

This will require approximately 1 MB of storage space.
Student Retention

Where We are and Why: A case for what is being done within the Sullivan University System and why it is working!!

By James M. Kearfott, MSDR
Director of Student Retention for the Sullivan University System

As this article is coming together, the Sullivan University Campuses are heading toward one of the strongest finishes to a quarter since recordkeeping began on this subject in 2010. Everyone who has and continues to focus on every student as important is due a debt of gratitude. It can never be stressed enough the importance that every employee has on keeping barriers away from coming to class and realizing their end goal.

Many are aware; many are not, of the challenges that faced us as a campus post-Department of Education Audit in our recent past. Add to these challenges the changing economic downturns, and you have an almost perfect storm. Some of these items include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Proof of academic engagement in an online class must be measured and verified with higher standards of daily engagement than that of a student sitting in a face to face class.
- Proof of academic engagement for ground based students also had to be tightened, and has resulted in many more students being dropped or suspended earlier in the quarter, with very limited room for appeal and re-instatement.
- The ever increasing demand for rigor to increase in all classes beginning at the freshman level.
- The ability for students to secure the financial aid needed to cover the cost of education has become more difficult. This problem is in part due to the lack of the family support system with resources prepared for college.

Historically, as well, our campuses faced just a select few competitors. All will agree that the
number of schools competing for our existing students has multiplied and grows every day. It is also true that the financial burden for all things in life continues to take more and more resources and time away from our students. The following was true of our type of student in 2012: “42 percent of part-time students and 19 percent of full-time students work more than 30 hours per week. More than half care for dependents. But only 26 percent of entering students reported that a college staff member counseled them about how many courses to take while balancing commitments outside of class.” (The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 2, 2012 Multi-year Study of Community-College Practices Asks: What helps students Graduate? Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Community-College-Study-Asks/130606/)

All this information makes what you do in the classroom each day much more important and appreciated. Each of our students has a story and wants to be a success. All of the methods, tools, activities, and facilities cannot replace the power that comes from your classroom. The attention to the daily needs of the student and requiring involvement on a daily basis is working. It is reported almost daily in the comments of faculty using the Contact Manager tool located on the faulty portal that a student has found an answer to a specific problem standing in the way of continuing at one of our campuses. It can also be noted that the expectation of excellence has not diminished nor the acceptance of mediocrity allowed. Many of the comments written as part of an ACD Faculty Retention activity give specific guidelines and expectations for a student to succeed.

To paraphrase our Chancellor, “Take care of the small things (details, daily problems, etc.) and the big things will take care of themselves (quarter completion, certification earned, degree accomplished).”

Keep up the great work and realize that our students rely on you every day.
Academic Council Highlights

By

Nick Riggs

As chair of the Academic Council, I am pleased to present another edition of *Academic Council Highlights (ACH)*. The goal of *ACH* is to keep faculty and other interested parties informed, on a quarterly basis, about the workings of the Academic Council (Council) and matters it addresses.

This article is a continuation of my stream of thought from the last *ACH* article I wrote, in the *February 2014 issue*. In that article, looking at some past data, I reached the conclusion that the faculty representatives on our Council are willing to present proposals or offer recommendations more often than is typical for most faculty senates. This caused me to wonder why. In researching the matter, I found an informative paper¹ in which the author states:

Identifying how faculty perceive their involvement in governance helps develop understanding of what factors are important to their effective involvement in governance. Williams et.al. (1987) provides six perceptive categories of how faculty view their involvement in governance. The categories are as follows: a) collegial- those who prefer a shared governance approach b) activists- those who reject a strong administrative role in governance c) acceptors- those who are willing to go along with what others decide d) hierarchicals- those who prefer a strong administrative role in governance and e) copers- those who manage to “get by” under current circumstances. These models help understand how faculty view their role in governance. Nevertheless, they do not necessarily help understand how such perceptions are played out within the organizational constructs of faculty senates. (Minor, 2002, p. 7)
If I may hazard a guess, I put our Council faculty representatives in a combined a) and c) category – we are “collegial acceptors” – sharing governance with some willingness to go along with what others decide. Out of a sense of historical reality, we don’t seem to automatically reject a strong administrative role in governance (thus we are not “activists”), but we do not leave it solely to the administration to move forward (thus we are not “hierarchicals”). Lastly, I do not see much evidence that the Council prefers to just get by with the status quo or to just survive whatever is coming down the road (thus we are not “copers”).

Certainly others may have their own views on this matter, and that is a good thing. Hey, I am willing to listen to others in a reciprocal environment (“collegial”) and sometimes I am even willing to go along with what others decide (“acceptor”). Wow! Maybe there is something to all of this!

As I always conclude this article - rest assured that the Council has lively debate and discussion at all meetings and regularly sends important matters to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for consideration and requested action. With that in mind, please don’t hesitate to send me an item for Council deliberation at nriggs@sullivan.edu. The Academic Council is here to serve you!

Submitted 05/19/2014

According to our primary accreditor, SACSCOC, substantive changes are “[A] significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of an accredited institution.”¹ Substantive changes are anything that would constitute a major shift in the University’s activities and constitution, such as a change to the mission statement, the opening or closing of a campus, or the addition or elimination of a new program that is very different from other programs offered.

Complying with SACSCOC’s Substantive Change Policy is an absolute must for an institution. If a school does not comply, it could lose its accreditation and access to Title IV funding. The full text of the policy is available online at [http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Substantive%20Change%20policy.pdf](http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Substantive%20Change%20policy.pdf). It outlines how institutions must notify SACSCOC when they make major changes, as well as the steps they must follow during a change to remain compliant. It is well worth a read.

To ensure our compliance with SACSCOC, Sullivan University has its own policy to ensure that substantive changes are handled appropriately. The following is a summary of that policy.

SACSCOC must be notified at least six months before a substantive change. Therefore, if changes are to be made within the University that may be substantive in nature, the responsible parties are to contact the Provost and CEO about them. For example, if the College of Business Administration decided to offer a new program that was different from its current offerings, the Dean would need to tell the Provost and CEO of the potential offering. The Dean would also need to notify them if any current programs were extensively changed.

Once the Provost and CEO are notified, they will examine the change to determine if it is substantive. If it is, they will write up documentation and send it to SACSCOC for approval. Once SACSCOC makes its decision, the Provost or CEO will notify the administrator and the Chairperson of the Curriculum Committee of the determination.

Administrators, please notify the Provost and CEO if you believe that any changes that are or were made may be substantive. The price for noncompliance is very high, so we must be vigilant!

Calendar of Events
Summer 2014 Quarter

First day of classes ................................................................. June 30, 2014
Last day that a student can enter an online class................................. July 3, 2014
Last day that a student can enter a day class* ..................................... July 7, 2014
Last day that a student can enter an evening or weekend class............. July 10, 2014
Academic Council Meets.................................................................... July 17, 2014
Last day that a student can withdraw and still receive a “W”............. August 15, 2014
Academic Council Meets.................................................................... August 21, 2014
Break ........................................................................................ September 12-28, 2014
First Day of fall classes .................................................................... September 29, 2014

*Standard protocol requires students to attend by the 5th meeting.

Note: For night/weekend classes, a roster will be placed in the instructor’s mailbox on each day of his or her class and that same roster with signatures is to be returned to Enrollment Services after each class by the instructor.
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The Academic Illuminator is an informational publication for faculty members at Sullivan University. Issued before the start of each academic quarter, the Illuminator covers topics of interest to faculty such as policy changes, compliance with regulatory bodies, the ongoing process of accreditation, the activities of the Academic Council, and upcoming events. Back issues of the Academic Illuminator can be found at http://library.sullivan.edu/archives/sulou_illuminator.asp.

Questions, comments, requests for article coverage, and article submissions may be sent to editor Nathan Ragland, at nragland@sullivan.edu.

NOTES TO THE FACULTY

- The Library’s annual survey of faculty members will be conducted this quarter. Please take a few minutes of your time to complete the online survey when it becomes available. The Library appreciates your support!

- If you know someone who could benefit from a Sullivan University education, be sure to refer them at http://sullivan.edu/referral/index.aspx!

- Reminder: If you need a Turnitin account for use with your classes, or need assistance with a Turnitin issue, contact a librarian. Printable instructions for faculty and students on using Turnitin can be obtained by contacting Nathan Ragland (Louisville/Online) at nragland@sullivan.edu, Kandace Rogers (Lexington) at krogers@sullivan.edu, or Jill Sherman (SCTD) at jsherman@sctd.edu.