UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF VISITORS
JOINT MEETING OF THE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS AND ATHLETICS COMMITTEES
November 9, 2012
JOINT EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ATHLETICS COMMITTEES

November 9, 2012
12:30 – 2:45 p.m.
Small Auditorium, The Harrison Institute

Educational Policy Committee Members:
Stephen P. Long, M.D., Chair
Frank B. Atkinson
A. Macdonald Caputo
Hunter E. Craig
Allison Cryor DiNardo
George Keith Martin
Linwood H. Rose
Hillary A. Hurd
Helen E. Dragas, Ex-officio
Robert S. Kemp, Consulting Member

Student Affairs and Athletics Committee Members:
Allison Cryor DiNardo, Chair
A. Macdonald Caputo
Hunter E. Craig
Marvin W. Gilliam Jr.
Bobbie G. Kilberg
George Keith Martin
Timothy B. Robertson
Linwood H. Rose
Hillary A. Hurd
Helen E. Dragas, Ex-officio
Allison S. Linney, Consulting Member

AGENDA

I. ACTION ITEM (Ms. Sullivan)
   • Establishment of the John C. Buchanan Professorship in Biology at the University of Virginia’s College at Wise

II. REPORTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST (Mr. Simon)
   A. Faculty Senate Report (Mr. Simon to introduce Mr. George M. Cohen; Mr. Cohen to report)
   B. Overview of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Fifth-Year Interim Report (Mr. Simon to report)
   C. Assessment of Degree Programs (Mr. Simon to introduce Ms. Josipa Roksa; Ms. Roksa to report)
   D. Quality Enhancement Plan (Mr. Simon to introduce Mr. J. Milton Adams; Mr. Adams to report)

III. REPORT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER (Ms. Lampkin)
   • Honor Committee Report (Ms. Lampkin to introduce Mr. Stephen Nash; Mr. Nash to report)
IV. REPORT BY THE ATHLETICS DIRECTOR (Mr. Littlepage)
   • Report on Atlantic Coast Conference Expansion

V. EXECUTIVE SESSION (to take place in separate session)
   • Faculty Personnel Actions

VI. ATTACHMENTS
   • Components of the SACS Fifth-Year Interim Report
   • Executive Summary of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Impact Report
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BOARD MEETING: November 9, 2012

COMMITTEE: Joint Educational Policy and Student Affairs
and Athletics Committees

AGENDA ITEM: I. Establishment of the John C. Buchanan
Professorship in Biology at the University
of Virginia’s College at Wise

BACKGROUND: John Chalkley Buchanan, M.D, took an undergraduate
degree from the College of Arts & Sciences in 1933, and a
medical degree from the School of Medicine in 1951.

After serving in the Navy in World War II and upon
completion of his medical training, Dr. Buchanan entered private
practice in Wise in general internal medicine.

Dr. Buchanan served in the Senate of Virginia from 1972
until his death in April 1991, representing the people of
southwest Virginia. He and his wife, Carol Phipps Buchanan,
were ardent supporters of the College at Wise for over 20 years.
Carol Buchanan passed away in 2011. Mrs. Buchanan was a strong
advocate for education, and she made provisions in her will for
the creation of a professorship at the College at Wise in honor
of her late husband.

ACTION REQUIRED: Approval by the Educational Policy Committee
and by the Board of Visitors

APPROVAL TO ESTABLISH THE JOHN C. BUCHANAN PROFESSORSHIP IN
BIOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA’S COLLEGE AT WISE

WHEREAS, John Chalkley Buchanan of Darwin took a Bachelor
of Arts degree in 1933 and a degree in Medicine in 1951 from the
University of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, during his time as a student at the University,
Dr. Buchanan participated in the University Singers, and was a
member of Phi Beta Kappa and the Alpha Omega Alpha Honorary
Medical Society, and a resident of the Lawn; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Buchanan served in the Navy for three years
and worked for the U.S. Civil Service Commission prior to
returning to the University for medical school; and
WHEREAS, Dr. Buchanan joined the staff of Wise Memorial Hospital in 1956 and operated a general medical practice in Wise until 1991; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Buchanan represented southwest Virginia in the State Senate from 1972 until his death in 1991; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Buchanan and his wife, Carol Phipps Buchanan, were donors to the University of Virginia’s College at Wise for over 20 years; and

WHEREAS, Carol Buchanan passed away on May 14, 2011; and

WHEREAS, through her estate, Carol Buchanan provided the funds to create a professorship to honor her late husband, to promote education in the region, and to benefit the College at Wise;

RESOLVED, the Board of Visitors establishes the John C. Buchanan Professorship in Biology at the University of Virginia’s College at Wise, to attract and retain exceptional faculty in the Department of Natural Sciences.
Mr. Simon will introduce Mr. George Cohen, Chair of the Faculty Senate, who will report on the Senate’s accomplishments during the fall semester.
BOARD MEETING: November 9, 2012

COMMITTEE: Joint Educational Policy and Student Affairs and Athletics Committees

AGENDA ITEM: II.B. Overview of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Fifth-Year Interim Report

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC or SACS), founded in 1895 and comprised of more than 800 members, is the regional accreditor for the University. In 2006, the University submitted its decennial compliance certification with its accreditation reaffirmed in 2007. By March 25, 2013, the University must submit a Fifth-Year Interim Report. SACS will review the report in June 2013. The University will learn the result of the SACS review in July 2013.

DISCUSSION: The Fifth-Year Interim Report, according to SACS, “was developed to respond to the U.S. Department of Education’s requirements [that] (1) accrediting bodies continuously monitor institutions to ensure compliance; and (2) accrediting bodies have a mechanism for reviewing multiple sites initiated since last reaffirmation.” Because it is a relatively recent requirement, 2013 represents the University’s first fifth-year submission.

The report is an abbreviated version of the decennial reaffirmation. In its report, the University is required to document compliance with approximately 20 standards, rather than the full 90 standards, in the Principles of Accreditation. Among the standards included are those addressing faculty, student support services, assessment of student learning, physical facilities, curriculum, admissions and recruitment, financial aid, and distance learning. In addition, the University must submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Impact Report.

A steering committee, comprised predominantly of faculty, is providing oversight of the process. Subcommittees, organized
around particular components of the Fifth-Year Interim Report, prepared draft narratives. A draft report will be completed by December 31, 2012. Upon completion, each draft narrative will have been reviewed by the provost's office, an administrative reviewer, two members of the steering committee, and the provost to assess how well each narrative documents the University's compliance with a particular standard. As of this meeting, the draft narratives are at various stages of review.

Presidential review and preparation of the final report will take place in January, February, and March 2013.
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BOARD MEETING: November 9, 2012

COMMITTEE: Joint Educational Policy and Student Affairs and Athletics Committees

AGENDA ITEM: II.C. Assessment of Degree Programs

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: Accreditation agencies have increasingly moved toward focusing on assessment of student learning outcomes. While the credit hour is still the cornerstone of degree programs, an increasingly important question to answer is what knowledge and skills students possess at the end of their program of study. The focus of this form of assessment is the degree program. Understanding assessment of degree programs, both what it looks like and how it is used for program improvement, is central not only for accreditation purposes but also for improving experiences and outcomes of our students.

DISCUSSION: Josipa Roksa is an Associate Professor of Sociology and Education and the Associate Director of the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. She focuses on studying social inequality in students’ experiences and outcomes in higher education. She has examined the role of state contexts in shaping access and attainment in higher education, the importance of life course transitions, including work, marriage/cohabitation and parenthood, for educational success, and whether and how much students learn through their journey in college. In addition to numerous articles in both sociology and education journals, Professor Roksa is co-author of Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses.

Ms. Roksa will present on the assessment of degree programs, which is one of the core components of accreditation. She will provide a broader framing for understanding this form of assessment, including a discussion about disciplinary autonomy, differences between direct and indirect assessments, and creating feedback loops from assessment to practice. Ms. Roksa will present examples of strong assessments and discuss promising practices for advancing this form of assessment in the future.
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BOARD MEETING: November 9, 2012

COMMITTEE: Joint Educational Policy and Student Affairs and Athletics Committees

AGENDA ITEM: II.D. Quality Enhancement Plan

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: As part of the decennial reaccreditation process, members of SACS are required to submit a QEP. According to SACS, the QEP "describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning." The theme of the University’s 2007 QEP was “Enhancing Student-Faculty Engagement.” As part of the Fifth-Year Interim Report, the University must submit a QEP Impact Report documenting the implementation of the QEP and its impact on student learning.

DISCUSSION: The theme of the University’s QEP was “Enhancing Student-Faculty Engagement.” The QEP proposed two student-learning objectives, two major initiatives, and five supporting initiatives. The two student-learning objectives were (1) to make research a fundamental part of the student experience; and (2) to incorporate thoughtful public service into the curriculum. The two major initiatives were (1) to increase opportunities for student-faculty research; and (2) to incorporate thoughtful public service into the curriculum. The five supporting initiatives were (1) to offer more small classes; (2) to formalize and expand student-faculty lunch and dinner programs; (3) to foster engagement through academic advising; (4) to expand the services of the Center for Undergraduate Excellence; and (5) to develop and improve mechanisms to communicate opportunities.

Included in the QEP Impact Report is a discussion of the QEP’s impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning. Mr. Adams will discuss the implementation of the QEP, as well as results from various assessments of undergraduate research and public service initiatives.
BACKGROUND: In the Honor System’s 170th year at the University, the System still serves the vital role of cultivating a Community of Trust and setting high expectations of all students regarding personal and academic integrity. Over the course of nearly two centuries, the Honor System has always sought to continuously improve and evolve to ensure its strength within the University community. Efforts in recent years have been focused upon the similar goal of striving to make sure this System continues to function well within an ever-changing University landscape.

Although several important initiatives have been launched in the last few years, the 2012-13 Honor Committee believes that more work needs to be done to connect the student body with its Honor System. As such, the Committee’s top priority for the beginning of its term has been to engage with students and faculty in a substantial manner. The Committee’s goal has been not only to do more to connect students to their Honor System, but also to better understand how students act and interact within this Community of Trust, what opinions they have of the System, and what weaknesses they believe need to be addressed.

The Committee has taken a targeted approach within each school to find the most effective mechanisms to connect with the interests and needs of the different school populations. The Committee has sought to do this through a combination of regular weekly events as well as periodic larger events. For instance, these larger events began with a roundtable discussion with University leaders including President Sullivan in Old Cabell Hall and have also included a debate on the single sanction in the chapel between the Jefferson and Washington debating societies, an educational event during Homecoming weekend, as well as events co-hosted with the National Pan-Hellenic Council and the Student Hip Hop Organization. Additionally, these
larger events have been combined with the Committee’s weekly
efforts that include conversations by each representative with a
faculty member and student discussions in Pavilions on the Lawn
each week. Moreover, the Committee has paired this engagement
campaign with an overall effort to make Honor more accessible to
students both as a system and a concept through the use of a new
website, final and midterm examinations, education, and outreach
events, improved educational materials, a University-wide Honor
educational module, social media, and enhanced orientation
efforts.

DISCUSSION: After working for two months on this engagement
campaign, Committee representatives believe that we now have a
more nuanced and complete understanding of the student and
faculty experience within the Honor System. Each initiative has
served to better inform the Committee about the scope and nature
of the problems confronting the Honor System.

Stephen Nash is one of five elected Honor Committee
representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences and serves
as the chair of the Committee for the 2012-13 term. He is a
fourth-year Echols scholar pursuing an Interdisciplinary Major
entitled “Religion and the American State.” Mr. Nash is a
Jefferson Scholar and is from Port Washington, New York.

Mr. Nash will present on the Committee’s findings of the
current state of the Honor System. His report will include a
summary of the Committee’s efforts to date, as well as a review
of a recent University-wide student survey that illustrates some
of the important challenges facing the System. The 2012 Honor
Survey was developed in consultation with the Office of
Institutional Assessment and Studies (IAS) at the University of
Virginia and solely administered and analyzed by IAS. The
survey was sent to 5,000 students, including students within
every school at the University. The response rate was roughly
34%, with slightly over 1,700 respondents. This sample size is
nearly twice as large as the survey conducted in 2008 which
garnered approximately 900 responses.

The engagement efforts described earlier reveal that, while
many think that Honor has an important and unique role at the
University, there exist serious reservations about the current
functionality of the System. Many students and faculty are
unwilling to report cases to the Honor Committee and are often
dissatisfied with the complexity of the System. Furthermore,
the expected wave of faculty retirements will inevitably lead to
a change in the landscape across the University with regard to
perception of the Honor System. It is thus even more important that both existing and new faculty have confidence in the Honor System. As such, serious attention needs to be given to fundamentally improving the functionality of the System.

The Committee is interested to hear the Board's perspective on the following question: What is the best long-term approach to confront the issues facing the Honor System that will ensure that it remains a functioning component of University life?
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BOARD MEETING: November 9, 2012

COMMITTEE: Joint Educational Policy and Student Affairs and Athletics Committees

AGENDA ITEM: IV. Report on Atlantic Coast Conference Expansion

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: In September 2011, the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) expanded with the addition of the University of Pittsburgh and Syracuse University. Both institutions will be full ACC members in the 2013-14 academic year. On September 12, 2012, the ACC announced that the University of Notre Dame will become a member of the Conference in all sports except in football, where they are committed to playing five games a year against ACC competition. The date of Notre Dame's entry into the Conference is not determined at this time.

DISCUSSION: The inclusion of these three institutions broadens the scope and breadth of Atlantic Coast Conference sports offerings. Director of Athletics, Craig Littlepage, will discuss some of the potential implications of ACC expansion in terms of the experience on University of Virginia student-athletes.
Components of the Fifth-Year Interim Report

Core Requirement 2.8 - The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs.

Core Requirement 2.10 - The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that are intended to promote student learning and enhance the development of its students.

Comprehensive Standard 3.2.8 - The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution.

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1 - 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 the following area: educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.

Comprehensive Standard 3.4.3 - The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its mission.

Comprehensive Standard 3.4.11 - For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration.

Comprehensive Standard 3.10.2 - The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations.

Comprehensive Standard 3.11.3 - The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution’s educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities.

Comprehensive Standard 3.13 – The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges.

3.13.1 – Accreditating Decisions of Other Agencies: Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

3.13.3 – Complaint Procedures against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions: In addition to FR 4.5 whereby each institution is required to have in place student complaint policies and procedures that are reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized, the Commission also requires, in accord with federal regulations, that each institution maintains a record of
complaints received by the institution. This record is made available to the Commission upon request.

3.13.4 – Distance Education: An institution includes a review of its distance learning programs in the Compliance Certification

Federal Requirement 4.1 - The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals.

Federal Requirement 4.2 - The institution’s curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded.

Federal Requirement 4.3 - The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies.

Federal Requirement 4.4 - Program length is appropriate for each of the institution’s educational programs.

Federal Requirement 4.5 - The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints.

Federal Requirement 4.6 - Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution’s practices and policies.

Federal Requirement 4.7 - The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act, as amended.

Federal Requirement 4.8 - An institution that offers distance or correspondence education documents each of the following:

4.8.1 - Demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (a) a secure login and pass code, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

4.8.2 - Has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.

4.8.3 - Has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity.
Federal Requirement 4.9 - The institution has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education and to Commission policy. (See Commission policy “Credit Hours.”).

QEP Impact Report – The institution provides the following information with regard to the QEP: (1) the title and a brief description of the institution’s QEP as initially presented, (2) a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP, (3) a discussion of changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes, and (4) a description of the QEP’s direct impact on student learning, including the achievement of goals and outcomes as outlined in item three above, and unanticipated outcomes of the QEP, if any."
ATTACHMENT

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

University of Virginia

In 2007, the University submitted its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), entitled “Enhancing Student-Faculty Engagement,” to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Recognizing that meaningful interactions between students and faculty members are at the core of the learning experience, the University identified two fundamental objectives to advance new opportunities for student-faculty engagement: (1) making research a fundamental part of the student experience, and (2) incorporating thoughtful public service into the curriculum.

The QEP brought together ideas and goals that had emerged from several University planning processes, including the Ten-Year Academic Plan under development at the time of the QEP’s submission. Priorities and resources that emerged from the Commission on the Future of the University (COFU) supported implementation of the QEP’s two fundamental initiatives on undergraduate research and public service.

Fundamental Objectives

To achieve the first fundamental objective, making research a fundamental part of the student experience, the University focused on increasing opportunities for student-faculty research. Initiatives that contributed to the achievement of this objective include the strengthening, initiation, or reinvigoration of multiple undergraduate research grants, such as the Harrison Undergraduate Research Awards, Community-Based Undergraduate Research Grants, University Awards for Projects in the Arts, and the Double Hoo Research Grants, among others. In addition, multiple avenues for students to publish their research emerged over the duration of the QEP, including Oculus, Wilson Journal of International Affairs, Spectra, Academical Heritage Review, Virginia Policy Review, and Public.

To achieve the second fundamental objective, incorporating thoughtful public service into the curriculum, the University focused on the development of a pan-University program connecting civic engagement with academic learning, increasing service-oriented course offerings, expanding internship/capstone service opportunities, and developing guidelines and review criteria for capstone projects. Initiatives that contributed to the achievement of this objective include the launch of the Jefferson Public Citizens (JPC) Program, the development of JPC Common Courses and Academic Community Engagement (ACE) courses, the initiation of Community-Based Research Grants, and the development of rubrics for evaluating JPC student project proposals, papers, and presentations.

Supporting Initiatives

The University also proposed five supporting initiatives in support of the overall goal of enhancing student-faculty engagement. The first supporting initiative, offering more small classes, was achieved as evidenced by the growth of small classes (less than 20 students) in proportion to total course offerings – from 52.7 percent to 56.3 percent. The second supporting initiative, formalizing and expanding faculty-student lunch and dinner programs, was achieved as evidenced by the reach of such
programs – from fewer than 300 events reaching 6,000 students to almost 450 events reaching 7,800 students.

The third supporting initiative, fostering engagement through academic advising, was achieved as evidenced by the growth of College Advising Seminars (COLAs) – from 10 course sections reaching approximately 170 students to 46 course sections reaching 785 students. The fourth supporting initiative, expanding the services of the Center for Undergraduate Excellence (CUE), was achieved as evidenced by the recruitment of a permanent director, assistant director, and fiscal administrator; the growth in programming designed to advise students on opportunities; and the initiation of new undergraduate research grants. The fifth supporting initiative, developing and improving mechanisms to communicate opportunities, was achieved as evidenced by the development of multiple communication outlets, such as the “Learning in Action—From Classroom to Communities” Web site; the redesign of the CUE Web site, including a database of research grants and summer opportunities; and the growth of programming designed to inform students about such opportunities.

Assessment

Over the course of the QEP, the University employed multiple instruments and approaches to understand and assess student participation and confidence in undergraduate research and/or academic public service and to assess individual programs, such as the Jefferson Public Citizens Program. Examples of assessment initiatives include:

- Alumni surveys
- First- and Fourth-Year Survey
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Student Engagement in the Research University (SERU)
- Research Self-Efficacy Scale (RSES)
- Learning Environment Preferences Scale (LEP)
- Measure of Intellectual Development (MID)
- Core competency assessment of undergraduate research
- Structured interviews with fourth-year students
- Youth-Nex assessment of the Jefferson Public Citizens Program

Fifth-Year Interim Report

The University will submit a QEP Impact Report as part of its Fifth-Year Interim Report to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The University’s submission is due March 25, 2013. In the report, the University must address each of the following: (1) a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP, (2) a discussion of changes made to the QEP and the reasons from making those changes; (3) a description of the QEP’s impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning (to include the achievement of identified goals and outcomes, and any unanticipated outcomes); and (4) a reflection on what the institution has learned as a result of the QEP experience.