Having been declared as “the mother of the world” by Time magazine, Margaret Mead, the famed anthropologist and social commentator, shared her insights into motherhood and what she believed were qualities of good mothers regardless of culture. Mead provided a list of five qualities which she believed good mothers regardless of cultural background have. The first two qualities listed—and possibly the most important two of a list of five—are that good mothers treat each child as an individual and help each child set out on his or her own path.

Titling this article “Raising the Kennedys,” one may rightfully think of the famous matriarchs of the Kennedy clan of Massachusetts, namely Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, the mother of John, Robert, and Teddy Kennedy, or Ethel Kennedy, the widow of Robert Kennedy who raised eleven children largely on her own following Robert’s assassination in 1968. Surely, nobody would argue that these famous matriarchs treated children as individuals and helped set them on their paths. However, the Kennedy family that is the subject of this article is one much closer to Sullivan University.
During the fall 2012 graduation ceremony, what could be considered as a parade of Kennedy family members walked across the graduation stage to receive their degrees. Lynnette Lambert-Kennedy and Jeff Kennedy, her husband, both received Master of Science in Conflict Management degrees. Two of their children, Deborah and Janae, both received associate degrees at the same ceremony. All-in-all, that particular graduation ceremony was one in which the university community reveled in the celebration of a single family. Since then, two of her other children have attended Sullivan University System schools while Deborah went on to complete a BS in Interdisciplinary Studies and Janae finished a BA degree at another university. Jeff is enrolled again as a student and is near completion of the MSHRL program. In total, all six members of the Kennedy family have attended or attend Sullivan University System schools.

Sometime back in May, Lynnette was selected as the QEP Coordinator—a position which is strategic for the university and one which will help set the tone for our “putting the care back in career” as we pursue QEP implementation over the next five years and institutionalize many of its initiatives. During her interview, Lynnette shared that her children had already lived through the most important aspects of Sullivan University’s QEP, and she partially credited some activities embedded in the QEP as a contributing factor to her children’s completion of academic studies.

As part of helping her children understand their individuality and setting them on a course of study which would best capitalize on their individual strengths, each of her children periodically took career assessment inventories and personality inventories like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to help them gain reflective insights into their personalities and the information they needed to open the window to potential opportunities through career assessments by helping them choose their programs of study carefully. In short, Lynnette followed Mead’s advice to treat each child as an individual and set them on their individual paths.

Setting her children on their individual paths also included helping guide their studies at Sullivan University beyond just making them reflect on career assessment inventories and discovering their individual strengths. According to Lynnette, the Kennedy children would use their courses as opportunities to further explore their career choices whenever they wrote papers,
essays, or conducted research in their courses. To emphasize communication skills, her children took the Dale Carnegie Course. To demonstrate to themselves and potential employers what they learned, each of her children developed portfolios and took advantage of experiential learning opportunities like externships. When preparing to enter the workforce, they worked closely with Career Services staff to do mock interviews and sharpen their resumes.

Quoting Lynnette from a statement she made to the QEP search committee members, “there is no better way to show ‘I care’ than to make certain that students graduate according to plan.” If there is a formula to graduating students according to plan, part of that formula would include what Margaret Mead noted nearly 50 years ago and Lynnette put into practice with her children. First, make as certain as possible that students first understand themselves as individuals—their strengths as individuals and which Sullivan University programs best fit those strengths. Second, do our level best to set students on a path which will maximize their odds at being successful as students and, ultimately, as working adults. As I stated in the e-mail which introduced Lynnette as QEP Coordinator, “if she shepherds each of our new undergraduate students just like she did with her own children, we are a long way toward successful implementation of the QEP already.”

As always, thank you for being supportive of our students, our students, and our mission as a career university. Best wishes as we enter into a new quarter—

Ken

Ken Miller
Provost
Sullivan University
The search is finally over — I have been appointed the QEP Coordinator for Sullivan University. I come to you with a passion for career education and Sullivan University. I am a product of career education and have earned several degrees from career colleges and universities. My four children have lived the life of a QEP just because, as I developed in my educational journey, they definitely benefited from my knowledge. Three of them have earned degrees from SUS institutions and are working in their fields of study. I plan to take that experience and apply it on a much larger scale.

Over the next few months, you’ll be hearing me talk about the QEP. I’ll be referring to Sullivan University’s Quality Enhancement Plan that will be in full effect winter 2016 quarter. 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. During the fall of 2015, we will conduct training on tools we will use to implement the QEP.

More details to follow.

Our first task was for Dr. Wiljanen to provide an answer for SACSCOC standard 3.3.2. We came together with the QEP Committee and reevaluated the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). We then took the proposed SLOs to the Academic Council for approval and, although the goals of the QEP have not changed, the four Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have changed. The revised Student Learning Outcomes and direct assessment measures approved by the Academic Council are as follows:

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

Direct Assessment: Pre-and-post-test using a multiple-choice instrument to be developed collaboratively by deans, directors, chairs, librarians, FYE 101 faculty, and the Director of Institutional Research. The pre-test will be administered as part of the admissions process. The post-test will be administered at the conclusion of the FYE 101
will demonstrate career-appropriate communication skills.

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

Direct Assessment: Pre-and-post-test using a multiple-choice instrument to be developed collaboratively by deans, directors, chairs, librarians, FYE 101 faculty, and the Director of Institutional Research. The pre-test will be administered as part of the admissions process. The post-test will be administered at the conclusion of the FYE 101 course or at the conclusion of the introductory course in the program of study.

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

Direct Assessment: Pre-and-post-assessment within the USA Funds Life Skills program. The pre-test will be administered in the first module of the USA Funds Life Skills program. The post-test will be administered in the final module of the USA Funds Life Skills program prior to attainment of the associate degree.

**Student Learning Outcome 4:** Students...
For this installment of “Five Questions For…,” we interviewed Dr. Abeer Al-Ghananeem. Dr. Al-Ghananeem is the Associate Dean of the Research and Graduate Programs at the Sullivan University College of Pharmacy. At the College, she teaches Advanced Drug Delivery, Pharmaceutics, Nanotechnology and Pharmaceutical Applications, and Clinical Pharmacokinetics. She has a professional interest in drug targeting and transmucosal drug delivery, and has a special interest in the FDA regulatory science of Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls (CMC).

During her career, Dr. Al-Ghananeem has had many accomplishments, including membership in the Rho Chi American Pharmaceutical Honor Society, earning an AACP Leadership Fellowship, and earning a Nanotechnology Symposium Award. She has been teaching for over twelve years, many of which have been spent at the College of Pharmacy.

1. Where are you from originally? Where did you attend school?

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

Education was and still is my passion. My mom was a science teacher and she played a pivotal role in instilling the love of reading,
learning, and teaching in my life. She was and still is my hero. I started teaching as a teaching assistant.

My dad played an equal role in supporting and grooming my ambitions to continue my graduate education that put me on the doorsteps of university teaching.

3. What are your goals in your educational career?
The main goal in my education career is to attain self-happiness and joy in giving a token of appreciation back to my community. I personally want to see creativity, passion, courage, and perseverance in my students. After all, they are the ones that will be in direct communication with the patients before taking their medications.

4. Do you have any advice for new educators?
If there is one single piece of advice I would give, it would be to celebrate and respect diversity and differences.

5. What hobbies or interests do you have in your off time?
Exploring nature, learning about other cultures, and of course my everlasting interest in reading.

---

LibGuides
By George Bergstrom
Instructional Librarian
Sullivan University, Louisville

The Sullivan University Library maintains a subscription to LibGuides for the benefit of our students. LibGuides, if you’re not familiar, is the backend program for the Library’s helpful research guides. Hopefully you have seen the guide that we created to help students with APA citation, but did you know we can create guides on almost any topic? For example, we have a great guide for teaching the basics of research and evaluating information. In addition, you can be kept informed of all the latest material in the library through LibGuides. If you ever find yourself stuck trying to explain what a scholarly article is, try this guide. For easy access, the top ten guides are always on the right of the library’s home page.

We can even create a custom guide for your course! Or, if you prefer, you can create your own! As an example, take a look at the guide that Richard Routt created for his finance classes.

If you would like to know more about LibGuides and its applications, please contact me at gbergstrom@sullivan.edu.
We recently conducted a survey of Sullivan University full- and part-time faculty teaching online during the spring 2015 quarter. Although we feared that some would not take kindly to yet another survey, we were thrilled when we received more than 70% participation! Our faculty told us that, while they experience an overall high rate of satisfaction, there are a number of areas in which we can improve our faculty support. I would like to take this opportunity to tell you what we plan to do about it.

Communications
A communication analysis found that our online faculty can receive email from a dozen different sources at the University—including different areas of Sullivan University Online. It actually used to be worse in previous years, as faculty teaching online were also receiving many irrelevant messages pertaining only to on-campus activities and procedures.

Based on the feedback from our survey, we are in the process of consolidating our communications into a publication that will be sent at a few strategic times throughout the quarter. This publication, tentatively titled “Those Who Can...Teach!” will contain news and announcements from the University and from Sullivan Online, along with effective practices, tips and tricks, faculty and staff spotlights and other pertinent information.

Professional Development and Faculty Resource Website
Our faculty spoke loud and clear in the survey regarding the fact that we could do much better in terms of providing relevant and applicable training and resources for our online faculty. They identified specific training topics, which we will develop and provide in a convenient format. We will also be working in tandem with SUS Human Resources to make sure that this training counts toward our quarterly professional development requirements.

We are also conducting an analysis of faculty resource websites at other colleges and universities, with the intention to develop a “destination” site that will be appealing, user-friendly, and provide useful resources for our faculty. Our plan is to implement these improvements during the summer quarter.
Preparing your Summer Online Courses

The document “Statement of Academic Responsibility for Online Instructors” outlines some tasks to be performed in preparation for the upcoming quarter. As you go into your online course(s) to prepare it (them) for summer 2015, ask yourself the following questions:

- Have I read the Important Notes for Instructor, Critical Course Information or Instructors Please Read if found on the Lessons page of my course?
- Have I checked my SUS e-mail and my LMS home page for communications from SUS or from students?
- Have I opened the Syllabus and Important Course Documents folder and:
  - Read the Syllabus and checked to make sure that the correct textbook edition is listed?
  - Read the Course Schedule and posted due dates for all assignments?
  - Posted my policies regarding late assignments (modifying the existing policy, if needed)?
  - Added my contact information and bio to Meet Your Instructor?

- Have I reviewed the content and hyperlinks of future weeks and reported any inaccuracies or dead links to onlinefacultysupport@sullivan.edu?
- Have I ensured that the proper start and end dates are set for folders and exams (if I am having the system automatically show and hide these; otherwise, I will show and hide these manually)?
- Have I posted a welcome announcement for the class in Course Announcements?

A word about online student engagement (attendance)

In order for our students taking online courses to be eligible for federal financial aid, they must be “engaged” in their courses each week. According to the Dept. of Education, this means they must either submit an assignment (drop box), post to a discussion forum or take a quiz at least once during each of the 11 weeks of the quarter. Logging into the course does not count as “engagement.”

At the current time, determining engagement for each student is a manual process that is done in ANGEL and then posted in the Faculty Portal every Monday and Thursday. You should have received an email from Student Academic Services on how to do this (in the future it will be on the faculty resource website). As we are evaluating
new learning management systems to replace ANGEL, we are working with the vendors to determine ways to make the online “attendance” process less burdensome. It is expected that you will be logging into your courses at least every other day (to be able to address student questions/issues in a timely fashion). In order to properly post engagement/attendance, you will need to log into your course and then post in the portal every Monday and Thursday.

And, finally...
I want to thank you for your dedication to our students’ education. Sullivan University has one of the lowest online attrition rates in the country. This is due to a combination of “high touch” student services and our dedicated student-centered professional faculty. If you have problems or issues, or items that need correction in your courses, please contact Cathy and Krista at onlinefacultysupport@sullivan.edu. You are also welcome to contact me directly (apina@sullivan.edu) if you have questions or concerns.

Tony Piña, Dean
Sullivan University System Online

---

**Committee Review**

**The Top 7 Questions about the Curriculum Committee**

by

**Cara Marco**
Committee Chair

The Curriculum Committee is the practical expression of SACS standard 3.4.10, “The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.” The Curriculum Committee helps discover the impact of changes in our closely interdependent departments, and it uses diverse faculty experience to help measure the value of the incremental changes in departments and curricula over time.

While the Curriculum Committee’s overall mission has stayed consistent for quite
some time, the practical functions of the Curriculum Committee have changed over the past two years. All changes were once considered by the entire Curriculum Committee; they’re now addressed by smaller Executive Committees. Curriculum Committee meetings once took place on a regular basis, and now many are called on an as-needed basis. These changes may leave even experienced deans and directors confused and unsure how to proceed.

To help clarify some of the changes, I’ve collected a list of the most commonly asked questions about the Curriculum Committee. As chair, I’m happy to answer any of your questions that don’t appear on this list, so please don’t hesitate to contact me at cmarco@sullivan.edu.

1) I want to change my textbook, student learning outcomes, or the name of the course. Do all of these changes need to go to the curriculum committee?

Any changes in courses that lead to a fundamental change in the curriculum, including adding or deleting courses, substantial changes to course content, name, or number, or other major changes, will require the approval of the curriculum committee before they’re adopted. A change in an assignment, a new version of a textbook, or a small addition to course content will not require a proposal to the Curriculum Committee.

2) How do I propose a change to the Curriculum Committee?

Deans and department heads fill out a the Change Proposal Form (Change Proposal Form – Fall 2014.docx) which can either be requested directly from the Curriculum Committee Chair or found in the Curriculum Change Repository under Information Repositories at http://ir.sullivan.edu. After you complete the form and accompanying information, send it all to cmarco@sullivan.edu.

To help you understand exactly what questions will be asked, you can review the Change Approval Checklist (Change Approval Checklist – Fall 2014.docx). This checklist guides the Executive Committees when they consider a change proposal. You can also find past change proposals under the Curriculum Changes heading. This supporting information is also found at http://ir.sullivan.edu in the Curriculum Change Repository under Information Repositories.

3) I hear you’re having a Curriculum Committee Meeting next week. I want to
change something in my department. Can you add my change proposal to the agenda?

It depends. There are two types of Curriculum Committee meetings. Quarterly meetings include the entire Curriculum Committee, and deans and department heads are also invited as guests. Program reviews take place at these meetings, and all programs are reviewed at least every four years by asking the dean or director of a given program to present the information about their program to the Curriculum Committee, after which the Curriculum Committee either votes to recommend changes or not. These meetings will also include discussion about official business that affects the entire committee, but no change proposals are addressed at these quarterly meetings.

Change proposals are addressed by the executive committees, of which there are four: Undergraduate, Graduate, Health Sciences, and College of Pharmacy. The College of Pharmacy Executive Committee is a largely autonomous unit that shares information with the Curriculum Committee, but that operates using its own procedures. The Undergraduate, Graduate, and Health Sciences Executive Committees meet on an as-needed basis when change proposals are made. Once a quorum is established, proposals reviewed by an executive committee, including the Chair and Vice-Chair, carry the approval of the Curriculum Committee when they are approved by a two-thirds majority of the appropriate executive committee.

4) My proposal wasn’t approved. What do I do?

The Curriculum Committee will provide you with an official response that outlines the concerns, and you can ask for additional clarification if you are unsure how to address them. You can resubmit the proposal anytime you choose.

5) My proposal to the Curriculum Committee was approved! That means the changes are official, right?

Not yet. The Provost, Louisville Campus; Director, Lexington Campus; Director, Ft. Knox Campus; Director, Sullivan University Online Division; and Sullivan University President all have to approve the changes before they become official. The registrar will also be consulted to ensure that the changes meet all appropriate requirements.
6) My proposal made it all the way to the president and received official approval! Can I start implementing the changes immediately?

While the curriculum belongs to the faculty, the implementation requires the support of many departments. As stated on the official proposal form, “Curriculum changes become effective no sooner than one full academic quarter following the date that the SUS President approves the curriculum change proposal.” Implementation may involve bookstore orders, CampusVue and catalog updates, the Online Division, and many more. To increase the likelihood of a successful transition, please submit your proposal as soon as you can. Depending on the extent of the change and the support required, the changes may not be able to be implemented immediately.

7) I might like to serve on the Curriculum Committee. What should I do?

The Curriculum Committee consists of members who are either elected or appointed. The provost appoints a chair, two faculty members to represent undergraduate programs, two to represent graduate programs, two to represent health sciences programs, and one to be a liaison with the College of Pharmacy. The faculty at large elects at least nine members including at least one member representing the Louisville campus, the Lexington campus, the Fort Knox campus, and the Sullivan Online Division respectively. Both elected and appointed members serve two-year terms.

The Provost appoints members to the Curriculum Committee based on “perceived strengths, availability, and interest on the part of the faculty member,” as stated in the Curriculum Committee’s charter, so expressing that interest to Provost Miller would be an important step in being considered for an appointment.

At the end of the members’ two-year terms, Provost Miller will open the floor for nominations for election to the Curriculum Committee, and interested faculty members can self-nominate. Once nominated, the faculty at large will vote to choose the additional members of the Curriculum Committee. Good luck!
In last quarter’s column, I addressed the general issues related to the portfolio of institutional effectiveness standards subsumed under the SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard [CS] 3.3.1. As you will recall, this standard comprises five constituent sub-standards which address institutional effectiveness (IE) in the following preordained areas or units of compliance, viz.:

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional effectiveness)

3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
3.3.1.2 Administrative support services
3.3.1.3 Academic and student support services
3.3.1.4 Research within its mission, if appropriate
3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate.

In this column, I will continue to focus on these standards with a more in-depth examination of bugbear Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.5.

As with its 3.3.1 compeers, this specific standard appears on the SACSCOC “Top 10 Most Frequently Cited Principles in Reaffirmation Reviews,” to which I alluded in the last column. Also, of all the institutional effectiveness standards (which also includes Core Requirement [CR] 2.5), this is the only such standard for which SU received a SACSCOC on-site review team recommendation. In SACSCOC-speak, we also know that “recommendation” has the following pejorative connotation, which appears on page 120 of the “Resource Manual:”

Recommendation: A Recommendation is a formal statement written by an evaluation committee of the Commission indicating an institution’s lack of compliance with a standard or requirement in The Principles of Accreditation. The Candidacy Committee and the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee are the only SACSCOC committees that do not write Recommendations.
So, ultimately, after an intently studied initial Compliance Certification (CC) submission, its off-site review, a turnabout Focused Report response, and a subsequent on-site review, SU was deemed out of compliance with this lone IE standard.

“How did that happen?” you may ask.

Answer: many universities set themselves up for potential noncompliance with this standard, as well as similarly with CS 3.3.1.4, by referencing one or both in their mission statement. To better illustrate this point, here is a 2011 SACSCOC off-site committee recommendation predicated on an institution simply mentioning the single word “service” in their mission:

“The College indicated that Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.5 (Institutional Effectiveness: Community/Public Service) is not applicable because “Peace College’s mission does not include community or public service.” However, its mission statement reads: ‘Peace is a baccalaureate college of the arts and sciences that challenges women to an adventure of intellectual and personal discovery, preparing women for graduate and lifelong learning, for meaningful careers, and for ethical lives of purpose, leadership and service.’ The College should demonstrate that it identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results of community/public service with its educational mission.”

I think of these two standards (CS 3.3.1.4 and CS 3.3.1.5) as the Castor and Pollux of the IE standards. [NOTE: In Greek and Roman mythology, Castor and Pollux were twin brothers, who are now better known as Gemini (Latin: “twin brothers”).] These standards are twins in that they are the only two CS 3.3.1 standards that bear the SACSCOC admonition: “… within its mission, if appropriate.” So, if an institution cites “community service” or “research” in its mission (i.e. in CS 2.4 [Institutional Mission]), then it is often “hoisted on its own petard,” because SACSCOC will assume that the institution’s mission validates the “appropriate” application for both of these standards. Relatedly, the SU mission states: “The University promotes a culture of teaching excellence throughout the institution which is augmented by a culture of research at the graduate level, and it also encourages faculty, students, administration, and staff to participate in service activities and projects which enhance the quality of life in the local and surrounding communities.” In which consequent case, an institution will often find itself in the unenviable noncompliance position in which we now find ourselves.

As an experienced reviewer myself, I must say that I anticipated this problem when drafting the narrative for this standard for the CC. To establish compliance, I also wanted to follow
SACSCOC’s own advice for “Avoiding Common Trouble Spots” by paying close attention to:

- Quality of the Response
- Interpretation of the Standards
- Evidence of Implementation of Policies/Procedures
- Technical Issues

(http://www.sacscoc.org/staff/cbaird/ComplianceCertification.pdf)

As a result, I interpreted the standard and attempted to comply with the inherent IE nature of this standard using pro forma assessment playbook strategies to:

a.) identify expected community/public service outcomes;
b.) assess the extent to which SU achieves these community/public service outcomes; and,
c.) provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results for community/public service.

Additionally, pursuant to the guidelines articulated in the “Resource Manual,” I generated an SU service mission definition and attempted to gather outcome data, data analyses, data-driven improvements, etc. However, as I am accustomed to say, “there was no putting lipstick on this pig,” because the assessment/IE architectonics (aka “structural design”) did not exist. In other words, no community/public service outcomes and ancillary data existed; some analyses did exist, but no data-driven improvements had been made. Consequently, in fallback mode, I made the case for these activities’ inclusion in the non-IE CS 3.4.2 [continuing education/service programs]. In the aggregate, SU’s position - unlike that of many state-supported, public benefits, or religious-based institutions, was that its “community/public service” activities were only very tangentially part of its mission. So, under advisement, the university opted to approach this IE standard as “not applicable.”

Non-applicability of either of the “twin” standards is subjective, a matter of opinion. When participating in SACSCOC off-site or on-site committees, I often see institutions aver that these standards are non-applicable based exclusively upon non-appearance in their mission statement. In those cases, they skate by. But while we argued that CS 3.3.1.5 was not applicable, SACSCOC would not buy our argument, hence: a noncompliance judgment from both the off-site and the on-site committees. So, we did not skate by and will have to address noncompliance by either, a.) retroactively adjusting our mission; or, b.) generating the requisite architectonics (i.e., outcomes, data analyses, improvements, etc.) to support ex post facto compliance. Failing to win its argument for non-apPLICability, the university will now gain compliance by following example b.). This approach was influenced by the dialectical processes attendant upon SU’s recent on-site review committee interchange. Towards that end, here is another tantalizing PDF from SACSCOC:
And, here are SACSCOC’s own guidelines from its “Resource Manual” (NOTE: imagine attempting to check off each of the little boxes [“”] below while you draft your compliance narrative and generate supportive evidence):

**3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate**

Note: Community/public service within an institution’s mission normally includes (1) centers and institutes that focus on community needs and (2) units and formal programs that deliver the outreach mission.
Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How does the institution define community/public service?
- Has the institution articulated its community/public service outcomes in relation to its mission?
- How are expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms?
- What is the evidence of assessment activities for community/public service?
- How are periodic reviews used for improvements?
- How does the institution’s use of assessment results improve community/public service?
- What assessment instruments were used and why were they selected? Were multiple assessment methods used? If so, describe.
- If the institution used sampling, why were the sampling and findings an appropriate representation of the institution’s community/public service mission?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Definition of institution’s community and public service mission
- Documentation of expected outcomes for its community and public service mission
- Documentation of the evaluation of those outcomes
- Documentation of the use of the findings from assessment to improve the institution
- If sampling is used, (1) how the sampling is representative of the institution’s mission, (2) documentation of a valid cross-section of units, and a (3) case as to why sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution’s community and public service mission

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

None noted

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5
Comprehensive Standard 3.4.2

At this point, I would like to discuss “expected outcomes” within the context of “S.M.A.R.T” treatment. More and more prevalently, “S.M.A.R.T” is an acronym used to denote the following five desirable characteristics of 3.3.1 expected outcomes:

Specific – “What exactly are we going to do, with or for whom?”

The program states a specific outcome, or a precise outcome to be accomplished.
The outcome is stated in numbers, percentages, frequency, reach, scientific outcome, etc. The outcome is clearly defined.

**Measurable** – “Is this outcome framed in measurable language and can WE measure it?”
This means that the outcome can be measured and the measurement source is identified. If the outcome cannot be measured, the question of funding non-measurable activities is discussed and considered relative to the size of the investment. All activities should be measurable at some level.

**Achievable** – “Can this outcomes be accomplished in the proposed timeframe/in this political climate with x budget?”
The outcome or expectation of what will be accomplished must be realistic given the market conditions, time period, resources allocated, etc.

**Relevant** – “Will this expected outcome lead to the desired results?”
This means that the outcome or results of the program directly supports the outcomes of the agency or funder’s long range plan or goal, e.g., the selected MOD priority area.

**Time-framed** – “When will we accomplish this expected outcome?”
This means stating clearly when the outcome will be achieved.

All IE standards should likewise accord with the university’s continuous improvement circle:
To tie up any potentially loose ends, I also like to vet standards’ narratives against the AC-CSHE listserv (Accreditation in Southern Higher Education) archives where insightful comments from SACSCOC VPs are often to be found, e.g.:

CS 3.3.1.5 asks for evidence that the institution’s IE process is being utilized to set expected outcomes, assess the extent to which they have been met, and use the results of the assessment to make improvements in its community/public service programs.

Three places to look:

First, look at the mission to see the extent to which such activity is expected for the institution.

Second, look at CS 3.4.2 to see what types of activities are listed there as being consistent with the mission. It amazes me when an institution says “not applicable” in 3.3.1.5 and then has an expansive narrative of a host of “continuing education, outreach, and service programs … consistent with the institution’s mission.”

Third, ask your CFO what activities are listed on the audit as public service expenditures at your institution. [If “none” that does not mean this is NA, but if there are some, it is harder to imagine this is NA.]

Also, consider that suggested changes to the Principles will include this change of wording – if approved, this would be effective January 1:

Current wording:

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

Proposed wording:

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

This proposal gets at some of the confusion in the two standards, and in my mind at least, strengthens the link of CS 3.3.1.5 to CS 3.4.2. As an example, extensive service learning activities are as likely to be addressed in CS 3.3.1.1 (if driven through the curriculum) or CS 3.3.1.3 (if driven through the co-curriculum) as in the community/public
service standard. Such activities may or may not be in 3.4.2. But those art and history museums at colleges are usually in 3.4.2, as are concert series, lecture series, candidate forums, college radio stations, continuing education classes, sports camps, high school science days, noncredit workforce programs, GED programs, TRIO, and the like. I would hope the college would be interested in ensuring these programs are meeting their objectives, and in seeing the programs improve.

I also like to vet them against such off-site committee pre-Focused Report comments, such as the following two (of many, many Googled examples):

**Example One: Findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee**

*Off-site Committee Comments:*

> The University of New Orleans identifies community/public service as central to its mission, describing itself in its mission statement as a “global community asset.” Service is also central to the university’s vision, emphasizing the institution’s aspiration to be “a primary engine of social, economic, intellectual and cultural development in the New Orleans region and beyond.” One of the university’s 2020 strategic goals relates specifically to expanding the institution’s “connection to the community.” The university has also identified five strategies for accomplishing the community/public service component of its strategic plan. Action tables in the university’s strategic plan identify action steps, responsible parties, plans and assessment measures associated with each of the five strategies. The institution identifies the role of external stakeholders, service learning and community service expectations for faculty in the university’s approach to community service. The university also describes existing institutional-level measures of community engagement (i.e. NSSE and FSSE). While institutional-level strategies, relevant units and stakeholders, and institutional-level measures of engagement have been identified, it is unclear how the university currently assesses or plans to assess the extent to which it achieves its expected outcomes related to community/public service. In addition, no evidence of improvement is provided.

**Example Two: Findings of Off-Site Committee**

*Off-site Committee Comments:*

For civic service and social enrichment, evidence of specific planning, assessment, and use of results for these activities was missing.
The institution’s narrative indicates the identification of expected outcomes with community/public service. Evidence to support the narrative was found within the PDF document entitled “Division and Departmental Outcomes NTCC.” There was no evidence, though, as to how the Institution “assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes” and “provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in community/public service”.

The institution’s narrative did indicate that the outcomes portion of the assessment process is still in development. The first cycle of results are not scheduled to be completed until spring 2012. Therefore, as reflected by the narrative, the institution’s compliance with these areas, upon a review of the DF document entitled “Division and Departmental Outcomes NTCC,” did not cite evidence of these two measures. The areas entitled “Status Reports”, “Actual Results”, and “Use of Results”, where this information should have been placed, were blank.

In both these instances – as with our own, the off-site committee undeniably desires the full IE treatment for 3.3.1.5, without which noncompliance is a certainty.

In conclusion, institutions can and do debate the applicability/non-applicability of this standard to their given situation. However, to the “little birds” comprising its 800+ member institutions, SACSCOC is

>The eagle [who] suffers little birds to sing,
And is not careful what they mean thereby,
Knowing that with the shadow of his wings
He can at pleasure stint their melody.

Shakespeare, Titus Andronicus: Act 4, Scene 4

It should be perceived unqualifiedly as what it is: an IE standard which requires the same assessment details as the other CS 3.3.1 standards.

I hope this more fine-grained insight into this particular standard has been helpful. If you have questions, kindly let me know.
Addendum

I provide this addendum to more practically illustrate the institutional effectiveness mandated by the SACSCOC CS 3.3.1 standards: more specifically, this recent example propitiates compliance with CS 3.3.1.2, administrative support services. These IE processes naturally ensue on a regular basis in many departments, which need to continue to document them for later compliance use.

Earlier this quarter, the Academic Council (AC) recommended re-examination of the Faculty Evaluation form: the expected outcome was improvement to the overall form, which was deemed to be too cumbersome, too long, too irrelevant in part, and missing any online and administrator faculty evaluative components. Accordingly, a Faculty Evaluation form improvement (FEFI) committee was assembled. I was on the prior committee that had originally developed the form, so I volunteered for the FEFI committee. The committee met and opted to generate a survey to solicit plenary faculty input. This was done and the input was analyzed and improvements in the form drafted a working model. The model was subsequently resubmitted to the faculty to generate any additional insights and to subserve latter buy-in. Afterwards, the form was submitted to the AC for approval. So, the accreditation processflow is tabularized below.

NOTE: please refer to the Continuous Improvement Circle’s corresponding steps illustrated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify goals and outcomes that coincide with our mission (step 1)</th>
<th>Identify Measurement Instrument(s) (step 2)</th>
<th>Data Gathered / Analyzed (steps 3-4)</th>
<th>Implement Data-driven Improvement Plan (steps 5-6)</th>
<th>Evaluate resultant Improvement(s) (step 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the faculty evaluation form.</td>
<td>Survey of all faculty to obtain initial input. Follow-up survey of all faculty to obtain reactions to draft proposal.</td>
<td>Survey analysis indicated faculty thought the form was too cumbersome, too long, too irrelevant in part, and missing any online and administrator faculty evaluative components.</td>
<td>A revised and improved form was developed that addressed deficiencies.</td>
<td>NOTE: Step seven (closing the loop) will have to be accomplished once the new form has been in use for a period of time. So, it is not listed now, but would need to be listed in any subsequent assessment of this process. However, it would say something like this: “As a result of this data-driven improvement, the university recently surveyed faculty, xx% of whom indicated that the new form was better able to evaluate FT/adjuncts, online and administrative faculty.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TWO PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES NOW ARE OUR STRENGTHS
(Ideas now being discussed by private and public schools that are Sullivan’s historical focus)

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

Recently, both in the press and in print material focused on retention issues, many ideas familiar to Sullivan University have been offered as solutions to solve longstanding persistence issues by all colleges and Universities. Concepts such as “employment readiness” and “degree relevance” are discussed at some length regarding the future of all post-secondary organizations. It has been a privilege to be a part of the Sullivan University history and know that this institution of higher learning not only prepares students academically but also prepares them with expectations that will be in place in the workplace. Concepts like professional dress Wednesday (ground-based campuses) and others continue to set Sullivan University apart from other colleges and schools.

As these concepts relate to retention and persistence issues, two items stand out that historically may have been viewed as weaknesses but are really our strengths. These issues are:

- Student satisfaction (based on the “college experience”) as the primary reason a student stays
- That attendance taking, either on ground or online, is not a positive influence on student persistence

**Student Satisfaction**

In a recent article entitled “Satisfaction with college: Re-examining its structure and its relationships with the intent to remain in college and academic performance” (2015), Sarah Strahan of the University of Albany, New York and Marcus Credé of The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. take a hard look at the issue of what is really important to keeping students on track to graduate at an institution. Their correlational analysis offered the following information: “college grades are most strongly related to satisfaction with the quality of instruction, while intentions to transfer to another college are most strongly related to the college experience” J. College Student Retention, 16(4), 537-561.

The quality you bring to your class every time you deliver a lecture, present a topic, etc..., is the reason that students stay in your classes. It is suggested that energy, both in a ground-based class or in an online class, is the reason that students make a point to stay. This is a special challenge to the online professor/instructor where the student can wrongly perceive lack of faculty interest.

Our students choose to come to Sullivan University because they assume that each of our
classes from the remedial to the capstone are relevant to their career goals. It is also perceived that the person teaching the class is qualified and is convinced in the purpose of the subject being taught (they want to believe in you). These two items are proven or exposed during the quarter.

**Attendance Taking**

Both online and ground-based faulty across the nation have heard or said that there is a question to the use of this policy for the college-going student. This subject was addressed in detail in a field very close to the offerings at Sullivan University. Lisa A Ruth-Sahd and Melissa A Schneider delivered a study printed in the June 2014 issue of *Nursing Education Perspectives* “Faculty and student perceptions about attendance policies in baccalaureate nursing programs.” You may be surprised by the results.

Responses came to the study from 19 baccalaureate programs across the United States, representing all four regions of the country. The respondents, both faculty and student, provided the following: “A total 61.5% percent of faculty linked professionalism to class attendance, saying that students not attending class were exhibiting unprofessional behavior.” The article then followed that “A total of 56.7 percent of students believed there should be an attendance policy, a fact that closely mirrored the percentage of faculty who also felt this way.” (*Nursing education perspectives* 35(3), 162-165. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.)

The fact that there was an attendance policy in place is recognized as absolutely vital to attaining the goal of the class and more than just a measurement for financial aid funds. Attendance is expected because that time is valuable to the student beyond what is given in the text for the class. It is a measurement that provides, as you all know, a method to identify those students needing your help and uncover issues they may not share openly.

Nursing is a discipline that upon graduation and licensure will have these individuals working with the lives of those that they touch. The argument can be made that every one of the degrees taught here has a similar outcome to some extent.

It is admitted that the academic discussion will continue on the issue of attendance but a case can be and is made for its relevance. The conclusions made in this article are these:

1. If you teach at the campus or online it is the quality of the instruction, the level of importance you stress on that week’s subject, and the level of engagement that will keep the majority of students coming or posting.

2. Most students will make it a priority to be in your class if expectations are clear and they believe in you and your message.

3. That attendance taking, although still argued by some academic circles, can and does have a positive impact on persistence, student preparation, and ultimately professional behavior.
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.

In my last article, I encouraged all faculty members to give serious thought to serving on the Council as an elected at-large member. Well, I am pleased to report that several esteemed faculty members stepped forward to run for the at-large Council positions. In a very tight race, four eager winners emerged. Now that these fine individuals are officially Council members, here’s what I have learned about each of them. Maybe reading their stories will spark an interest by others to serve at a later time.

Jill Ferrari, M.A. MT MLT (ASCP)
Medical Assisting Program Director
(Lexington Campus)
jferrari@sullivan.edu

- Title: Medical Assisting Program Director/Practicum Coordinator.
- Academic program: Medical Assisting.
- Courses taught: All courses related to program. This quarter: Anatomy and Physiology, Pharmacology, Medical Software Applications, Health and Safety, and Externships.
- Degrees/colleges attended: Masters of Art in Education; Bachelor of Science, Medical Technology, MT; Associate of Science, Medical Laboratory Technician. All earned from Eastern Kentucky University.
- Why you wanted to be on the Council: I wanted to learn the true process of how things are proposed and implemented regardless if it is from the faculty or administration.
- What you hope to accomplish on the Council: I hope to represent the Lexington campus.
well and bring things to the table that are of significance to our campus as well.

- What is the biggest issue SU faculty face: *Making decisions about what classes to offer each quarter with the decreasing student population but still assisting a student in graduating on time.*

**Gregg Romans, MBA**

*Supply Chain Management, Department Chair*

gromans@sullivan.edu

- Title: *Supply Chain Management, Department Chair.*
- Academic program: *College of Business Administration - Supply Chain Management Program.*
- Length of service at Sullivan: *Just over 5 years now.*
- Degrees/colleges attended: *Attended Thomas More College in Crestview Hills, KY. I have an Associate Degree in Accounting, a Bachelor’s Degree in Business Administration, and a Master’s in Business Administration. I also have an AS in Logistics Management from the Community College of the Air Force.*
- Background: *I spent 25 years in the military, 4 years active duty in the Air Force and 21 years in the Air National Guard in Louisville. I retired in 2008.*
- Family/hobbies/interests: *Avid golfer, college basketball fan (I.U.), and a major league baseball fan (Go Reds!).*
- Why you wanted to be on the Council: *In order to better understand how academic policies are developed at the university and to be more involved with helping set direction.*
- What you hope to accomplish on the Council: *At this point, I am so new to the council that I haven’t developed specific goals to accomplish during my tenure.*
- What is the biggest issue SU faculty face: *I think the biggest issue faced by faculty today is determining the best way to engage students in a meaningful way, both online and in class, so that we can better impact retention. One of the ways to do this is to have rigorous academic programs that fulfill requirements but that also are enjoyable for students.*
Beth Patterson  
Assistant Professor  
Sullivan University - Louisville  
bpatterson@sullivan.edu

- **Title:** Assistant Professor.
- **Academic program:** Computer Science and Office Technology departments.
- **Courses taught:** A wide array of courses from Computer Applications (which is my favorite) to Legal Terminology.
- **Length of service at Sullivan:** I have been with the Sullivan system since 2002. I love teaching and I love Sullivan! This is a job I look forward to coming to each and every day. I love meeting and working with new people and I learn as much from my students as they do from me.
- **Degrees/colleges attended:** I received my undergraduate degree from the University of Louisville in Political Science. I have a Masters in Managing Information Technology from Sullivan University and an MBA from Sullivan. I am currently pursuing a PhD in Management at Sullivan.
- **Family/hobbies/interests:** I have two wonderful kids, Peyton and Victoria. I love going to haunted houses and on ghost walks in the little bit of spare time I have!
- **Why you wanted to be on the Council:** I wanted to be on the academic council because I wanted to become more aware of the needs of the school and how I can best help meet those needs.
- **What you hope to accomplish on the Council:** I hope to get better acquainted with my colleagues while on the council as well as become a better teacher and advocate for my students and colleagues.
- **What is the biggest issue SU faculty face:** The biggest issue Sullivan faces right now is enrollment. Helping to promote enrollment as well as retaining current students is of utmost importance at this time.
Kimberly K. Daugherty, Pharm.D., BCPS
Professor and Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs and Assessment
Department of Clinical and Administrative Sciences
Sullivan University College of Pharmacy
kdaugherty@sullivan.edu

- Title: Professor and Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs and Assessment.
- Academic program: College of Pharmacy.
- Courses taught: Learn to teach elective.
- Length of service at Sullivan: 7 ½ years.
- Degrees/colleges attended: Bachelors in Chemistry: Milligan College; Doctor of Pharmacy: University of Kentucky.
- Family/hobbies/interests: Husband and one son (7 years old); I like to cross stitch, read, play golf, and watch UK basketball.
- Why you wanted to be on the Council: I wanted to learn more about the academic side of Sullivan University.
- What you hope to accomplish on the Council: I hope to be able to improve communication with the College of Pharmacy and the main campus.
- What is the biggest issue SU faculty face: Changing make-up of undergraduate students.

As you can see, those who serve on the Council, particularly at-large faculty representatives elected by their peers, do so for a variety of reasons. Even though these individuals come from different backgrounds, they have a common goal in mind – to make Sullivan University a better place for students to learn as they pursue their chosen career paths.

If you are a faculty member, the next time you see the notice sent out by the Provost seeking nominations for an at-large position on the Council (usually during the winter academic quarter), please give due consideration to running for one of the at-large positions on the Council. We are all in this together!

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 05/29/2015
Calendar Of Events
Summer 2015 Quarter

New Day Student Registration.................................................................June 23, 2015
New Night Student Registration .............................................................June 23, 2015
New Housing Student Registration .......................................................June 24, 2015
Day School New Student Orientation .....................................................June 26, 2015
Night School New Student Orientation .................................................June 27, 2015
First day of classes ...............................................................................June 29, 2015
Last day that a student can enter an online class ....................................July 2, 2015
Last day that a student can enter a day class* .........................................July 6, 2015
Student pre-orientation .........................................................................July 7-8, 2015
Last day that a student can enter an evening or weekend class ...............July 9, 2015
International Registration and Orientation ............................................July 10, 2015
Academic Council Meets .......................................................................July 16, 2015
Adult Open House ................................................................................July 25, 2015
Last day that a student can withdraw and still receive a “W” .................August 14, 2015
Academic Council Meets .......................................................................August 20, 2015
Break .....................................................................................................September 14-27, 2015
First Day of Fall 2015 classes .................................................................September 28, 2015

*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.
Out of the Archives

By Cara Marco

Baby libraries grow up so fast!

Looking over Library books are, L. to R. Brenda Frankum, Linda Wilkerson, Peggy Anderson, and Kenny Bowman.

New Library Opens

During the month of December books were collected from Mr. Martin’s room, Miss Welsh’s room, and Mr. Sullivan, Sr.’s office. These books were all put together to make a new library for the school. Most of the books are special books pertaining to the subjects taught at Sullivan. The library consists of a large set of medical books, a set of encyclopedias, periodicals, a few fiction books and IBM reference books.

The IBM reference books have information about the different IBM systems and equipment.

In all, the library may be used before and after school; with permission, during school. If you would like to check out books, see Miss McWhorter. The library is located in room 433.
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NOTES TO THE FACULTY

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

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