Charles Kuralt, the late and much beloved host of *CBS News Sunday Morning* and the author of many best-selling travel books, was absolutely right when he noted that: “Thanks to the Interstate Highway System, it is now possible to travel across the country from coast to coast without seeing anything.” Somewhere between Sandy Hook and Morehead, following the recent opening ceremony of our new Louisa Learning Center, and somewhere well off the beaten path of I-64 traffic, I was once again reminded just how correct Kuralt’s observation still is.

While driving along KY Highway 32 and listening to a Kentucky basketball game, I caught sight of a little bit of folk culture which caused me to turn my car around at the nearest safe place to see if what I thought I saw was real. Surely enough, my eyes had not deceived me. Perched high in a tree was quite clearly a large, fake gorilla holding a plastic baby doll. Across a narrow road from the gorilla was a tattered barn decorated with painted television satellite dishes and wooden cutouts of children along the top. On the other side of the narrow road leading back to the house was—what I can best determine as—a “body farm” for once loved but long forgotten baby dolls. Dolls in all types of disturbing conditions lined a partly wooden and partly wire fence leading to the house. The wooden picket fence in front of a two-story house was decorated with an odd combination...
of dolls’ heads and Marti Gras beads. As if engaged in casual Sunday afternoon conversation, four well-dressed mannequins gathered on the front porch of the house.

On the way back to the highway, I noticed a small sign which I hadn’t seen on my first pass. Amid the doll parts attached to the metal portion of the fence was a sign which read, “Science goin on.” Knowing a thing or two about Kentucky folk culture and the marvelous folk artists who live or lived along the Eastern Kentucky corridor, I knew that I had stumbled upon Cecil Ison’s experimental research site. Self-proclaimed as the world’s foremost forensic anthropomorphologist (whatever that may be), Mr. Ison retired as chief archeologist for the Daniel Boone National Forest and now studies the “deaths” and decomposition of plastic dolls.

Although Mr. Ison’s understanding of science may not mesh with many, his “Science goin’ on” statement certainly seems to be an appropriate enough description of many core activities in a university. Sullivan University’s mission formally promotes a culture of research at the graduate level, but “Science goin’ on” is as appropriate as any description of what has been happening at Sullivan University for some time now. However, as may surprise some, “Science goin’ on” also applies to our students as evidenced by a couple of recent kudos for our College of Pharmacy.

Held just last week at the University of Southern California campus in Los Angeles, the 2016 Student Pharmacist Compounding Competition (SPCC) attracted student teams from 18 participating universities. The competition was formidable and included many of the best known and respected schools of pharmacy in the nation: Colorado, Oklahoma, Washington State, South Carolina, Arkansas, SUNY-Buffalo, Missouri-Kansas City, among others. Comprised of three parts, the competition included compounding jeopardy, compounding practice, and a poster presentation.

Three second-year pharmacy students, Brianna Combs, Maritika Martin, and Rachel Ramsey represented Sullivan University. Accompanied by Dr. Uyen Le, the faculty advisor for the team, Brianna, Maritika, and Rachel showed their knowledge of compounding during the jeopardy contest, demonstrated their compounding skills during the compounding practice competition, and impressed judges with their abilities to present scientific research in the poster competition. Once all of the components were complete and all of the judges’ scores totaled, the team representing Sullivan University finished in first place. Brianna, Maritika and Rachel—on behalf of a very proud university—I extend congratulations to each of you for this truly grand accomplishment. You make us proud and are among the finest examples of “Science goin’ on” at Sullivan University.

Proving the point that success in science is more than just mastering a body of knowledge and
discipline-specific techniques, MeLeigha Milby, a third-year student in the College of Pharmacy, knows that human skills like communication, empathy, and relationship-building also play critical roles in the transfer of scientific knowledge. MeLeigha recently placed in the top 10 students in the nation for patient counseling at the APhA-ASP National Patient Counseling Competition. Each college of pharmacy is invited to send one student representative, and there are over 120 colleges of pharmacy in the United States. Dr. Stacy Miller reports that, “seeing MeLeigha getting called on stage for the 10 top students was a very proud moment for all of the faculty to see, and we are very proud of the hard work.”

Somewhere between Sandy Hook and Morehead and well away from I-64 traffic is a most marvelous example of Kentucky folk culture which reminded this educator of the “Science goin’ on” at Sullivan University. Building a culture of scientific research at the graduate level, which is part of the Sullivan University Mission Statement, largely means engaging our students and fostering their discovery, their experimentation, and their journeys. As we enter into a new academic quarter, I extend my thanks to all of you who facilitate this discovery, experimentation and help students along their journeys.

Best wishes—

Ken

Dr. Kenneth R. Miller, Jr.
Provost
Sullivan University
Beginning with the Spring 2016 quarter, Sullivan University has implemented the Folilotek digital portfolio management system as part the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The goal of this implementation is for each student to establish a digital portfolio to collect samples of the student’s career related accomplishments. The initial implementation includes the College of Pharmacy, Ph.D. in Management, National Center of Hospitality Studies, Culinary Arts Associate’s program (Lexington) and Institute for Legal Studies (Associate’s and Bachelor’s programs).

**Why create an e-Portfolio?**

Creating an academic and professional e-Portfolio encourages one to think critically about and document one’s thoughts and experiences related to lifelong learning.

**Who benefits from using e-Portfolios?**

**STUDENTS:**
e-Portfolios provide an interactive and dynamic workspace to showcase student assignments. Many students may never think about what they need to bring to an interview until they start the job-search process, and at that point it’s a matter of scrambling to find quality pieces that will speak to their skills, interests, and expertise.

If students instead construct an e-Portfolio as they progress through their college education,
they can look at their assignments, projects, and achievements as they’re completed and earned, and consider which pieces best exemplify their talents and experience. e-Portfolios encourage and enable reflection about a particular assignment and/or the learning process itself. They also encourage students to innovate and experiment as they develop technological skills.

Rather than simply listing “public speaking,” “estate planning,” “graphic design,” “culinary,” or “conflict management” as skills on a résumé, students’ e-Portfolios can contain papers, projects, videos, photographs, and other “artifacts” that prove they can work with job-relevant skills and tools—and thereby enable employers to see that their talents and abilities fulfill what they’re looking for in a job candidate.

**FACULTY:**

e-Portfolios facilitate the delivery of feedback to students and encourage dialogue about the work they complete. Faculty benefit from having one unified place to read assignments, leave feedback, and discuss work or drafts. E-Portfolios provide a space to assess students’ creativity and capture shifts in student thinking. They serve as a showcase for an entire class’ work and capture it as an example for the future.

**THE UNIVERSITY:**

e-Portfolios enable the ongoing collection, evaluation, and storage of key artifacts of student learning for assessment and accreditation purposes. They allow for the creation and use of rubrics, within the application, for evaluating student work. They store data (e.g., ratings, reflection, and more) for university-wide assessment use and archives. They capture and archive the process of deep, authentic, and experiential learning.

The ultimate outcome for Sullivan University students will be a deeper understanding of their career discipline and a clearer career path. Great things are in store for Sullivan University as we all work together to put the Care Back into Careers. As we roll-out the QEP, it will be an interesting and rewarding journey. Your thoughts and suggestions are always welcome. Please send them my way at lkennedy@sullivan.edu or call me at 502-413-8519.
Pop quiz! What is the function of the Sullivan University Institutional Review Board?

A) To review all documents issued by the Sullivan University Administrative Office and correct all mistakes of spelling, grammar, punctuation, and sentence construction.

B) To review all Sullivan University institutional effectiveness plans.

C) To review all circumlocutions emanating from senior administrators, whether they be enunciated or inscribed, that embrace more than a quartet of polysyllabic Latinate linguistic formulations.

D) None of the above.

Congratulations if you selected D! The Sullivan University Institutional Review Board (IRB), under the direction of its Co-Chairs, Dr. Gopal Pillai (College of Pharmacy) and Dr. LaVena Wilkin (Graduate School), oversees all research involving human subjects conducted by Sullivan University faculty, staff, and students. This includes not only the obvious categories of pharmacological or medical studies but also studies involving questionnaires, surveys, or interviews and studies making use of data derived from or concerning humans, including census data. The goals of the IRB are to preserve and ensure the safety and welfare and the rights of all human research subjects, including the right of privacy. A very large part of the IRB’s time and effort is, in fact, focused on the issue of preserving confidentiality and only allowing data to be used to the extent and for the purposes agreed to by the subjects without revealing the identity of subjects against their wishes.

The last issue of the Academic Illuminator (Winter 2016) contained several references to the growing interest in research and scholarly activity by our faculty and students. In light of this, the role of the Sullivan University IRB is becoming increasingly important, and it might be helpful to understand what it does and how it functions. The Sullivan University Institutional Review Board operates according to the regulations presented in the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46, also known as the Common Rule), and in accordance with the principles outlined in the 1979 Belmont Report which describes the three guiding principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice.

In the enforcement of these regulations and principles, the IRB is empowered to approve research pro-
projects, to disapprove research projects, and to require modifications in research projects. Research that the IRB approves may require approval by other officials at Sullivan University, who may choose to disapprove the project. Other officials at Sullivan University may not, however, approve a project that the IRB has disapproved. All approved research receives continuing review and approval by the IRB at least annually. The IRB may require more frequent review if it so desires.

Here’s the single most important thing you need to know about the IRB:

All research projects involving human subjects or involving data on humans (including census data) must be reviewed by the IRB. No interaction with human subjects is permitted until a project has been approved by the IRB.

There are only two exceptions to this rule:

Survey or data projects which are conducted within the scope of a Sullivan University course, involving only students currently in the course or publicly available data, with no intent or expectation that the results of those projects will ever be used outside of that course.

Data collection forms and processes that are routine, standardized, and fundamentally essential to the core operations of the University, for example the routine and essential data collection activities of the Admissions, Financial Planning, and Human Resources units. Surveys focusing strictly on service evaluation, such as the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, faculty and course evaluations, and the simple service evaluation surveys used by the IT unit, also do not require IRB approval.

In order to fulfill its responsibilities, the Sullivan University IRB meets monthly to consider research projects involving human subjects or data on humans. In addition to such projects conducted by Sullivan University faculty and students, the IRB also approves or disapproves similar projects which require or request the involvement of the university in providing access to university faculty, staff, or students.

A current initiative of the Sullivan University IRB involves the extensive revision of its application forms, and I’ll tell you more about this in the next issue of the Academic Illuminator. But in the meantime, if you are undertaking a research project that requires IRB approval, the current forms may be found on the Institutional Review Board website (start at ir.sullivan.edu and follow the navigation panel on the left). A schedule of IRB meeting dates may also be found on the IRB website. Please keep in mind that all applications for IRB review must be submitted at least one week prior to the date of an IRB meeting. Completed applications, with all required signatures and all supporting documentation, should be submitted to IRB@sullivan.edu. And I’m always available to discuss your plans and answer your questions at MWijjanen@sullivan.edu.
Five Questions For…

Krista Riggs, PhD
Director of Assessment and Basic Science Curriculum
Physician Assistant Program
College of Health Sciences

For this installment of “Five Questions For...,” we interviewed Dr. Krista Riggs, the Director of Assessment and Basic Science Curriculum for the Physician Assistant (PA) program at the College of Health Sciences, located at Sullivan University’s Louisville campus.

Dr. Riggs has been an educator for five years, one and a half of those years being spent with Sullivan University’s PA program. The subject areas she specializes in within her discipline are biochemistry, pathology, pathophysiology, and pharmacology. She also coordinates all assessment activities within her program, a major undertaking thanks to the program’s recent accreditation site visit by ARC-PA, their programmatic accreditor. She wears many hats here at the University!

1. Where are you from originally? Where did you attend school?
I am originally from Sayre, a small town of about 5,000 people in northeastern Pennsylvania. I earned a bachelor of arts in Biochemistry at Keuka College in Penn Yan, NY and a Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Molecular biology at the University of Louisville School of Medicine.

2. How did you originally get into education? What was your motivation?
I started teaching part-time to supplement my income while I was a postdoctoral fellow. I completely fell in love with it. At first, I felt conflicted leaving research because it is important work with the exceptional purpose of providing new treatments for people who become ill. After accepting my first teaching position at the Alabama College of Osteopathic Medicine, and now with future Physician Assistants in the Sullivan University Physician Assistant Program, I have found a new purpose in educating future healthcare providers on how to use advancements
made through research to improve their patient’s lives.

3. What aspect of teaching do you like the most?
My favorite thing about teaching is that I still get to be a student myself. As a teacher I’m always learning more about the topics I teach. Plus, there is always one student who will ask a question that you don’t know the answer to.

4. Do you have any heroes or role models in education or your field of study?
I’m always inspired by strong women in science, from those of the past like Rosalind Franklin to those who influenced my life directly. I was most impacted by my undergraduate professor of biology, Dr. Joan Magnusen at Keuka College and my doctoral mentor at the University of Louisville School of Medicine, Dr. Carolyn Klinge. Dr. Magnusen gave me solid foundational knowledge and encouraged me to pursue the research field. Dr. Klinge inspired me to do important work such as hers in the field of breast cancer research. Both of these women demonstrated to me what it was to be dedicated, disciplined, and successful. Of all my teachers, they challenged me the most and expected more from me than I thought I was capable of. It was rarely easy, but I learned so much from them.

5. Do you have any advice for new educators?
I think the most important thing I’ve learned in teaching is to be bold, have fun, and not be afraid of trying new things. I’ve tried many things that failed, but I’ve also found success. Also, if I’m being honest, students can smell fear.

---

Library Events for Spring 2016!

March 30, 10:00 AM-1:00 PM – Get to know the library services at the Student Involvement Fair.

April 10-16 – National Library Week! We will be holding a contest for best book spine poetry! Send us your creations.

April 23-30 – Money Smart Week! The library will have an info table on financial literacy in the café on 4/27 from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

May 12, 2:00-3:00 PM – Book Club! We will meet in the library to discuss the most recent reading selection.

May 24, 7:00-9:00 PM – APA Wrap-up! Send students to the library for last minute APA assistance.
Apposite the Federal Requirements (FR), I have been asked to share any SACSCOC insights related to online pedagogical: several FR’s – notably the triad of 4.8 requirements – specifically address DOE-mandated technical online requirements, such as:

**FR 4.8 (Distance and correspondence education)**
- 4.8.1 (identity of a student who participates in class or coursework)
- 4.8.2 (written procedure for protecting the privacy of students)
- 4.8.3 (written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges)

Due to the expert leadership of its Online Division, the university complied very handily with these requirements on our 2015 reaffirmation. More recently - as the committee member assigned to review these FR’s (I am regularly assigned these standards in addition to my usual complement of library and technology standards), I also had the occasion to work more closely with them as a member of an on-site reaffirmation team.

To address such issues, the SACSCOC’s website touts its:

- Commission Policies
- Commission Guidelines
- Commission Good Practices
- Commission Position Statements

SACSCOC defines a commission policy as:
By the way, politicians, as well as political commenters bent on diffusing their noise-machine agitprop, often talk derisively about statutory “overbreadth,” which connotes the excessive broadness, for example, of a statute that in proscribing unprotected speech might also proscribe protected speech. In its disparagingly jurisprudential application, overbreadth is also often referred to as “lochnerization,” a legal method to examine and overturn economic legislation under the guise of enforcing the “Due Process Clause” (cf.: Lochner v. New York, 198 U.S. 45 [U.S. 1905]).

That is not what is going on here with SACSCOC and online issues, for: in June 1997 – now, almost twenty years ago, SACSCOC initially adopted its official online policy statement: “DISTANCE AND CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION Policy Statement,” to which it refers throughout the Principles of Accreditation. Subsequently, SACSCOC updated this policy in accord with the revised Principles, in December 2006; then they were revised by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees in June 2010; re-edited in January 2012; and, finally, reformatted in July 2014. This policy also offers a “Definition of Correspondence Education.” The three-page SACSCOC “DISTANCE AND CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION Policy Statement” lists the following five sub-statements, the first threw of which basically encapsulate the 4.8.1-.3 Federal Requirements:
Policy Statements

1. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (1) a secure login and pass code, (2) proctored examinations, and (3) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification. [This is essentially FR 4.8.1]

2. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution demonstrates that it has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs. [This is essentially FR 4.8.2]

3. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution demonstrates that it has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity. [This is essentially FR 4.8.3]

4. An institution that offers distance or correspondence education must ensure that it reports accurate headcount enrollment on its annual Institutional Profile submitted to the Commission.

5. Institutions must ensure that their distance and correspondence education courses and programs comply with the Principles of Accreditation. This applies to all educational programs and services, wherever located or however delivered.

At the application level, this policy also contains a bulleted section more specifically addressing the following:

- Mission
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Faculty
- Institutional Effectiveness
- Library and Learning Resources
- Student Services
- Facilities and Finances

For our purposes, the Institutional Effectiveness bulleted section – restated below - may be of particular interest:
In addition to this commission policy, SACSCOC also promulgates the following Guidelines for Addressing Distance and Correspondence Education: A Guide for Evaluators Charged with Reviewing Distance and Correspondence Education (see: SACSCOC Resource Manual, Appendix C, pp. 127ff). In the words of SACSCOC,

This Guide provides assistance for committee members when preparing to serve as evaluators of distance and correspondence education. It should be used in conjunction with the Principles of Accreditation, the Resource Manual, and the Handbook for Peer Evaluators as well as the Commission policy “Distance and Correspondence Education.”

Notably, this guide lists “An Overview of Expectations,” in which it allows that “Accreditation is a higher education self-regulatory mechanism that plays a significant role in … in enhancing institutional effectiveness.” Intriguingly, although “institutional effectiveness” appears 34 times in the SACSCOC Resource Manual, the word “online” only appears once...in the Appendix C section. All other references are subsumed under “distance education” or “correspondence education.” SACSCOC Guidelines do list the following definition of Distance Education:

For the purposes of the Commission on College’s accreditation review, distance education is a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. A distance education course may use the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVD’s, and CD-ROMs if used as part of the distance learning course or program.
In a July 13, 2015, email to the Accreditation in Southern Higher Education (ACCSHE) listserv, Virginia Kinman, the Assistant Vice President for Accreditation and Compliance at Longwood University in Farmville, VA, broached the following questions regarding a definition of online:

We have changed our definition of hybrid from 50% or more of instruction (which corresponds to the SACSOC definition of distance education) to 30% or more of instruction. This will extend the requirement for training to instructors who are teaching a course with 30% or more of instruction delivered online. We code courses as either hybrid (which will now be 30-99% online) or online (100% online).

Can we use our internal 30% or more definition instead of the SACSCOC 50% or more distance education definition when demonstrating compliance with the Principles for distance education? For example, in our 2013 Compliance Certification Report, we compared the percentage of full-time faculty who taught face-to-face classes with those who taught classes that were 50% or more online. In the future, can we use our internal 30% definition instead for 2.8 and other standards where we would use generated student credit hours in calculations to isolate distance education? This will affect how we code courses going forward.

I would still expect to track which programs are 50% or more online for the Institutional Summary.

I’m not sure if I’ve expressed my question well. The bottom line is that we really don’t want to have to code courses that are 30-49% online differently from those that are 50% or more online. Has anyone else dealt with this recently?

My response to her ACCSHE questions – and my suggestion to SU for any definition that it might devise - would be: SACSCOC is not prescriptive, but does require that, first: institutions propitiate the requirements of all parts of all standards; and, second, institutions adhere to any associative policies, such as those that might supervene for online that they have set in place in accordance with the famous SACSCOC “implicit” policy statement:

The Requirement of a Policy:
Implicit in every Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, and Federal Requirement mandating a policy or procedure is the expectation that the policy or procedure is in writing and has been approved through appropriate institutional processes, published in appropriate institutional documents accessible to those affected by the policy or procedure, and implemented and enforced by the institution. At the time of review, an institution will be expected to demonstrate that it has met all of the above elements. If the institution has had no cause to apply its policy, it should indicate that an example of implementation is unavailable because there has been no cause to apply it. (See Commission best practices, “Developing Policy and Procedures Documents.”)
Also, Appendix C provides some elucidating “Generic Questions Related to the Distance and Correspondence Education Programs Being Reviewed.” Again, the university satisfactorily addressed these questions as detailed below:

- What distance and correspondence learning courses and programs are being offered?
- What are the modes of delivery for the programs? The description should include hybrids of online/face-to-face, etc.
- Where are they offered?
- Why did the institution choose to offer these programs through a distance learning mode?
- Who are responsible for the academic and administrative coordination of the programs?
- Who are “teaching” the courses? Are the faculty of record the same faculty employed by the institution?

Ah, institutional effectiveness assessment: “There’s the respect/That makes calamity of so long life,” as Hamlet says in Act 3, scene one. For - as many of you know, the university’s primary third-party assessment relies upon the validity of data gleaned from both the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz℠ Student Satisfaction Inventory™ and Priorities Survey for Online Learners™ assessment instruments. While the University uses the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz℠ PSOL™ to assess the satisfaction of services provided to online students assigned to the Online Division, it is not administered to other students taking online courses. The SU IR Director has observed:

the lack of congruence between the Online Division as an administrative, course-offering, and service-providing entity and the campus identifiers attached to the students taking online courses. Certainly, students with an online identifier take only online courses, with few exceptions. But students with brick-and-mortar campus identifiers also take many online courses. When we say that we want to assess online students, does it make sense to assess only those with an online identifier? Or for that matter, does it make sense to include the student with a brick-and-mortar identifier, but who takes only online courses, in with those students who take only (or mostly) face-to-face courses? If we want meaningful assessments, we will have to build them upon meaningful definitions.
Expressed another way by the SU Dean of the Online Division:

*There is no mechanism to assess the online experience of those considered to be “hybrid” students or those from Louisville, Lexington or Ft. Knox who may be taking all online courses, since they are serviced by their physical location and the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz SSI is designed for on-ground courses and services.*

At present no formal SU/SUS definition of an “online student” exists in either the SUS or SU faculty/staff manual or in the catalog. The Dean of the Online division tells me, “we have definitions for online and hybrid courses. Online courses are those in which all instruction occurs online and there are no required face-to-face class sessions. Hybrid courses include a combination of face-to-face and online class sessions. Normally, a fully online student would be defined as one who is taking online courses exclusively, while a hybrid student would be taking a combination of online and on-ground courses. In actual practice, the situation is a bit more complicated.” If we harken back to the SACSCOC “Distance Education” statement related ostensively to its IE assessment, above, it – in concert with CR2.5 and CS 3.3.3 - mandates regular assessment of the “comparability of distance and correspondence education programs to campus-based programs and courses...including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction.”

While current mechanisms can track retention and satisfaction of campus-based and online students and can also track learning outcomes at the course level, it is not possible to compare campus-based versus online degree or certificate programs. This is because Sullivan University has no program that is exclusively campus-based for some students and exclusively online for others. While Louisville and Lexington by-campus assessment (as detailed in Dr. Nick Riggs’ excellent assessment table listed below) may be compared, including a comparison of the campus-based courses taken at each location, there are no Louisville-online or Lexington-online courses. A single online course may include students from Louisville, Lexington, Ft. Knox and those assigned to the Online Division.
As heretofore noted, unfortunately, the university has not been assessing the experiences of hybrid students, but this may improve soon.

I am grateful to the invaluable insights of my colleagues for this article which should provide the SU academic community with a SACSCOC-filtered overview of this important subject.
The phrase in the title of this article, “Collective Capacity,” is a term used at some length by Michael Fullan, author and educator. His credentials, as stated by Corwin, his publisher, include “Order of Canada, professor emeritus at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. He served as special adviser in education to Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty from 2003 to 2013.”

He is also credited as a major contributor in the dramatic improvement of student success for school systems while serving in his advisory position there. This article is using the phrase “Collective Capacity” as validation for what has been done by the Sullivan University System’s successful retention efforts to date, and as a benchmark for what will be used in the development of retention ideas in the future.

Our students move at the speed of technology. Methods once used successfully to maintain contact with a student in academic difficulty are no longer as effective, if effective at all. Students are no longer exclusively attached to just one campus location and/or platform, making universal knowledge of student issues by one faculty base all but impossible. Even though many agree with these statements, it is also true that some hold to exclusive independence and success in their individual classrooms. Zack Sampson authored for Learning Lab the following in May of 2014:

“When teachers work together they can more easily overcome instructional challenges and identify common goals to work toward, according to the report. The Rennie Center found that to foster collaboration, good schools can set up a team-based structure for teachers and can promote a general appreciation of cooperation among staff members.

Still pervasive today, teachers tend to work independently and are often unaware of what is going on in nearby classrooms. Thus, fostering collaboration is a challenge for most schools. When it does occur, collaboration depends on establishing trust among teachers and between teachers and school leaders. In short, a two-pronged approach is needed. First, schools must implement structures, routines, and protocols to establish and facilitate teacher interaction focused on instructional issues. Second, specific attention must be devoted to nurturing school-wide behavioral norms that undergird collaborative practices, such as collective responsibility for student learning.”
Everyone sharing and working together in concert makes this happen. This type of collaboration is evident quarter after quarter from the feedback given from users of both the prior quarter poor academic performance report and the excessive absence report generated from the system office of retention. Two recent examples of the use of collective capacity happened during the December 2015 break. One professor (Sullivan University Lexington), upon review of the poor academic performance report, actively contacted a student named on the report and set in motion a chain of events that will keep the student moving toward their degree. A second was a department head (Sullivan University Louisville), acting upon a call resulting from an activity in the contact manager (the systems Student Information System), met with the student specified in the contact activity and discovered a non-academic problem. A plan is in place and that plan hopes to solve the problem, allowing the student to persist at Sullivan University rather than transfer away. It is becoming more and more apparent that it takes everyone every day to help resolve the issues raised by the current generation of students. The Sullivan University system’s faculty are making a difference and are exemplifying, with regard to retention, a collective capacity culture. Recently a quote was made in the Ed Week blog by the Learning First Alliance that said:

It’s no surprise that high performers place good teaching at the core of system success. What is striking, though, is that these nations see teaching capacity as neither a finite resource nor an individual commodity. While individual skill is important, it is the notion of collective capacity that supports results for students and drives a continuous improvement cycle for educators. In his 2010 book, All Systems Go, Michael Fullan called collective capacity a hidden resource that "generates the emotional commitment and the technical expertise that no amount of individual capacity working alone can come close to matching.”

As the Sullivan University System rebounds from this down admissions cycle, all can be hopeful because of the processes now in place; systems of communications available; and the ever growing number of those who use the retention tools to help students regardless of platform, time of class, or location. Weekly as well as quarterly reports are a testament to the effort now exampled. It goes without saying that 2016 will bring its own set of challenges for our students, and as we work together solutions to those challenges will be found. Issues such as communication by texting, less complex means of recording effort, and better ways to identify students at risk are but a few of the items being looked at for 2016. With all working together, and using your individual skills, the university system will continue to see our students thrive in the caring environment of Sullivan University.

• • •
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Sullivan University Partners with Dale Carnegie

By Jeffery Stone
Associate Professor, General Education
Sullivan University, Lexington Campus

Change is often a struggle that people do not look forward to. However, if they hope to progress in their professional and personal lives, change is essential. In 2001, Sullivan College became Sullivan University and embarked on an ever-changing path of growth and improvement. Since then, Sullivan University has successfully added Master’s and Doctoral degrees and worked to improve all of its course offerings by updating content, enhancing teaching methods, and increasing skill relevancy. In the spirit of such changes, Sullivan University recently initiated another improvement that will affect many if not all of its students. Sullivan University partnered with the Dale Carnegie Program with the goal of integrating the teachings of Dale Carnegie into an academic course that will fulfill a general education requirement in most degree programs. This course, tentatively titled “Effective Communication and Conflict Resolution,” will replace the Public Speaking course. This new course will offer a different approach to improving the communication skills of students while maintaining Sullivan University’s academic integrity and the time honored tradition of Dale Carnegie’s teachings. This course is being designed with the concept of improving the overall general education experience for Sullivan University’s students as well as increasing the relevancy of general education in all degree programs offered. More information on this exciting new development will be released as it becomes available.
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.

This article will be shorter than usual! 😊 Typically, when I write this article for publication in the spring edition of the *Academic Illuminator*, I inform readers about the most recent election of four new at-large faculty members to the Council. Well, a recent vote by the Council membership resulted in the postponement of the election until such time as the Academic Council Charter (hereafter AC Charter or charter) is reviewed and revised.

Within the past year, it became apparent that the practice of the Council has not always been in tune with the AC Charter – or vice versa. As an example, due to lack of clarity or changes in titles and job descriptions of some academic leaders who are Council voting members, a question has arisen as to whether those members meet the requirements to have voting status. With that in mind, the Council (at my suggestion) has decided to take a look at the AC Charter to see if it needs revision. Since voting status is not the only area of the charter needing review, the decision was made by formal vote to take a fresh look at the charter as a whole.

As a result, a committee has been formed to review all sections of the AC Charter for revision, updating or deletion. The committee’s review and recommended charter changes will be predicated on the fact that modifying the charter to meet the needs of the ever-changing work environment is appropriate and wise. In fact, if you did not know, the AC Charter has been amended several times since its inception in April 2007. Documented revisions were made in January 2010, May 2012, February 2014, April 2014, and July 2014.

The goal is for the committee to make charter revision recommendations to the full Council during the Spring 2016 quarter, with the revised AC Charter being presented for a formal vote at the first Council meeting in the Summer 2016 quarter, if not sooner. This will allow for an election of new at-large faculty members soon thereafter. So stayed tuned. And, if you are a faculty member, when you see the election notice disseminated by the Provost’s office, please give due consideration to running for one of the at-large positions.

In conclusion, 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 03/10/2016
Plugged In With SUS IT

By Michael Runner, MSM
Application Support Analyst, Sullivan University System

We moved to Office 365! Moving to the Office 365 cloud comes with many great features and benefits for you and the Sullivan University System. Namely, SUS gets to continue to use the software we all know and love, but everything is now housed in one convenient location. In addition to this convenience, there are many other notable advantages of using Office 365:

- **Generate Greater Productivity**: Microsoft has placed great emphasis on the simplicity of Office 365. Navigation within Office 365 is very intuitive and makes accessing a wide variety of tools and data easier than ever before.

- **Access from Anywhere**: Mobility is a hot-topic for the modern business, and with Office 365 it’s never been easier to access your enterprise software on the go. All you need is a computer (desktop, laptop, tablet, or smart-phone) and an Internet connection/phone connection.

- **Increased collaboration capabilities**: You can now create, edit, and share data and documentation with anyone at SUS in real time. You can connect with colleagues through a wide range of communication tools, from email and IM to social networking and video conferencing.

The IT team is here to help with whatever questions you have regarding Office 365.

It’s been quite an eventful couple of months for the IT team. In addition to the huge achievement of migrating to Office 365, the new IT Helpdesk solution has been launched! The new IT Portal makes finding answers to your tech questions easier than ever before. Users can visit itportal.sullivan.edu to:

- Request IT Assistance
- Learn more about mobile device setup for email
- See upcoming technological changes on their campus
- Read up on and view helpful guides for GoToMeeting, Faculty and Student Portals, Panopto, CampusNexus (formerly called CampusVue), ImageNow, Sway, OneDrive for Business, and many more
Calendar Of Events
Spring 2016 Quarter

New Day Student Registration.................................................................March 23, 2016
New Night Student Registration...............................................................March 23, 2016
New Housing Student Registration..........................................................March 23, 2016
Day School New Student Orientation.........................................................March 25, 2016
Night School New Student Orientation......................................................March 26, 2016
Late Registration ......................................................................................March 26, 2016
First day of classes ....................................................................................March 28, 2016
Last day that a student can enter an online class........................................March 31, 2016
International Orientation ..........................................................................April 1, 2016
Last day that a student can enter a day class* ............................................April 4, 2016
Last day that a student can enter an evening or weekend class..................April 7, 2016
Academic Council Meets ..........................................................................April 14, 2016
Spring Graduation Ceremony .....................................................................April 23, 2016
Summer Start Pre-Orientation ..................................................................May 14, 2016
Academic Council Meets ..........................................................................May 19, 2016
Last day that a student can withdraw and still receive a “W”.......................May 27, 2016
Summer Break .........................................................................................June 13-24, 2016
Summer Graduate School Cohort Dinner ....................................................June 15, 2016
First Day of Summer 2016 classes ..............................................................June 27, 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.
From night school librarian to provost. #careergoals
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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

- 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.

- Reminder: Employees and students at Sullivan University must wear their identification badges at all times. NCHS students who have their names embroidered on their uniforms are exempt from this policy while wearing said uniforms.