Many—if not most—college courses and programs of study are so focused on teaching students technical skills and knowledge and the fundamentals of going into a particular career or profession that too little attention is devoted to preparing students for what happens after college. In some ways, recent graduates can be similar to Bill McKay, Robert Redford’s character in The Candidate. Toward the end of the movie, Senator-elect McKay turns to his campaign manager after an upset victory and asks, "What do we do now?" Sadly, too many recent graduates may feel somewhat fretful about the future: finding the right job, paying back those student loans, interviewing, networking, etc. More than one presidential campaign has made not so subtle references to our collective fault as college faculty and administrators for ill-preparing students for life outside the ivory towers.

While it’s commonly believed that demonstrable technical skills are the key to scoring the interview, those softer or human skills are often the qualities which differentiate those who simply get the in-
terview versus those who actually get the job. Quite a bit of the anxiety students often feel derives from a perceived failure of colleges to adequately prepare students for what happens after they have their diplomas in their hand. While technical skills are important, it is equally important—possibly even more important—to develop those soft or human skills of persuading others and influencing decisions, coping with stress and resolving problems, engaging with others and being engaging, and dealing with conflict constructively.

As has been the topic of more than one of my Academic Illuminator editorials, the Sullivan University quality enhancement plan (QEP) is titled, *Putting the Care Back in Career: Career Competencies and Career Literacies.* In short, this is Sullivan University's way to double-down on our basic value proposition as a career-first university and rededicating ourselves to the basic premise and promise of preparing our students for what happens after college. Specific career literacies and competencies, as defined by the QEP, include: (1) attaining high levels of career awareness and tying the relevance of their courses of study to specific careers; (2) developing financial literacy skills; (3) participating in experiential learning opportunities in their intended career fields; and (4) acquiring career-appropriate communication skills to confidently engage in job interviews and in their intended career fields.

It's the fourth point which I believe is the most important of the four and marks a notable sacrifice of time, energy and effort by eleven full-time and adjunct faculty members to become Dale Carnegie certified instructors. Jeff Stone, Sacha Pruitt, Josh Simpson, Anna Stamp, Tammy Logsdon, Tammy Kaelin, Penny Clark, Ruth Nall, Wes Auberry, Lauren Kelly, and John Heuglin took on the challenge, and most all successfully completed all challenges put before them. Thank you so much for volunteering your time and energies to this effort.

The road to completing the specific, well-defined pathway toward Dale Carnegie certification has been a difficult one that required great dedication to the effort and mandated a good deal of sacrifice in terms of personal and family time. Weekends dedicated to learning Dale Carnegie methodologies surely would have been spent differently, and the evenings going over flash cards, memorizing material, and learning new approaches to teaching could have been spent relaxing or with family. Thank you for your time and dedication thus far and for stepping up
when asked to do so. Our students will surely be the beneficiaries, as I also truly hope that each of you is finding the journey a worthwhile one.

A fundamental requirement of a QEP is that the QEP have a "transformational" impact on students or the institution itself. Transformational is a high hurdle to cross and one required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges. This is where the dedication of each faculty member to the Dale Carnegie instructor training is especially important for our QEP. As a 100-year-old organization, Dale Carnegie is the first name in human development, as it is still an authority on the arts of "winning friends and influencing people" and "stopping worry and starting living." In short, no other organization is so recognized and built upon the promise of promoting human potential than Dale Carnegie, and I am so glad to partner with Dale Carnegie International as an essential part of the transformational effort.

Best wishes as we begin a new quarter—

Ken

Ken Miller
Provost, Sullivan University
Exciting Occurrences in Northern Kentucky: An Interview with Dr. Vicki Berling

You’ve no doubt heard the wonderful news — Sullivan University is expanding to northern Kentucky with the opening of the new Northern Kentucky Center for Learning! The University has hired Dr. Vicki Berling to head up this initiative, and she has demonstrated that she has a lot of great ideas for the site.

Dr. Berling has a very strong background in education that has uniquely prepared her for her challenging role. She has a PhD from Indiana State University in Higher Education Leadership and an MBA from Thomas More College. Before coming on board at Sullivan University, she was the executive director of Educational Outreach at Northern Kentucky University for 11 years, as well as the interim director of NKU’s Norse Advising Center for three years. Prior to her work at NKU, she worked in the Thomas More College Accelerated Program, an accelerated program for working adult students, for seven years. Clearly, she has the education and experience to lead the Northern Kentucky Center for Learning to success!

We decided to ask Dr. Berling a few questions to learn more about the new initiative:

Tell us a little about the Northern Kentucky Center for Learning. What kinds of work are done there?

Initially, we will be recruiting for online programs and providing onsite student support as appropriate, but we will gradually offer classes, too. Initial feedback from employers in our region indicates that Sullivan’s programs in Logistics & Supply Chain Management, the Interdisciplinary Business Studies, Conflict Management, and the graduate programs in Management and Business Administrative will be highly sought after. We also hope that we can be a host location for the residency requirements for the Ph.D. in
management program. Our location is also an ideal site for Dale Carnegie programs, and we will be working closely with our DCA colleagues to build awareness of DCA in Northern Kentucky and Greater Cincinnati.

What role does the Northern Kentucky Center for Learning fill in the education of students?

I have been very focused on reaching out to Sullivan alumni who live in Northern Kentucky and Greater Cincinnati, and they are thrilled to hear we will be here. Initially, we will provide a local “face” for Sullivan. Our suite offers a computer lab and is an awesome quiet space for studying for our online students. I envision student support groups and onsite tutoring, as we grow. We will also offer lots of information sessions about Sullivan programs and non-credit continuing education programs. Evidentially, the plan is for NKY to reach “campus” status and offer a full complement of Sullivan programs. We are very open to ideas and feedback from faculty and staff as we embark on this journey.
tured on the top of our building (see the artist’s rendering above). The space includes two large classrooms and one seminar-style room, as well as ample administrative space to accommodate faculty, staff and students. It’s a truly beautiful location - the attached photos don’t do it justice.

We still need to get the computer network established and get some final furnishings in place before we can open to the public. We hope that will be mid-June (maybe earlier!). In the meantime, we are very busy talking to employers, alumni, and community leaders about Sullivan’s unique career-focused programs. Reception so far has been great. Our official “grand opening” will be on August 30 and I hope a lot of SUS faculty and staff can join us then – we’ll share the details soon.

We look forward to the Grand Opening of the Northern Kentucky Center for Learning, and wish the staff success!

How large is your staff? What roles do they perform?

I am pleased to announce that our administrative assistant, Kelsey Wichers, starts on May 23, and we are recruiting for an Admissions Officer to start in June. Including me, that’s three full-time staff members.

How far along are you in your preparations for opening? Do you have any major undertakings left before you officially open your doors?

We purchased the existing furnishings and computer equipment from the previous tenant, Xavier University, which helped accelerate our timeline for opening the center. Faculty are going to love our space. It is easily accessible from Interstate I-75/71 with a beautiful panoramic view of the surrounding area. We will get tons of “free” advertising because the Sullivan University name will be prominently fea-
As many of you are aware, the Sullivan University System has selected Blackboard Learn to be the successor to the ANGEL learning management system (LMS) that SUS has been using since 2007. The evaluation of different systems has been extensive. In the process all of the major LMS vendors have been considered, including Canvas (Instructure), Brightspace (Desire2Learn), LoudCloud, LearningStudio (Pearson), Sakai and two versions of Moodle. While these systems each came with their particular advantages, some came with expectations that faculty would be performing the bulk of administrative tasks, such as setting up their own courses, copying content from previous courses and running various student activity reports. Other systems had difficulty running several institutions (e.g. Sullivan University, Spencerian College, and Sullivan College of Technology & Design), while others lacked tools and capabilities that we had come to expect with ANGEL. The fact that we are an attendance-
taking organization (as opposed to census-taking) also limited our choices. In the end, Blackboard Learn met our requirements better than any of the alternatives and offered the smoothest path for migrating from ANGEL. Kudos to Michael Johnson and Jeff Lyons for negotiating a contract with Blackboard that was very favorable to our institution and for Cathy Crick and Krista Lyons, whose insights and feedback during the process were invaluable.

The New LMS

ANGEL has been a reliable and functional system for the past nine years. Quarterly evaluations by students have consistently given ANGEL high marks for satisfaction. However, since ANGEL’s acquisition by Blackboard in 2009 (and the subsequent announcement of the system’s planned demise) there has not been a lot in terms of new ANGEL features and capabilities.

With our new Blackboard system, we can expect a new modern look and feel, which Blackboard calls the “Ultra Course View” or “Ultra Experience.” Like other modern LMSs, the system will be SaaS (Software as a Service) and will use the power of cloud-based computing to overcome the space, performance, and deployment limitations of our dedicated server-based ANGEL system. The new system is based on responsive web design, which means that it will look and function well regardless of whether the courses are being viewed on a computer, tablet, or smartphone.

Speaking of tablets and phones, Blackboard has mobile apps for students and for instructors. Instructors will be able to do grading offline and perform other functions without having to use a computer. The Blackboard Grade Center is a significant improvement over ANGEL’s grade book and will provide the ability to grade and annotate papers in the LMS, without having to download papers onto the instructor’s computer. Blackboard also comes with its own built-in plagiarism checking (SafeAssign) and also full integration with Turnitin, so students and instructors will not have to rely on uploading documents to external sites.

An exciting feature is the integration of full-featured web conferencing within the LMS through Blackboard Collaborate, and another sure to be popular feature will be the ability for instructors to send messages to all of their students’ email accounts from inside the LMS (probably our most asked-for feature from our faculty).
LMS Throughout the SUS

Once the system has become established and all online and hybrid courses have been converted to the new system, the goal will be to begin an implementation path that will result in all on-ground (face-to-face) courses having access to the LMS. The implementation path will be announced at a later date.

When Will This All Happen?

Some things are already in process, others must wait until our Blackboard contract begins and others must wait until after the migration from ANGEL to Blackboard is complete. Our contract with Blackboard does not begin until after we are already into the summer 2016 quarter. The clean-up and migration of over 600 courses from one system to the other, the training of LMS administration, instructional designers, and faculty support, and the fixing of various issues in which ANGEL and Blackboard function differently, will take a number of months. Some of the timetables—such as how long the actual course conversions and fixing courses once they are converted will take—are not known.

We wish to spare our students, instructors, and staff from the nightmare of running both LMSs simultaneously (i.e., offering some courses in the old LMS and others in the new LMS). Our colleagues at institutions that have attempted to do this have unanimously counseled us not to try it! So, it is safest to state that we will be offering courses in Blackboard sometime in 2017.

The Process of Migration

Going from ANGEL to Blackboard is a multi-step process:

First, many courses needed to be “cleaned up.” When the University switched from “CLEGA” (Intralearn) in 2006, all course content had to be manually copied (page-by-page) into ANGEL. This created large libraries of “associated files” with old code and formatting that is no longer needed. Since we did not wish to encumber our new LMS with “old junk,” the instructional designers and instructional technologists have been going through the courses to strip out these old unneeded files.

Second, there are a number of items that work differently in Blackboard than they do in ANGEL, so certain features, including internal links within courses, syllabus print
buttons, exam settings, and rubrics in ANGEL, will not work in Blackboard. This provides a challenge, as some features can be disabled or removed, while others might disrupt courses currently in progress. We are in the midst of working on this issue.

Once the cleaning up of courses and addressing the items that will “break” in the new LMS are addressed, we will be able to work with Blackboard to perform the physical conversion of our 600+ courses to the new system. Unfortunately, we do not know at this time how long the conversion will take—it could be a couple of weeks or several weeks.

When the conversion is complete and we have all of our courses in Blackboard, then the process of QA will begin. For each course, we will need to check that links are not broken, that videos will play and that features function as they should. We will need to reset or rebuild all tests, quizzes, exams, and rubrics, and set up new gradebooks for each course. Again, since we do not know how extensive this work will be, we do not know the exact dates at this time. The courses to be offered the upcoming quarter will be the highest priority.

Training

While we anticipate a slight learning curve for our students and faculty in adjusting to the new system, the differences between Blackboard and ANGEL are actually greater for those who will be administering, building courses and supporting the system. After the contract with Blackboard begins, the LMS Administrator, instructional designers, instructional technologists (faculty support), and other support personnel will receive training in the system. Subsequent training will be delivered to faculty and students through a combination of live training sessions and video-based training.

Conclusion

Our new LMS will provide us with an opportunity to improve how we do online and hybrid learning and to eventually provide these tools to all students, regardless of how the course is delivered. We would like to see the lines between online and face-to-face learning become blurred as our students receive the best of both worlds. The change may take a little while and there may be some bumps in the road as we get used to the new system, but the future looks bright!
In the last issue of the *Academic Illuminator* (Spring 2016), we learned that the mission of the Sullivan University Institutional Review Board (IRB) is to preserve and ensure the safety and welfare and the rights of all human research subjects, including the right of privacy. I also mentioned that the single most important thing you need to know about the IRB is this:

**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:

1. 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.

2. 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.

If your intended research (including informal surveys of Sullivan University faculty, staff, or students) does not indisputably fall within one of these two exceptions, it probably needs the approval of the IRB — but it’s always good to start by having a conversation with me.

If you need to submit an application to the IRB, the forms are found on the Institutional Review Board website (start at ir.sullivan.edu and follow the navigation panel on the left — the application forms are in the Forms and Templates folder). You will see that there are two application forms: Form 10 for “exempt” applications, and Form 11 for “expedited” applications. (The words “exempt” and “expedited” are references to the federal regulations, and they don’t mean anything like what you might think they
would mean.)

Deciding which application form to use can be a bit tricky, and if you choose wrongly, it can mean a delay of a month or more in obtaining IRB approval. Here’s a few guidelines: If you are conducting a survey that will be totally, completely anonymous, you can use Form 10 – but be careful. “Totally, completely anonymous” means that you will not be able, in any way, to connect a survey response to the survey taker. In other words, the survey will not contain identifying information, including any information that would allow you to deduce the identity of the respondent. This also means, in the case of online surveys, that IP (computer address) tracking must be turned off. Many of the online survey tools do not give you the option to turn off IP tracking, and they would be inappropriate for this use. One tool that does give you this option is SurveyMonkey. In your application to the IRB, state what survey software you intend to use (if you are planning an online survey), and be sure to indicate that you will turn off IP tracking (and don’t forget to do it). If your survey is being conducted in person, rather than online, you will need to consider very carefully (and explain to the IRB) how you are keeping the identities of the respondents “totally, completely anonymous”.

Another time when the use of Form 10 is appropriate is when the research will be focused directly on educational practices and outcomes and will be conducted entirely within Sullivan University. In research projects like this, it is not absolutely essential that the subjects remain anonymous, but the greatest possible care should be taken to preserve the confidentiality and privacy of identities and educational data.

Pretty much all other applications should use Form 11, but if you are in doubt, please talk to me about it.

Both of the application forms have been recently revised. A considerable effort has been made to clarify the instructions so that the applicant will provide the IRB with all of the information and documentation that will be needed to make a decision. Try to follow the instructions precisely and respond to every prompt. And be sure to obtain all of the required signatures (written signatures are mandatory) before submitting the application. The application forms are digital, so sections may be cut and pasted as necessary to cover additional project personnel, additional signature lines, etc. If you run into any problems or complications, please consult with me.

When considering your research project’s timeline, keep in mind that the Sullivan University IRB meets once a month. A schedule of IRB meeting dates may be found on the IRB website. Please also keep in mind that all applications for IRB review must be submitted at least one week prior to the date of an IRB meeting. If significant revisions are required, the IRB may ask you to make those revisions and resubmit your application, delaying your project for another month. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that you prepare your IRB application carefully and thoughtfully, being sure to answer every question in appropriately convincing detail. 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 MWiljanen@sullivan.edu.
For this installment of “Five Questions For...,” we interviewed Chef William Hallman. He is an instructor for the National Center for Hospitality Studies at Sullivan University’s Lexington campus, and holds the faculty rank of Associate Professor. He has been an instructor at Sullivan since November 2005, and primarily teaches Garde Manger and Hospitality Management. He is not averse to lending a hand, and so teaches Basic Skills, Basic Baking, and Advanced Techniques as needed, also.

1. Where are you from originally? Where did you attend school?
I grew up in Florence, Ky. for most of my youth, then moved to Lexington to attend the University of Ky where I received my Bachelor’s degree in Business Management. After a few years out in the business world I decided to go back to school at Cincinnati State and get my Associates degree in Culinary Arts. After moving back to Lexington in 1995, I worked at different upscale restaurants/catering/bakeries. In 2003 I went back to the University of Kentucky for my MBA.

2. How did you originally get into education? What was your motivation?
I had a former colleague, Kelli Oakley who was the new culinary admissions officer for Sullivan University Lexington campus. I
3. What is it that you like the most about teaching?
The thing that I like most about teaching is the opportunity to facilitate the learning process. Some students really embrace the opportunity given to them to learn and take full advantage of that. We are like conductors guiding these students to constantly practice and improve and hopefully one day go out confident in themselves and succeed. But my favorite stories are the students who don’t give up and keep fighting no matter how difficult and frustrating it is for them. When I see them succeeding out in the world it feels like one of my own children has made it and makes teaching worth all the time and effort.

4. Do you have any heroes or role models in education or your field of study?
I got a chance to take some classes from Master Chef Rich Rosendale last year. I was really impressed by his passion for his craft and his constant drive to understand as much as he could about the ingredients he worked with. Even more so I was grateful for his willingness to share with others the knowledge that catapulted him to stardom in the culinary field. He was very humble and really loved to educate people.

5. What hobbies or interests do you have in your off time?
I love spending time with my two teenage daughters and wife of 23 years. I am very active in my church, St. Andrews Anglican Church, where I help provide food for various functions. I also help tutor local elementary students from the Hispanic community during the week. My favorite pastime is probably BBQing, or going out to eat to experience really good food and fellowship.
The principle of complementarity of relationship, structure and function, i.e. “something that completes, expands, makes up a whole, or brings to perfection,” is a transdisciplinary construct existing in many disciplines, including the social as well as in the applied sciences. For example, instructor Natalia Caporale provides the following insightful base pairing’s definition in her Biology 101 Complementary Base Pairing course on study.com:

Complementary base pairing describes the manner in which the nitrogenous bases of the DNA molecules align with each other. Complementary base pairings are also responsible for the double-helix structure of DNA. If you imagine yourself looking at a closet with 4 pairs of shoes that are all mixed up, complementary base pairing would be the set of rules that you would use to know which shoes go together. In a similar way to which only the correct two shoes will form a working pair (you don’t want two left shoes, or a black and a brown one!), only some of the nitrogenous bases of DNA can interact to form a stable DNA molecule. Complementary base pairing describes the manner in which the nitrogenous bases of the DNA molecules align with each other. Complementary base pairings are also responsible for the double-helix structure of DNA. If you imagine yourself looking at a closet with 4 pairs of shoes that are all mixed up, complementary base pairing would be the set of rules that you would use to know which shoes go together. In a similar way to which only the correct two shoes will form a working pair (you don’t want two left shoes, or a black and a brown one!), only some of the nitrogenous bases of DNA can interact to form a stable DNA molecule.

Accordingly, Chargraff’s Rule 1 of base pairs states that adenine always associates with thymine, so that the number of A’s and T’s in DNA must always be the same. Likewise, cytosine
and guanine complement each other and must always be numerically the same, as illustrated below:

![Chargaff Rule 1](http://study.com/academy/lesson/complementary-base-pairing-definition-lesson-quiz.html)

Complementarity also exists in quantum physics, where the “Copenhagen interpretation” holds that objects possess complementary properties which cannot be measured accurately at the same time. As well, complementarity is a common paradigm in math, international law, and economics, where complementary good is an economic good with a negative cross elasticity of demand, in contrast to a substitute good.
If all of this “complementarity” blather sounds as unintelligible as Stacheldraht DDoS or dark pool liquidity, please allow me to explain: as mentioned in prior columns, complementarity exists between some of the “Core Requirement” [CR] standards and some of the “Comprehensive Standards” [CS]. SACSCOC often notes that standard **1.0, The Principle of Integrity**, is “essential to the purpose of higher education, [and] functions as the basic contract defining the relationship between the Commission and each of its member and candidate institutions.” (*Principles*, p. 13) As such, then, integrity overarching insinuates itself into all the approximately 100 SACSCOC standards, which it might be said to – at least philosophically, complement. More specifically and strategically, however, for some Core Requirements, there appears to be a complementary Comprehensive Standard.

In both its official SACSCOC *Resource Manual* as well as in its SACSCOC *Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation* (but not in the SACSCOC *Principles, per se*), SACSCOC defines Core Requirement and Comprehensive Standard, respectively, as follows:

**Core Requirements**: Basic, broad-based, foundational requirements, the **Core Requirements** (2.1-2.12 in *The Principles of Accreditation*) establish a threshold of development required of all institutions seeking initial accreditation or reaffirmation.

**Comprehensive Standards**: More specific to the operations of an institution than the Core Requirements, the Comprehensive Standards (3.1-3.14 in *The Principles of Accreditation*) represent good practice in higher education and establish a level of accomplishment expected of all institutions seeking Initial Accreditation or Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Among its many valuable insights, the SACSCOC *Resource Manual* (RM) also provides cross-referenced correlation between standards regardless of their designation as a “Core Requirement” [CR], a “Comprehensive Standard” [CS], or a Federal Requirement [FR]. Compiled di-
Complementarity differs from cross-referenced correlation: the former is commonly defined as “something that completes, expands, makes up a whole, or brings to perfection;” and, the latter is commonly defined as “a reference from one part of a book, index, catalog, or file to another part containing related information.” Based on these definitions, the red CS’s listed in the table above may be deemed complementary, and the balance may be deemed simply cross-referential. To augment what I mean by complementarity, an RM “NOTE:” specifically identifies unitwide-applicable [hence, unit = “comprehensive standard”] CS 3.3.1 as complementing or expanding upon the institutionwide-applicable [hence, institution = “core requirement”] CR 2.5, viz.:

Note: Core Requirement 2.5 is distinguishable from CS 3.3.1 in that CR 2.5 focuses on institutional effectiveness at an institution-wide level. In CS 3.3.1, the effectiveness of the functioning units is addressed.

| “Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable.” |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 2.1                         | None noted       |
| 2.2                         | CS 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4 |
| 2.3                         | None noted       |
| 2.4                         | **CS 3.1.1, FR 4.2** |
| 2.5                         | **CS 3.3.1, 3.5.1, FR 4.1** |
| 2.6                         | None noted       |
| 2.7.1                       | FR 4.4, 4.9      |
| 2.7.2                       | FR 4.2           |
| 2.7.3                       | CS 3.5.1, 3.5.3, FR 4.2 |
| 2.7.4                       | CS 3.4.7         |
| 2.8                         | **CS 3.7.1**     |
| 2.9                         | **CS 3.8.1, 3.3.1.3** |
| 2.10                        | **CS 3.3.1.3, 3.9.1-3.9.3, 3.3.9** |
| 2.11.1                      | CS 2.2, **3.10.1, 3.10.4** |
| 2.11.2                      | **CS 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.3** |
| 2.12                        | CS 2.5, **3.3.2** |
In its own official definition of CR and CS – noted above – SACSCOC provides definitions that underscore my theory of complementarity between these standards: it connotes the former as “basic, broad-based, foundational requirements...[which] establish a threshold of development required of all institutions seeking initial accreditation or reaffirmation”; and, connotes the latter as “more specific to the operations of an institution than the Core Requirements... [which] represent good practice in higher education and establish a level of accomplishment expected of all institutions seeking Initial Accreditation or Reaffirmation of Accreditation.”

You may be asking yourself: “why is this important; why does it matter?” These issues apparently matter to SACSCOC, so it follows must matter to us. More importantly, however: in their Evaluator Training Module: MODULE 4: FOUNDATIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (http://www.sacscoc.org/trngmods/IEModules.pdf), SACSCOC lists three institutional effective Case Analysis Factors (CAF). CAF 1 – “Knowing and Understanding the Language of The Principles of Accreditation,” represents what SACSCOC wants its volunteer IE evaluators to know. Accordingly, it is paramount that we who generate documents to support the university’s compliance with SACSCOC standards be equally knowledgeable and understanding of the standards and their interrelationships to other SACSCOC requirements as well as to what we do on a daily basis to improve the quality of higher education at our institution. Therefore, if we are to “Think like a SACSCOC reviewer,” that is: know the standard’s IE requirements, then we must address all parts of the IE standard and follow – in accordance with our mission, all the explicit and implicit processes mandated in the Principles of Accreditation. Then, as Shakespeare notes in Hamlet, Act 1, Scene 3:

>This above all: to thine own self [or mission] be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man [or standard].

Countervailingly, the yin-yang complementarity premise I have outlined above seems to be in
contradistinction to the following well-premised comments from a senior SACSCOC VP with whom I have discussed it. For your edification, I quote his email in its entirety due to the many excellent perceptual and historical points he makes which are directly applicable to this particular discussion and supportive of the broader premise that “SACSCOC still matters.”

While I think some CR and CS standards do have some complementarity, there is mainly just some overlap and some subject matter commonality. Different standards often cover different parts of related subjects, so to me, a complementary relationship is a bit too strong of a term. If the Resource Manual did not contain the section on cross-referenced standards, it would make little to no difference. The advantage of pointing out to an institution where standards overlap is probably in assigning personnel to write report narratives to ensure there are not inconsistencies in what is presented. It also reflects standards that are commonly assigned to the same reviewer on an off-site or on-site committee where that person serves as a primary reviewer. Using your definitions, I think these are all cross-referenced. Otherwise, I fear you may be reading more into them than is there, and reading more into the Resource Manual than was ever intended.

I would agree that the Core Requirements are generally more institution-wide in focus while the Comprehensive Standards are often more unit focused. Under the old Criteria, the analogous standards to the Core Requirements were called “Conditions of Eligibility,” meaning that an institution could not be reaffirmed without these basic, underlying standards being met. That remains true of the Core Requirements – they are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for being reaffirmed and staying in good accreditation status.

I think linkage between standards is better thought of in terms of the actual wording in the standards, not the numbering scheme. Hence, the distinction you make between 2.5’s institution-wide focus and CS 3.3.1’s unit or program focus is essential. Where is there is true complementarity in this case is in the word “integrated” within 2.5 – there is generally an expectation that the parts (unit or program reports) feed into and help determine success of the whole (institution-wide mission). Further, the institutional mission should flow into the types of expected outcomes thought most important by units.

Or take another case. CR 2.10 speaks of student services that “are intended to promote
student learning and enhance the development of students.” That wording was put into place fairly recently because reviewers tended to confuse the intent of the standard to ensure institutions offer an appropriate range of student services with the question of whether or not they are being as effective as they can be, which more logically belongs in CS 3.3.1.3 which deals with the institutional effectiveness process for student services. Are they complementary? Well, they conceptually should be in that I think CR 2.9 pretty much implies student service units should have some expected outcomes related to the co-curricular learning process.

In the case of finances, linkages tend to follow this logic:

1) 2.11.1 requires specific documents for compliance, but conceptually centers around adequacy of financial resources.

2) 2.2 deals with governance, but does specifically make it a Board responsibility to ensure adequate financial resources. So sometimes when there are severe financial issues, reviewers ask “Where was the Board?” Then they cite 2.2 as problematic.

3) CS 3.10.1 speaks in terms of recent financial stability, while 2.11.1 has a broader, overall stability focus. In this case, a finding in 3.10.1 is often seen as a “lesser problem” that still needs to be noted. So the relationship is one of viewing the standards as substitutes for each other.

4) CS 3.10.4 is, I think, an error in that the standards were renumbered a few years ago, and that probably refers to CS 3.10.3. But either way, one of the required documents in CR 2.11.1 is an auditor management letter, which in turn becomes a primary document in compliance with 3.10.3 and 3.10.4. The Core Requirement is that you have the document. The Comprehensive Standard is that the document shows there are no major issues of concern.

I hope this helps. I don’t think the Principles of Accreditation are quite as logical as your analysis implies, although it would be nice if they were!
So, what are the take-away’s from this column?

Number one: while assessment is a data-driven praxis, metacognitively reviewing assessment requirements aids not only the institution with compliance, but has the potential to elevate individual course and program quality across the higher educational board, because:

Number two: “student learning is a campus-wide responsibility, and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility...assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim is wider, better-informed attention to student learning by all parties with a stake in its improvement [Banta, TW, Lund JP, Black KE and Oblender, FW. (1996). Assessment in practice: putting principles to work on college campuses. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, p 35.].

Number three: Therefore, I suggest examining the three key SACSCOC documents alluded to below for any and all interpretative information. All three documents are useful in this regard, especially the Resource Manual, which is organized to provide insights into each standard by means of the following:

Rationale and Notes
The rationale and notes provide a further explanation of the standard/requirement along with reasons for its inclusion in the Principles.

Relevant Questions for Consideration
For each standard or requirement, there is a series of questions designed to help an institution examine its current processes and practices.

Documentation, if applicable
Evidence that should be examined by the institution and provided as part of the documentation of its case of compliance with the requirement/standard. (Does not apply to all standards.)

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable (p. 2)
Additionally, SACSCOC indicates that:

an institution’s primary resource, however, is its Commission staff member assigned to provide advice and to consult with the institution regarding the accreditation process, its expectations and applications. Such advice and information do not supplant the peer review process, but rather provide additional insight in assisting institutions reaching informed judgments about their self-assessment. (p. 2)

The word “assess” harkens etymologically back to the Latin word “assidere,” which means to “sit next to a person in the position of an assistant judge.” I just attended the annual SACSCOC conference last week, and 4000+ attendees from 800+ institutions across 11 states were there with the single and signal purpose of understanding the standards relative to their own self-assessment efforts. In so doing, they invariably solicited insights from SACSCOC conference presenters as well as from the attending authoritative SACSCOC VP experts. These accreditation judges, or rhadámanthuses (from the New Latin, from Ancient Greek Ῥαδάμανθος (Rhadámanthus, the “name of a son of Zeus and Europa, one of the three judges of the dead.” Rhad-ə-man-thi-ne [radaˈmanTHən,-ˌTHiːn/] is an adjective connoting an implacable judge, or a person with stern and inflexible judgment.) provided varying ex parte insights into the standards. Then, it was incumbent upon those attendees to apply those insights to their own unique institution. For, as the Preamble of the Resource Manual states: “The manner in which an institution makes its case for compliance with the Principles of Accreditation is an institutional decision, and the process employed by a review committee to reach its decision on compliance issues is likewise determined by the professional judgment of that committee within the context of the institution’s specific circumstances and mission.”

I hope these assessment thoughts have stimulated your own introspective analytical processes relative to classes and department. If you have questions, kindly advise: assesseo ergo sum.
Student Retention

Motivation: A Fragile Balance in Advising and Retention!

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

Since the beginning of the Retention office in 2009, a review and study of how many institutions perform the function of retention and advising has occurred. This practice continues to this date. The early stages of this investigation found that many of the institutions of higher learning in the area rely, almost exclusively, on separate titles of departments and individuals to achieve what is expected of the faculty and staff here at Sullivan University as part of our culture. These institutions provide a compensation based policy for advising and mentoring to monitor and control assurance that retention activities are completed. It is implied, if not stated, that if there is no compensation (motivator) for the staff/faculty to assist in advising and persistence, then the job will not get done.

The question is asked then, is a compensation-based incentive practice needed for creative leadership to perform retention activities? It is opined by this article that the answer to this question is “NO” and, in part, many of you are to be praised for the “out of the box thinking” that you continue to utilize to inspire and motivate your students to persist. The impetus for this writing comes from a recent article read that spoke about the limited value of incentive-based motivation on creative people. The premise of the article stated that incentive-based rewards are successful in production environment (such as the number of units produced, etc...) but, when moved to a creative thinking environment, there is actually a detrimental outcome as the creative work decreases. A deep dive ensued and the result of that study is in this article.

The focus of this article will speak to the whole practice of the retention effort by all and has no correlation with specific departments focused on Advising. The point is this; what does it take to motivate all to act and work in a collaborative environment, with special focus now on millennials and like minds, moving forward? Discussions with colleges and universities in the area over several years expressed that a salary-based compensation model and a prescribed formal process has to be in place to expect involvement by all working with students. It may be idealistic of this article, but it is a personal belief that the faculty and staff working within the Sullivan University System are better than that. It is argued that using incentives to expect performance suggest that the activity is for the reward, not the outcome. Alfie Kohn, noted author on human behavior, brought forward this point in his work “Incentive Plans Cannot Work” in the Harvard Business Review.

“Research suggests that, by and large, rewards succeed at securing one thing only: temporary compliance. They do not create an enduring commitment to any value or action.
They merely, and temporarily, change what we do.”

What is looked for is a long lasting and culturally entrenched model of motivation which goes beyond superficial reward as the method to achieve results. Everyone’s internal desire to engage and work toward change requires real intrinsic motivation.

“Intrinsically motivated people are often described as becoming absorbed in a task and deriving enjoyment from the challenge it provides. Conversely, those who experience low intrinsic interest find an activity to be tedious and boring. Because creativity is mentally taxing and often requires sustained effort, intrinsic motivation is considered critical to this process” (This type of motivation (fulltime or adjunct, faculty or staff) exampled by you and shared with your peers can and will replace some of the extrinsic motivation other educational environments provide for their staffs along with student motivators as intercollegiate sports, student unions, etc."

It is strongly suggested that your intrinsic motivation will and does inspire many of our students to succeed. Today’s students expect to see a personal reason for being in your class and on your campus. You can be just that motivator because it is who you are. This type of motivation is now an issue spread across many disciplines, education being just one. You do make a difference.

“Leadership is not a sort of manipulation – it depends mainly on integrity and it has an extraordinary power. Leadership, as it is, can make the difference between success and failure in anything you do for yourself or any group you belong to. Regardless of your own abilities, there are many important goals that you cannot attain without the help of others. Leadership is the changing of a man’s vision to higher sights, the raising of a man’s performance to a higher standard, the building of a man’s personality beyond its normal limitations.”

The internal motivation of the faculty and staff of the Sullivan University System has always made the difference setting the educational experience from others in the area, if not the region. As the system rebounds from the recent down cycle of enrollments, your motivation and the way you motivate your peers and your students will be a force that strengthens that recovery in this decade and future decades.

---


Academic Council Highlights

By

Nick Riggs and Nathan Ragland

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.

To write this particular article, I have enlisted the able assistance of Nathan Ragland, Distance Education Librarian & Associate Professor, who currently serves as Council secretary. Nathan and I have developed a symbiotic relationship and have worked together to run Council operations for several years. We share the same goals of representing the interests of the faculty at large, conducting productive meetings, providing accurate minutes of meetings, and keeping the Sullivan community cognizant of all formal actions taken by the Council and related matters.

The purpose of this article is to make our readers aware that there has been a major overhaul of the official Charter of the Sullivan University Academic Council (AC Charter). Within the last couple of years, 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, questions arose as to whether those members met the requirements to have voting status. With that in mind, the Council decided to take a look at the AC Charter to see if it needed revision. Since voting status was not the only area of the AC Charter needing review, the decision was made by formal vote to take a fresh look at the AC Charter as a whole.

As a result, a committee of AC members was formed to review all sections of the AC Charter for revision, updating or deletion. The committee (Nathan Ragland, Larry Bohn, David Tudor, LaVena Wilkin, and Nick Riggs) decided its review of the AC Charter (and any recommended changes) should be predicated on the fact that modifying the charter to meet the needs of the ever-changing work environment would be appropriate and wise. After hearing from the committee and holding discussions on the matter, the Council voted unanimously at its May 2016 meeting to adopt the following revised charter:
SULLIVAN UNIVERSITY
Charter of the Sullivan University Academic Council
May 2016

I. Name: The name of this organization shall be the Sullivan University Academic Council (herein referred to as “the Council”).

II. Statement of Purpose: The purpose of the Council shall be to:

A. Further the mission of Sullivan University (herein referred to as “the University”) to provide educational enrichment opportunities for the intellectual, social and professional development of its students;

B. Advise and support the administrative prerogatives that sustain the academic function of the University;

C. Promote an academic standard of quality education to enhance institutional effectiveness;

D. Advance bi-lateral communications throughout the University and the Sullivan University System;

E. Report to and advise the Provost on matters pertaining to the University's academic policies as related to:
   1. Recruitment of students and admissions policies,
   2. Academic standards,
   3. Criteria for and credentials of faculty,
   4. The formulation of policies and procedures for maintaining and improving the quality of academic programs,
   5. Faculty and student concerns,
   6. Technology and logistical matters affecting teaching and learning, and
   7. Other matters for which the Provost wishes to seek advice from the Council; and

F. Receive from and disseminate information to the faculty of the University, directly and through the appropriate Academic Deans and Directors.

III. Membership: The Council will be comprised of voting and ex officio members as follows:

A. Voting members shall include:
1. At least one, but no more than three representatives, from each of the following academic units:
   a) The School of Accountancy
   b) The College of Business Administration
   c) The Department of Early Childhood Education
   d) The General Education Department
   e) The Graduate School
   f) The National Center for Hospitality Studies
   g) The College of Information and Computer Technology
   h) The Institute for Legal Studies
   i) The College of Pharmacy
   j) Other academic programs or units as may be added by the University, upon notification by the Provost
      ◦ Procedure for selecting voting representatives from the academic units listed above:
        (1.) The Dean or Director of each academic unit will determine the process for selecting the voting representatives from the academic unit, one of which shall be the Dean or Director of the academic unit, and the others shall be selected from among the associate/assistant deans or directors, department chairs, and program coordinators in the academic unit.
        (2.) The Dean or Director of each academic unit shall provide the Council secretary with the names of the voting representatives by June 1 of each year.
          o Academic unit representation may be updated outside the June 1st window in situations where changes in job title or employment status render a representative ineligible for voting membership status;

2. At least one, but no more than three representatives, from the College of Health Sciences (which shall include the College of Nursing for the purposes indicated herein):
   a) The Associate Provost of the College of Health Sciences will determine the process for selecting its voting representatives, which shall be selected from among the academic deans or directors, department chairs, and program coordinators from the college.
   b) The Associate Provost of the College of Health Sciences shall provide the Council secretary with the names of the voting representatives by June 1 of each year.
o College of Health Sciences representation may be updated outside the June 1st window in situations where changes in job title or employment status render a representative ineligible for voting membership status;

3. At least one, but no more than two representatives, from the Lexington campus:
   a) The Dean of Academic Affairs on the Lexington campus will determine the process for selecting its voting representatives, which shall be selected from among the academic associate/assistant deans or directors, department chairs, program coordinators, or faculty members from that campus.
   b) The Dean of Academic Affairs on the Lexington campus shall provide the Council secretary with the names of the voting representatives by June 1 of each year.
      o Lexington campus representation may be updated outside the June 1st window in situations where changes in job title or employment status render a representative ineligible for voting membership status;

4. At least one, but no more than two representatives, from the University Libraries:
   a) The Dean of Libraries will determine the process for selecting its voting representatives, one of which shall be the Dean of Libraries, and the other, if any, shall be selected from among the library faculty.
   b) The Dean of Libraries shall provide the Council secretary with the names of the voting representatives by June 1 of each year.
      o Library representation may be updated outside the June 1st window in situations where changes in job/faculty title or employment status render a representative ineligible for voting membership status;

5. Four faculty members elected from the faculty at large (full time and/or adjunct):
   a) The election of the at-large faculty members will take place in June of each year and the election process will be coordinated through the office of the Provost.
   b) The Provost shall provide the Council secretary with the names of the voting representatives elected from the faculty at large by July 10 of each year.

B. Ex officio members, who will not vote on actions of the Council, shall include:
   1. The Provost, and
   2. Other officers of the University, as designated by the Council or the Provost.

C. In the event there is not at least one voting representative selected from each of the academic units identified in Section III., A., 1-4, above, the Provost shall have the authority to appoint at least one voting representative from each of the affected academic units.
IV. Officers: The voting members of the Council will elect as officers:
   A. A Chair and a Vice-Chair from the Council voting membership:
      1. The Chair and Vice-Chair will serve two-year staggered terms and may be reelected to their respective positions.
      2. If the Chair is temporarily unable to perform his/her function, the Vice-Chair will temporarily assume responsibilities of the Chair.
      3. The Chair will appoint a Secretary, selecting someone from outside the Council voting membership.

V. MEETINGS: The Council shall hold regular meetings as follows:
   A. A minimum of two meetings will be conducted in each academic quarter, preferably during Week 3 and Week 8.
   B. The Chair may convene additional meetings as necessary and appropriate.
   C. Quorum: Forty percent of voting members of the Council will constitute a quorum for all Council meetings.
   D. Order of Business: The Council order of business will include, but is not limited to:
      1. Call to Order
      2. Approval of Minutes
      3. Administrative Response to Previous Council Actions
      4. Provost Academic Leadership Items
      5. Committee Reports
      6. Old Business
      7. New Business
      8. Communications from Other Departments
      9. Adjournment
   E. Support staff and other ad-hoc members are invited and/or may be asked to attend meetings of the Council.
   F. The Secretary will draft meeting minutes to summarize all discussions and actions of the Council and handle the email distribution to Council members for approval.
      1. It is incumbent upon Council members to read and provide corrections to the draft minutes within 10 working days of receipt.
G. Upon approval, the minutes will be made available to all faculty and staff via electronic format.

VI. COUNCIL ACTIONS: The Council will initiate actions to advance its aims as follows:

A. The Chair will receive recommended actions from any member of the University community on matters of Council concern.

B. All proposed actions that the Chair and/or the Provost deem affect areas of Council concern will be submitted for consideration with timely notice to allow an opportunity for review by the Council.

C. Action Approvals: On all matters presented to the Council, members will review, discuss, and approve/disapprove based on the vote of a majority of Council members voting at a duly-called meeting.

1. If a member cannot be present, either in person or virtually, the member may designate a proxy (who shall have voting privileges) by sending an email or other communication to the Chair or Secretary prior to a called meeting.

2. The Provost will review the actions of the Council:

   a) If the Provost agrees with the actions, they will be forwarded to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO). If the CEO agrees with the actions, and if approval of the University President is not required, they will become the policy of the University. If necessary, the CEO will forward the actions to the Office of the University President. If the President agrees with the actions, they will become the policy of the University.

   b) If the Provost, the CEO, or the President disagrees with the actions of the Council, the Provost or his or her designee will provide comments at a Council meeting or a written report to the Council giving reasons for the disagreement.

VII. COMMITTEES: The Chair of the Council, with Council approval, will appoint standing committee members from among its members, and from the faculty at-large:

A. Committees of the Council will review, revise and/or formulate policy on issues of concern to the Council. Any policy revised or formulated by a Committee will be presented to the Council for vote.

VIII. AMENDMENTS: This Charter may be changed or amended by approval of three-quarters of Council members voting at a duly called meeting.
The major changes to the AC Charter include the following:

- Stating the official name of the organization: Sullivan University Academic Council.
- Removing “degree requirements” from the list of policies the Council considers. It was found that this concern is better addressed by other bodies within the university.
- Adding “technology and logistical matters affecting teaching and learning” as an item the Council considers. This addition reflects the real-world fact that the Council frequently addresses these concerns at its meetings and via its subcommittees.
- Changing the voting membership status provisions to reflect wider faculty representation across all academic programs and disciplines.
- At the behest of the Provost, removing the authority of the Provost to appoint voting members, except in emergency situations. This laudable request from the Provost ensured that the Council is, and will always remain, the voice of the faculty at large.
- Changing the number of voting members required for a quorum from a majority to 40%. This change was made as a concession to the membership, as other faculty responsibilities can preclude Council meeting attendance for large portions of the membership at some meetings. This ensures that Council business can still be conducted in such situations. It would be a rare meeting where a majority did not attend, but due to the timely nature of many Council agenda items, a safeguard was necessitated.
- Adding “Provost Academic Leadership Items” to the regular meeting agenda. This has become a de facto regular agenda item over the years, so the change was simply to bring the AC Charter in line with current practice.
- Clarifying the attendance provision to reflect either personal or virtual presence is allowed.
- Cleaning up the language relating to proxies.
- Eliminating the requirement of advance notice to amend the AC Charter. This change allows the Council to adapt to the needs of the University in a more timely fashion.
- Adding a few housekeeping items.

The result of these changes is a newly constituted Council membership. If all voting positions are filled, the Council would have a maximum of 38 voting members [3 each from the list of the first 9 academic units; 3 from the College of Health Sciences; 2 from the Lexington campus; 2 from the Library; 4 at-large members]. Under the new voting status structure, the Council could operate with as few as 16 voting members [1 each from the list of the first 9 academic units; 1 from the College of Health Sciences; 1 from the Lexington campus; 1 from the Library; 4 at-large members].
Here is the Council roster as it will appear when the Council next convenes at its meeting scheduled to be held on Thursday, July 14, 2016 (subject to additions as the revised AC Charter provisions are implemented):

**Voting Members**

**The School of Accountancy**
- Mike Miller (Interim Assistant Dean)

**The College of Business Administration**
- Ken Moran (Dean)

**The Department of Early Childhood Education**
- Vicke Bowman (Director)

**The General Education Department**
- Margie Gallo (Dean)
- Josh Simpson (Chair, English)
- Jason Greenberg (Chair, Social and Natural Sciences)

**The Graduate School**
- Tim Swenson (Dean/Associate Provost) (Joan Durso, standing proxy)
- Heather Merrifield (Chair, Conflict Management)
- LaVena Wilkin (Director, PhD Programs)

**The National Center for Hospitality Studies**
- David Dodd (Executive Director)

**The College of Information and Computer Technology**
- Emmanuel Udoh (Dean)
- Julie King (Associate Dean)
- Scott Cordle (Chair, Information Technology)

**The Institute for Legal Studies**
- Nick Riggs (Dean)  (*AC Chair*)
The College of Pharmacy
Cindy Stowe (Dean) (Kim Daugherty, standing proxy)
Misty Stutz (Assistant Dean and Chair, Clinical and Administrative Sciences)
Arthur Cox (Assistant Dean and Chair, Pharmaceutical Sciences)

The College of Health Sciences
[Unknown at time of publication]

Lexington Campus Representatives
Jill Ferrari (Director, Medical Assisting Program)
Kandace Rogers (Director, Sullivan University Library, Lexington Campus)

Sullivan University Library and Learning Resource Center
Charles Brown (Dean)
Cara Marco (Assistant Director)

At-Large Faculty Representatives (4)
To Be Determined

Nonvoting Members
Kenneth Miller (Provost)
Nathan Ragland (Sullivan University Library) (AC Secretary)

The hope is that the Council can continue to expand its influence in the governance of the university, including matters affecting student learning, issues related to academic programs, faculty interests and concerns, and the betterment of the university as a whole.

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 Nick Riggs an item for Council deliberation at nriggs@sullivan.edu. The Sullivan University Academic Council is here to serve you!

Submitted 06/03/2016
The Northern Kentucky Learning Center is nearly ready to open its doors for new students! Located in Fort Mitchell, the picturesque location is easily accessible and visible from Interstate 75/71. From an IT perspective, the new location is equipped with the latest and greatest technologies and classroom aids including: state of the art LCD projectors, digital projection screens, multimedia lecterns, and high definition classroom monitors.

Network Administrator David Wiseman has been tirelessly working to ensure the new Learning Center’s successful network launch, and we are anticipating to have everything up and running by mid-June at the latest. Along with the Louisa, KY location, the strategic launch of the new Northern KY Learning Center gives the Sullivan University System strong coverage over 2/3 of Kentucky, allowing us to provide access to our wonderful programs and faculty to a greater number of potential students.

We in the IT Department are ecstatic about the new site and are eager to service the new groups of students, faculty, and staff members. To stay up to date with the latest and greatest of all things SUS IT, please visit the IT Portal at itportal.sullivan.edu.
Calendar Of Events
Summer 2016 Quarter

New Day Student Registration.................................................................June 21, 2016
New Night Student Registration ..............................................................June 21, 2016
New Housing Student Registration .........................................................June 22, 2016
Day School New Student Orientation .....................................................June 24, 2016
Night School New Student Orientation .....................................................June 25, 2016
Late Registration .....................................................................................June 25, 2016
First day of classes ...............................................................................June 27, 2016
Last day that a student can enter an online class...................................June 30, 2016
International Orientation ......................................................................July 1, 2016
Last day that a student can enter a day class* .......................................July 5, 2016
Last day that a student can enter an evening or weekend class ...................July 7, 2016
Academic Council Meets .......................................................................July 14, 2016
Campus Discovery Day ..........................................................................July 23, 2016
Academic Council Meets .......................................................................August 18, 2016
Last day that a student can withdraw and still receive a “W” .....................August 26, 2016
Chef Shadow Day ..................................................................................September 2, 2016
Fall Break ..................................................................................................September 10-25, 2016
First Day of Fall 2016 classes ...............................................................September 26, 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.
Hippy Movement, Hippy Generation, May Affect Your Pocketbook

A great deal has been said about the "hippy movement." Some people have even gone so far as to call it a "hippy generation." But is it really one generation? And how will this movement affect people like Sullivan students—people who will, in the not-so-distant future, be getting jobs, raising families, and paying taxes?

Of course you might say, "The hippies won't bother me. I don't know anyone like that; and if I did, I could just stay away from them."

But this statement may not be true. It could be that the flower children will hurt Americans indirectly where they can be hurt most—in the pocketbook.

It may seem like an odd idea, but research will show that the restaurant and grocery owners are feeding the jobless hippies. These meals are merely donations from the pockets of these merchants. As for the questions of this movement involving only one generation: children have been born to some of the hippies. If these children are reared in that way of life, how can they be expected to live in any other way when they become adults? Scientists have also proved that definite changes occur in the chromosomes of people who take LSD. These changes are then passed on to the children in the forms of birth defects and serious brain damage. This is where the taxes come in. Someone must care for these people, so the responsibility will be placed in the hands of the United States Government; and that means, of course, in the hands of the taxpayers.

So far, no solution to this problem—one of our greatest—has been found. There have always been people who try to withdraw from society. They were once called hermits, and in the last decade they were beatniks. Never before have the people of the world paid so much attention to so few. They may say it is because they have something to offer the people of the world. But could it be because the problem is bigger than we have ever had to cope with before?
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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](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.