Earlier this week, I had the opportunity to serve as a discussant on a panel for 40 or so educators, students, and administrators at a viewing of *Ivory Tower*, a CNN documentary which explores the question, “Is college worth the cost?” All of the usual topics were raised in the documentary like the burgeoning student loan indebtedness, entering college as a “pathway to parties,” the rising cost of education at a rate which greatly outpaces general inflation, and competing on the bases of which college can build the newest buildings, most luxurious student facilities, etc. If you have not yet seen the documentary, I certainly encourage you to watch it, as it was a fair—albeit harsh—portrayal of higher education in the United States.

At one point during the documentary, the former provost of San Jose State University was interviewed about a failed experiment to substitute developmental courses offered in the face-to-face environment for developmental courses offered by Udacity, one of the three large MOOC providers. As a partial explanation for the experiment’s failure, the former provost shrugged her shoulders and offered up the following: “You can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make it drink.”

About halfway through the discussion session following the viewing, a young lady asked a question which focused on the aforementioned segment of the documentary and wanted my reaction as a provost to that particular idiom “you can lead a horse to water...” uttered by the
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former provost of San Jose State University. My reply to the young lady, as the idiom also struck a nerve with me during the viewing, was: “I’ll give the provost of San Jose State University a piece of advice: A teacher’s job is not to make the student drink; it’s to make the student thirsty enough to drink.”

As Sullivan University enters into another fall quarter and greets all of those fresh-faced freshmen, often times cautious and slightly frightened adult learners, and those who trust us enough to return for yet another quarter, it is perhaps a good opportunity to reflect on whether we are simply leading the student to learning or making the student thirsty enough to learn. After all, as teachers, one of our most important obligations to our students is to make them thirsty enough to want to learn.

The checklist below, which was also featured last year about this time in an Academic Illuminator article, simply serves as a reminder that there are certain things which educators can do to make the student thirsty enough to learn. The first day of classes can truly set the stage as to whether a student expects to play a leading role in a vibrant, connected, personal learning experience versus playing a supporting role in which he or she simply expects to passively absorb whatever the teacher decides to teach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...Making the Student Thirsty</th>
<th>...Leading the Student to Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Know students as individuals and as learners...Get personal and know your students.</td>
<td>Students see themselves as just another face in the crowd. Faculty members may rely too heavily on one teaching strategy, usually lecture, and do not reach all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build a sense of community within the classroom...Actively facilitate social connections.</td>
<td>Students do things like study alone, fail to build social connections, and are more likely to simply disappear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify “strugglers” as early as possible...Get them the resources they need.</td>
<td>Faculty and staff fail to recognize tell-tale signs like repeated absences, not participating in class discussions, missed appointments, and leaving early/arriving late to classes and appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set clear, high, attainable expectations...Introduce the course enthusiastically, not just read the syllabus.</td>
<td>No real expectations are set for students. Connections between a course and student’s future goals are unclear. Reading the syllabus verbatim is just plain boring. Why show up for class other than to just check off a block on the planner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use every minute of class time productively...Don’t dismiss class early.</td>
<td>Faculty members regularly dismiss classes early, fail to show up for classes on time, and cut courses short by not holding week #11 class sessions. Students get a clear idea that faculty members do not value their educations as much as they do their personal schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide academic advising in the classroom...Invite Enrollment Services to your classroom.</td>
<td>Students often times have difficulty juggling multiple, immediate priorities—families, friends, personal crises, etc. Planning for the future takes a second seat to other pressing priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with other faculty, staff and administrators to develop shared expectations...You are not alone.</td>
<td>Faculty members struggle alone with how to manage a classroom, build community, set high expectations, use time productively, and implement alternative teaching strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be invasive...Reach out and touch somebody (figuratively speaking, of course).</td>
<td>Students who struggle with personal, academic or other issues which undermine their academic success can feel alone, isolated, and question their commitments and/or abilities to succeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In concluding this editorial, my thoughts go to a familiar quote attributed to Benjamin Franklin: “Tell me and I forget. Teach me and I remember. Involve me and I learn.” It simply isn’t good enough to shrug your shoulders, as did the former provost interviewed in *Ivory Tower*, and simply say that, “you can lead a horse to water...” Our job as teachers is to create an environment in which students want to learn, and true learning—as so aptly stated by Benjamin Franklin over 200 years ago—requires our engaging students in a manner in which they are active participants and the lead actors or actresses in their own education. As faculty members, we play vital roles in setting that stage for true learning to happen, and much of stage-setting, such as establishing clear expectations and building community, happens on the very first day and with the very first interactions with our new students.

Best wishes as we begin a new quarter—

Ken
Dr. Kenneth R. Miller, Jr.
Provost
Sullivan University
It is officially the first quarter of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), and we are excited about the implementation process. No matter what experience we have, no matter how much we know or have learned, if we can’t communicate our experiences and knowledge to others, we are less effective than we need to be. The QEP is titled “Career Literacies and Career Competencies: Putting Care Back into Career,” and it’s all about a set of initiatives designed to prepare students for a successful transition into a satisfying and rewarding career.

My role is implementation of the QEP and making sure everyone has an understanding that our main goal of the QEP is career awareness.

The Career Coach website is now active and we are working with the Admission Team on how they will implement this process in their department. Over the past month, I have personally had an opportunity to meet with the admission teams from all locations. They understand their role in the QEP, which is exciting, and they feel that the Career Coach will be a great tool for the University and for the students. The Admission team will have a role in Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 1. The site can be accessed at [http://sullivan.emsicareercoach.com](http://sullivan.emsicareercoach.com).

Over the past couple of months we have been working with the College of Pharmacy (COP) on the implementation of the FolioTech e-portfolio. The COP team has worked on guided reflections that the student will be required to write. Implementation of the e-portfolio will be in Winter 2016 for the COP and other programs will follow shortly.

There are several different types of ePortfolios:

**Student Learning Portfolio:** A tool that allows the systemic documentation and reflection on skilled development, competency, and career readiness resulting from a single course, an experience, or the integration of multiple courses or experiences. It is designed to enhance student learning and growth through the use of self-reflection, integration, meta-cognitive appraisal of the learning process, and mentoring. (Zubizaretta 2009)
Assessment Portfolio: The major purpose of an assignment portfolio is to document demonstrable, measureable student competence, achievement, and skills for well-delineated content areas and specified framework.

Professional ePortfolio: A collection of artifacts selected by a student to showcase the knowledge, skills, and abilities they have developed as part of their learning experience. The ePortfolio Project provides the student the opportunity to reflect on their learning experiences and present their experiences in and out of the classroom in a way that will aid them in achieving their career goals.

At Sullivan University we feel that getting a handle on debts is very important, as is the fact that student loans are an investment in the student’s future and should be looked at over the long term. In our QEP we will offer a financial literacy portion to cover Student Learning Outcome 3. Our students will have an opportunity to participate in twelve targeted lessons, with each having a specific goal. The lessons of the USA Funds Life Skill are clear and understandable, written in a matter of fact style and easy for the students to go through. The USA Funds Life Skill is currently being used in the FYE101 Information Literacy course and will be added to at least four additional courses by the end of 2016.

The ultimate outcome for Sullivan University QEP is that students will have a deeper understanding of their career discipline and a clearer career path. Below are the four Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) we will focus on over the next five years:

Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate a knowledge of typical career prospects, conditions, tasks, and responsibilities in their intended career fields.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will recognize the career-focused relevance of the courses comprising their programs of study.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills to make informed financial decisions.

Student Learning Outcome 4: Students will demonstrate career-appropriate communication skills.

Your thoughts and suggestions are always welcome. Please send them my way at lkenne-dy@sullivan.edu or call me at (502)413-8519.
Sullivan University’s Louisville campus entered the arena of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-oriented) scheduling beginning with the scheduling period for Fall 2015. With the addition of the Louisville Campus, all locations are now facilitating student self-registration. SMART scheduling evolved out of Sullivan University’s desire to provide a smooth route to on-time graduation for every student.

While on-time graduation is the main goal of SMART scheduling, increased efficiency regarding the University’s class offerings each quarter will be another positive outcome of the process. The University’s deans and directors produced a yearly schedule in order to provide a template for anticipated course offerings each quarter. This ability to forecast will allow students to plan ahead and for advisors to be able to better assist students with what course to take and when each course should be taken.

Sullivan’s brand of student self-registration is heavily guided by academic staff. Students are advised by faculty and academic staff. Weeks six through eight, the University’s student portal is opened to allow students to electronically select and register for classes. Each student’s submission is reviewed and confirmed by registrar staff. If the submitted schedule fits the student’s program curriculum and contains an adequate number of hours to achieve on-time graduation, the student’s request is approved. An electronic confirmation, which contains the approved schedule and pertinent information regarding the upcoming quarter, and is to be used to purchase books, is sent to the student through the student’s portal account. If the submitted schedule does not fit the student’s program curriculum or contain
The effort to bring SMART scheduling to all Sullivan University locations has been done with the collaboration and assistance of all campuses and departments of the University. Positive results have already been realized in areas such as the number of students who have been scheduled prior to the end of the quarter and the number of hours for which students are scheduled. There have also been some good ideas to make the process even more efficient. All of this pomp and circumstance will result in better service to our students and help move them more expeditiously toward on-time completion of their programs of study.

Another positive outcome of SMART scheduling is its assistance with the Registrar’s Office’s goal to have all students scheduled before finals week. This is achieved by providing a courtesy schedule for students who did not self-register. Beginning week nine, the registrar staff compiles courtesy schedules in accordance with the student’s program curriculum and with an adequate number of hours for on-time graduation. The staff then sends notification to the student regarding the courtesy schedule through the student’s portal account.

The library to organize University’s Panopto Videos

As the organization of information is their specialty, a team of librarians at the Louisville campus Library and Learning Resource Center has taken on the task of organizing the videos on Sullivan University’s Panopto server, and renaming the videos in a structured, controlled format. This reorganization will increase the findability and user-friendliness of the videos themselves. As part of the process, the librarians are soliciting feedback from the University community, especially those members who use, or plan to use in the future, online videos in their classes.

If you are a stakeholder in this reorganization, or have any questions or comments whatsoever, please contact librarians Cara Marco, Nathan Ragland, George Bergstrom, or Sarah Rice.
SACSCOC (STILL) MATTERS:
An ongoing column addressing compliance issues
“Springes to catch woodcocks:” Faculty standards 2.8 and 3.7.1
By
Charles Brown
Dean, University Libraries

In Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, Ophelia naively reveals the prince’s amorous blandishments to Polonius, her father, who derisively characterizes them as “springes to catch woodcocks” (i.e.: “traps for unwary birds”). The *Principles of Accreditation* are rift with standards that pose potential compliance traps for the unwary. As you know, the *Final Report of the SACSCOC Reaffirmation Committee* cited the university for three recommendations; and, in last quarter’s column, I focused on one of the three standards (i.e., CS 3.3.1.5) that tripped us up. In this column, I will address another one of these standards, viz.: CS 3.7.1. [In order to better elucidate the pitfalls coincident to this particular standard, however, I will also need to provide insights into other such “faculty” standards, notably CR 2.8, which is the core requirement “faculty” standard antecedent for the five comprehensive “faculty” sub-standards comprising 3.7. So, I will discuss CS 3.7.1 in combination with CR 2.8.] Of the nearly 100 SACSCOC standards reviewed decennially for full institutional reaffirmation, many either directly or indirectly affect – or are affected by – faculty, for example,

- CS 3.4.10 Faculty Responsibility for the curriculum;
- CS 3.5.4 Terminal degrees of faculty;
- CS 3.7.2 Faculty evaluation;
- CS 3.7.3 Faculty development;
- CS 3.7.4. Academic freedom of faculty;
- CS3.7. 5 Faculty role in governance.

In fact, the word “faculty” appears 247 times in the 130-page *Principles*. As I have noted, many of these standards constitute insidious noncompliance traps for unwary institutions. However, no faculty standards are more insidious and trap more unwary institutions than **CR 2.8 (“Adequate number of faculty”)** and **CS 3.7.1 (“Faculty competence”)**: the former standard appears on the SACSCOC “Top 10 Most Frequently Cited Principles in Reaffirmation Reviews for 2013 class institutions (N=75)” (q.v.) 53% of the time by off-site committees; and, remarkably, the latter appears a whopping 100% of the time in off-site reports! Over the
course of our most recent accreditation, these two standards, perforce, precipitated com-
ments from our off-site committee; and later, as you know, we received a recommendation
for CS 3.7.1 in the final Report of the Reaffirmation Committee. This SACSCOC (STILL) MAT-
TERS column will focus on the vexatious “springes” within these two standards.

As I noted two columns ago (Volume3, Issue3, Spring 2015):

In their Evaluator Training Module: MODULE 4: FOUNDATIONS OF INSTITU-
TIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (http://www.sacscoc.org/trngmods/IEModules.pdf),
SACSCOC lists three institutional effective Case Analysis Factors (CAF). CAF 1 –
“Knowing and Understanding the Language of The Principles of Accreditation,”
represents what SACSCOC wants its volunteer IE evaluators to know. Accord-
ingly, it is paramount that we who generate documents to support the universi-
ity’s compliance with SACSCOC standards be equally knowledgeable and under-
standing.

Moreover, each SACSCOC on-site and off-site committee will contain at least one peer evalua-
tor who is an experienced expert in faculty issues. Therefore, it is critically important to know
and to address all parts of these two standards.

CR 2.8 The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the
institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs. (Adequate num-
ber of faculty) [SACSCOC keywords are underscored]

The following highly elucidatory CR 2.8 Suggestions and Excerpt citing noncompliance are
drawn directly from the SACSCOC Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation:

- **Suggestion:** Define “full-time” faculty. Remember that a full-time administrator who teach-
es a class or two is not considered to be a full-time faculty member.
- **Suggestion:** List the expectations of the institution concerning duties of full time faculty.
For example, what are the expected teaching loads? What are other expected duties, such as advising, committee service, directing of theses and dissertations, etc.?

- **Suggestion:** Provide information for specific faculty members to include for specific terms the teaching load and, where applicable, advising loads, committee assignments, and other expected duties.

- **Excerpt citing noncompliance:** “The number of faculty and the faculty/student ratios appear to be sufficient in most programs. The number of hours assigned to individual faculty persons also appears to be appropriate, generally 12 to 15 per term. However, several programs appear to have few or no full time faculty involved in the program.”

Albeit a core requirement (CR), the data cited above from SACSCOC’s own “Top 10 Most Frequently Cited Principles in Reaffirmation Reviews” report would indicate that this standard is less vexatious than CS 3.7.1: 53% versus 100%. TRANSLATION: it might be easier - and it was for us - to confirm the adequate number of faculty (2.8) than to confirm faculty competence (3.7.1). For this standard, the commission has promulgated a recent (June 2014) policy:

**CORE REQUIREMENT 2.8 (Faculty)**

**Guideline**

**Why a Guideline instead of a Template?** This guideline replaces the CR 2.8 Template that was formerly posted on the SACSCOC website. The template focused exclusively on data-driven information regarding the teaching responsibilities of full-time faculty. This guideline appropriately addresses the array of responsibilities assigned to full-time faculty.

CR 2.8 The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and the integrity of each of its academic programs. Upon application for candidacy, an applicant institution demonstrates that it meets the comprehensive standard for faculty qualifications. (Faculty)

**Rationale.** Adequacy of faculty resources is necessary to ensure the quality and integrity of an institution’s academic programs in order to support its mission. Moreover, the
mission of the institution will govern the type of faculty employed, including the number, distribution, and expected role of full-time faculty in academic and governance matters. The achievement of the institution’s mission with respect to teaching, research, and service requires a critical mass of full-time, qualified faculty to provide direction and oversight of academic programs. The number of full-time faculty should be sufficient to fulfill basic faculty functions—curriculum design, development, and evaluation; teaching; identification and assessment of appropriate student learning outcomes; student advising; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and institutional and professional service. Consequently, an institution relies on full-time faculty engagement in all aspects of the academic program; its quality and integrity are not driven solely by the number of hours that full-time faculty are teaching.

Expectation. CR 2.8 expects an institution to (1) define full-time and part-time faculty; (2) define faculty oversight of its academic programs (beyond just broad areas such as social sciences or humanities, or broad degree categories such as Associate in Arts or Bachelor of Science) and academic processes; (3) describe the distribution/disaggregation of full-time and part-time faculty by academic program; (4) identify the expected role, responsibilities, and functions of full-time faculty charged to support and ensure the quality and integrity of each academic program, while also referencing work overloads; and (5) provide persuasive evidence that the number of full-time faculty in each academic program is adequate to fulfill those responsibilities. Institutions committing such evidence to tables should use institutionally-generated tables/charts as appropriate in lieu of those formerly provided by SACSCOC.

Document History
Approved: SACSCOC Board of Trustees, June 2014

Additionally, no less than 14 annual SACSCOC meeting presentations over the last several years have been devoted to exegeses of 2.8 (NOTE: for hardcore assessment fanatics, please see the SU Library folder Library>Accreditation>SACS Examples>2.8 to access handouts for these presentations)
To comply with this standard, which - reflective of its overall importance – is one of the 17 subsets of approximately 100 overall standards that institutions need to address at the time of their SACSCOC fifth-year *Interim Report*, typically institutions will provide the following evidence:

- Peer-to-peer benchmarks (i.e., IPEDS, College Results Online, Common Data Sets, etc.) against institutions with similar programs;
- Faculty Rosters and job descriptions, and other documentation;
- Institutional SACSCOC-aligned credentialing validation processes and policies.

The following highly elucidatory CS 3.7.1 *Suggestions* and *Excerpt citing noncompliance* are drawn directly from the SACSCOC *Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation*:

- **Suggestion**: Ensure that the qualifications are directly and specifically linked to the courses assigned to the faculty member. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. *(See Commission guidelines “Faculty Credentials.”)* *(Faculty competence)*
- **Suggestion**: Support justifications of faculty qualifications and experience through third-party documentation, such as transcripts and letters of recommendation, rather than rely-
ing on faculty-generated documents, such as resumes and personal websites. However, do
not include transcripts or letters of recommendation with the Application for Membership.

- **Suggestion:** When developing justifications for faculty whose expertise derives from person-
  nal/professional experience rather than from degrees earned, use the compliance com-
  ponents provided in the standard as appropriate for competence, effectiveness, and capac-
  ity as the organizing principle for presenting the documentation.

- **Excerpt citing noncompliance:** “The faculty roster was found to be incomplete. In some
cases, courses taught were missing; in others, the academic degrees of the faculty member
were not presented. Lacking a complete faculty profile, the Committee was unable to de-
termine the competency of thirteen faculty members.

CS 3.7.1 is one of the longer - and, hence, more complicated standards, which, in
SACSCOCspeak, is referred to as a “Multi-faceted Standard”
Faculty competence also applies to the total faculty complement, which involves a large num-
ber (typically, hundreds) of potential qualification pitfalls. Due, perhaps, to its complexity and
to its alignment with standards and requirements that directly parallel the criteria of the
USDoE as well as to its high rate of noncompliance, the Commission has developed useful
“Faculty Credentials” guidelines ([http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/faculty%20credentials.pdf](http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/faculty%20credentials.pdf)), which read:

> **When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the following as credential guidelines:**

  a. **Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level:** doctorate or
     master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with a concentration in
     the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching dis-
     cipline).

  b. **Faculty teaching associate degree courses designed for transfer to a baccalaureate
     degree:** doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with
     a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours
     in the teaching discipline).

  c. **Faculty teaching associate degree courses not designed for transfer to the baccalau-
     reate degree:** bachelor’s degree in the teaching discipline, or associate’s degree and
demonstrated competencies in the teaching discipline.

d. Faculty teaching baccalaureate courses: doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

e. Faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work: earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.

f. Graduate teaching assistants: master's in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline, direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline, regular in-service training, and planned and periodic evaluations.

Approved: College Delegate Assembly, December 2006

Astutely, the university has incorporated most (not the last one relating to “Graduate teaching assistants”) of these key guidelines into its “Faculty Qualifications” in the SU Faculty/Staff Manual.

Obviously, faculty credentials and qualifications constitute integral parts of this standard. To better abet one’s understanding, the following definition may be found in the SACSCOC Resource Manual’s Appendix B “Glossary of Terms,”

Faculty Credentials: When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the Commission’s credential guidelines.

Essentially, institutions are asked to employ faculty qualified to teach the courses it offers. At bottom, this assertion may seem axiomatic, but aligning faculty credentials/qualifications to courses is not as straightforward as it seems. Managing faculty credentials contributed to the university obtaining the latest Xitracs™ web 2.0 software in October, 2013. The Xitracs™ Plus software comprises a dual module: one for compliance and one for credentials. As you may know, I used the Xitracs™ compliance module to build for and deliver to SACSCOC both the Compliance Certification and the subsequent Focused Report. Additionally, however, the Xitracs™ Credentials module – aided by recent policy enhancements (i.e: the new “Verification and Authentication of Educational Credentials for Faculty and Professional or Para-Professional Staff Members” policy) - helps us to continuously manage the often thorny qualitative issues relating to SACS CR 2.8 (Faculty) and CS 3.5.4 (Terminal degrees of faculty). Functioning as the university's credential repository, this module may be accessed by authorized personnel for individual/departmental/school review of:
To any speculative calculus designed to achieve compliance with CS 3.7.1 (and CR 2.8), one will also need to factor in the CS 3.5.4 (Terminal degrees of faculty) requirements, viz.:

At least 25 percent of the discipline course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding the terminal degree – usually the earned doctorate – in the discipline, or the equivalent of the terminal degree.

Proverbially, this additional complexity “piles Ossa upon Pelion,” due mainly to faculty talent management difficulties prior to and after recruitment. To be sure, the academic credentials – or work experience - for any and every faculty member must be defensible in order to be compliance-proof. That is, if a faculty member possesses such and such academic degrees supplemented by such and such experiences, is he/she qualified to teach such and such class(es). A large number of highly differentiated credentials and experiences reside among any given faculty candidate; and those credentials and experiences may or may not align with the course’s academic qualification requirements. At some point, subjectivity may creep into the qualification calculus, which depreciates any ex post facto credentials’ defense to SACSCOC. As evidenced by googling “SACSCOC 3.7.1,” institutional faculty defenses can and often are made, but SACSCOC remains the final arbiter of these defenses. Plus, if one is routinely defending large numbers of faculty, one’s credibility may be compromised. So, recruiting qualified personnel is hypercritical and poses many problems for the compliance officer’s consideration. Yet, once again, the Xitracs™ Credentials module can be used to archive the qualifications of these faculty.

Having purposefully comported with all the CR 2.8 and CS 3.7.1 standards’ many complex issues – including those associated with CS 3.5.4 – an institution may still end up with noncompliance’s steely teeth biting into one’s ankle. Notwithstanding our best efforts to achieve and - with Xitracs™'s help - to demonstrate compliance with these important standards, they trapped us in 2005 and again in 2015, plus CR 2.8 solicited clarification for our 2010 Interim Report.
So, what is an institution to do—besides attempt to scrupulously adhere to the standards as they understand them? As illustrated in the University of Kentucky 2011 PowerPoint slide below, often institutions will enlist technology (e.g., Xitracs™) to manage transcript/CV credential digitization and strengthen upstream recruitment practices to align them with SACS criteria. (Google: University of Kentucky SACSReaffirmationUpdateGeneric PowerPoint)

Also, at the time of his/her application and appointment, each faculty member is strictly evaluated for his/her potential to contribute to the mission, vision, and goals. Additionally, the credentials of all fulltime faculty, all special faculty, and all part-time faculty are assessed by the appropriate department/program head and dean of their school or college, before the faculty member is hired and can teach any classes. Department chairs enter a justification for
each instructor and teaching assignment that does not satisfy SACS criteria with the university’s Office of the Provost reviewing all transcript to the course-level. As an integral part of this process, all credentials are digitized and archived in Xitracs™.

Lastly, institutions may feel like the person in the cartoon below: that the SACSCOC one-size-fits-all assessment criteria does not work for such a variety of applicants teaching such a variety of courses. As detailed in these standards, the essence of what SACSCOC requires is that qualified individuals should be enlisted to teach disciplines for which they are academically or experientially qualified. We want that; ACPE wants that; ARC-PA wants that; IACBE wants that. Even Major League Baseball wants that.

I hope this more fine-grained insight into this particular standard has been helpful. If you have questions, kindly let me know.
STANDING IN THE GAP
(The role of the educator in the life of a student with little or no support system)

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

Working with the non-traditional student and, in some cases, the first generation student with parents who don’t have any experience with academic expectations at the college level is the lot of the Sullivan University instructor/professor. This challenge in larger percentages, unlike those who teach at state and private four-year institutions, is a wonderful opportunity for the Sullivan University educator. The fact remains that all students want and need someone or several individuals to stand in the gap with them, enabling them to succeed at college. No one, not even the best and brightest, go through the academic rigors of college alone. Multiply this stress with the aspiration of the Sullivan University student to achieve an employable skill quickly rather than to have a pure academic experience, and the need for that support is increased.

Regardless of title, be it Advisor, trusted instructor, mentor, or other... the student is going to reach out to someone for support, and that support needs to be there. The function of the individual(s) who “stand in the gap” to help a student goes well beyond making sure that they are taking the right classes in the right order. The true person who fits this role is concerned with the growth and success of the student and goes beyond the classroom to really listen for the student’s goals and aspirations. A critical assessment on articles and research done on this subject brought out the following:

Phillip and Hendry (2000) have identified five types of natural occurring mentoring relationships adolescents and young adults may experience including: classic mentoring (one-on-one relationships between experienced adult and a younger person similar to an apprentice), individual-team (young group of people look to an individual or a few individuals for advice), friend-to-friend (provides a safety net, common among women friends), peer-group (among a group of friends, often when exploring an issue), and long term relationships with “risk taking” adults (similar to classic mentoring, but the person being mentored has a history of rebellion).\(^1\)

Someone or some group of individuals will be giving suggested life actions to your students when it is requested or perceived to be needed. The challenge for each individual who takes on the mantle of instructor/professor is to what level you are willing to be available and be that individual, or at least one of
Research done in recent history does not denote a change in the need for such support. The need for a student to expect support is no different in the community college student (usually a comparison with the student who would first look at Sullivan University as a freshman) and the four-year traditional college student.

This findings suggest that there was no significant difference between community college and 4-year college students in terms of the number of students who nominated a supporter. About half of students nominated a parent (mother or father) as the person who most supported them rather than another individual from the list provided. Among community college students, 53.0% selected a parent, and among 4-year university students, 50.0% selected a parent. Siblings (9.0%), significant others (8.5%), and friends (6.8%). Only 17.1% of the individuals nominated in this item worked or studied on the same campus as the student.2

So what does all this say to those who teach at Sullivan University? First, for many of you it confirms what you already know to be true and justifies the time you invest in the students in your class. Many of you, like this author, have students who will admit that they have absolutely no one in their corner for support. The fact is many of the students have people in their lives who they should count on for support, but who stand in the way of their academic progress. These students, in many cases, identify themselves by changes in behavior. They start the quarter off strong, then start missing assignments and class sessions. At that time, for those of you who watch for these signs, is when your action begins. As you know, it often doesn’t take much. The correct words of encouragement, a small bit of understanding, or getting the student to the correct person helps solve the problem at hand. Many of our students are stronger than they seem and respond very well—often eagerly—at the smallest guidance by you. Second, if you have not experienced this type of change in your class you are encouraged to think back at some of the students you have lost and consider what might have caused that student to separate from your class. Could you, by standing in the gap, in just a small way have made a difference and helped that student continue his or her dream of a degree and a better life?


Academic Council Highlights

By
Nick Riggs

As chair of the Academic Council, I am pleased to write 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.

While many in the Sullivan University community receive minutes of Council meetings and have a chance to offer matters for Council review and action, I think there are many who are not aware of the breadth of topics the Council handles over a year’s time. In just the past 12 months, the Council received or gathered information on, gave consideration to, and, in many instances, acted upon the following – in no particular order:

1. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
2. Sullivan University website
3. Creation of policy on appropriate student conduct when communicating and interacting with faculty and staff
4. Proposed universal grade book
5. Acceptance of academic credit
6. SACS matters
7. Shared public folders
8. Make-up exam policy & procedure
9. Statement of academic responsibility – online
10. Online course development process
11. Research study on assessment of online instruction
12. Project Governance Committee
13. SPSS training for faculty
14. Policies and procedures for bypass exams
15. Proposed revisions to the Charter of the Academic Council
16. Library survey
17. Project for improving communication, development and support for online faculty
18. Faculty professional development funds
19. Storage and cataloging of faculty-created video content
20. Role of the Institutional Review Board for “internal” surveys disseminated to university constituents
21. Proposed change to the university’s admission requirements
22. Faculty community service survey
23. Contact Manager RE: retention efforts
24. Sullivan University Cares On-Time Graduation Guarantee
It should be mentioned that many of these items were discussed and considered over multiple meetings. Few items are “one and done” when they come to the attention of the Council. This means selected matters are given the amount of time and scrutiny needed to make informed decisions.

As an example, the QEP, “Putting Care Back into Career,” has been viewed and will continue to be viewed as one of the most critical components of what we do as educators. Accordingly, the plan has been on the agenda of every Council meeting for more than a year and will remain as an agenda item for the foreseeable future.

As the QEP was going through its formative stages, the Council was kept up to date on its evolution into what is now considered to be a meaningful and assessable mechanism to enhance student learning. Dr. Mark Wiljanen, our fine Director of Institutional Research and leader of the development of the QEP into its present form, believes the Council played an essential role in bringing the QEP to its approved status. According to Dr. Wiljanen, “The Council’s review of the recommendations coming from the QEP Committee was both a vital contribution in shaping the QEP and an important process allowing the academic leadership, the deans and directors and all the Council members, to become directly involved with the QEP. Every meeting of the Council over the past year-and-a-half included a review and consideration of the QEP, and that process of ongoing deliberation was tremendously helpful in guiding the development of the QEP.” And Lynnette Kennedy, the recently appointed QEP Coordinator, sees the Council playing an important role as the QEP is implemented over the coming academic quarters. “The Academic Council will obtain a snapshot at each assembly and have an opportunity to ask questions or provide input on the QEP. Having the academic leadership involved and mindful of each stage of implementation is vital and will only increase the importance of this plan for our University. During this five year process I am looking forward to building a strong relationship with the Academic Council,” Kennedy said.

The above QEP commentary and representative list of other items brought to the attention of the Council should give all university constituencies a good feeling that all matters (large, small, direct, indirect, ancillary, etc.) affecting student learning are being addressed by the Council with the students’ best interest in mind.

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 Provost 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 09/09/2015
2. What are your goals in your educational career?

I’ve had the privilege of working with an amazing mentor at SUCOP, Professor Barbara Jolly. She and I have an ongoing project that identifies learning styles of pharmacy students. We successfully got a grant funded to create supplemental learning tools to
3. What do you like the most about teaching? What do you find the most challenging?

Standing in front of a hundred faces is both rewarding and daunting. It is a rush to me when the students are asking good questions – when I see they’re putting together multiple pieces to see a larger whole. A student comes to SUCOP as a blank slate, then flourishes into a caring, critical thinking pharmacist – that’s the most rewarding thing I experience as an educator. I still struggle with creating learning experiences in the classroom that will keep a large group interested for long lecture periods. I include active learning, quizzes, and case studies to keep students engaged. I also struggle with overcoming students’ “apathetic Googling.” Some students search Google for reputable biomedical literature, and quit when they don’t find what they’re looking for in the top three hits. I have to urge students to dig deeper, critically analyze the sources they’re using, and to weed out the information that is biased.

4. What motivates you when you teach?

As a pharmacist, my focus is always on the patient. As a faculty member, my focus is our students. I lead by example, always impressing upon students that the safety and well-being of our patients is crucial. That focus should drive every professional decision they make.

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

I am a fourth-generation beekeeper. I keep bees in my backyard in the Highlands. It is a meditative and fun hobby. As a scientist, I am fascinated by bees – their communication, their organization, their life cycle. I take every opportunity to tell others about the importance of bees to our food supply and our economy. In fact, this year, I am president of the Kentuckiana Beekeepers’ Association.
Check Out The Library’s Book Club!

By
Sarah Rice, MLS
Outreach and User Experience Librarian,
Sullivan University Library, Louisville Campus

Sullivan University Library (Louisville Campus) is proud to host a Book Club and discussion group that is open to the entire Sullivan University community. We believe that everyone, faculty, staff, or student, can enjoy a good book. And for students, we hope to show that reading can be fun as well as fundamental to their studies. Additionally, there has been correlation between individuals who read for recreation and individuals who are more likely to stay in school. For faculty, we are focusing on titles that are both interesting to read as well as useful for continuing education and skills management.

The format for the club is simple. Interested individuals are added to a mailing list. Members of the list vote on a title. Book Club members are encouraged to send in suggestions for titles to vote on. We are only attempting one book per quarter because we do not wish to add a lot of stress to anyone’s workload. If people clamor for more, we would certainly be open to adding more meetings and books. The Book Club meeting is held, generally during Week 7, and we discuss the title in depth. Discussion questions are also posted to a Goodreads group linked to the club so that those who cannot make it to campus can still engage with the material. We will be testing out the addition of a webinar component to the meeting for fall quarter so that members could call in on the meeting day.

Fall quarter’s book will be *Quiet: The Power of Introverts in a World That Can’t Stop Talking*, by Susan Cain. The libraries at the Louisville, Lexington, and SCTD campuses each have a copy of this text. In addition, the Louisville Free Public Library has multiple copies as well as eBook and audiobook editions. Copies from a book club kit will also be available. The Book Club will meet November 12th. If you are interested in joining the mailing list or if you would like to obtain one of the book club kit copies of the book, please contact Sarah Rice (srice@sullivan.edu).
Calendar Of Events
Fall 2015 Quarter

New Day Student Registration ................................................................. September 22 and 24, 2015
New Night Student Registration ................................................................. September 22-23, 2015
New Housing Student Registration ............................................................. September 23, 2015
Day School New Student Orientation ......................................................... September 25, 2015
Late Registration ...................................................................................... September 26, 2015
Night School and Online New Student Orientation .................................... September 26, 2015
First day of classes .................................................................................... September 28, 2015
Last day that a student can enter an online class ....................................... October 1, 2015
International Orientation .......................................................................... October 3, 2015
Last day that a student can enter a day class* .......................................... October 5, 2015
Last day that a student can enter an evening or weekend class ................. October 8, 2015
Academic Council Meets ........................................................................... October 15, 2015
Faculty Retreat ......................................................................................... October 17, 2015
Fall Graduation .......................................................................................... October 24, 2015
Adult Open House ..................................................................................... November 14, 2015
Academic Council Meets ........................................................................... November 19, 2015
Thanksgiving Break ..................................................................................... November 23-27, 2015
Last day that a student can withdraw and still receive a “W” ..................... December 4, 2015
First Day of Winter 2016 classes ............................................................... January 4, 2016

*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.
Before Ronda Rousey, there was Mary Guthrie!

Mary Guthrie Earns Two Judo Belts

By Cheryl Christopher

Yokogake! Osotoguruma! Haraigo-shi! Is it a bird? Is it a plane? Is it Batman? (Superman is old fashioned!) No, it's Mary Guthrie; and the language is Japanese. The reason Mary knows these Japanese words is because she is "almost an expert" on the subject of Judo.

Following the encouragement of her cousin, Mary began her interesting hobby last year at the Y.M.C.A., taking two twelve week courses.

She now possesses a white belt and a green belt, signifying she is an intermediate. She lacks only two more steps in obtaining the black or professional belt. Mary plans to continue her hobby, because it keeps her in contact with her first love—physical education.

The importance of the course was made evident to Mary when she found it necessary to send a belligerent young man sprawling to the ground.

So girls, if you are interested in making that special someone fall head over heels for you—try Mary Guthrie's way.
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NOTES TO THE FACULTY

• 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.

• If you have not already, please register for the 2015 Faculty Retreat here as soon as possible. This year’s Retreat is being held at Churchill Downs on October 17, 2015.