MEMORANDUM

TO:  The Educational Policy Committee:

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

and

The Student Affairs and Athletics Committee:

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

and

The Remaining Members and Senior Advisors of the Board:

The Hon. Alan A. Diamonstein  Edward D. Miller, M.D.
Victoria D. Harker  John L. Nau III
Leonard W. Sandridge Jr.

FROM:  Susan G. Harris

SUBJECT:  Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Educational Policy Committee and the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee on November 9, 2012
Establishment of a Professorship

Dr. Long introduced President Sullivan to discuss the establishment of a professorship in Biology at The University of Virginia’s College at Wise. Ms. Sullivan described the connection of John Chalkley Buchanan, M.D., with the University and his strong support of The University of Virginia’s College at Wise. His wife, Carol Phipps Buchanan, passed away in 2011, making provisions in her will for the creation of a professorship at the College at Wise in honor of her late husband.

On motion, the committee approved the following resolution and recommended it for approval by the full Board:

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.

---

Faculty Senate Report

Dr. Long introduced Mr. George Cohen, Chair of the Faculty Senate, for his report. Mr. Cohen’s statement is reproduced verbatim:

I would like to take this opportunity to update you on recent activities of the Faculty Senate. Before doing so, I want to say a few words about the meeting yesterday. First, Mr. Nau mentioned that Bobbie Kilberg has a son at the Law School. What he did not mention is that her son, Andrew, is in my Professional Responsibility class. In fact, I just saw him this morning for a discussion of lawyer involvement in securities fraud. Andrew is an excellent student and one of the top participants in my class. Bobbie, you should be very proud. Second, I wanted to add my voice of praise to the work being done by Madison House that you heard about yesterday. I know about this work first-hand because
my daughter, Emma, is a second year in the College and a proud volunteer through Madison House at one of our local schools.

In addition, before updating you about Senate activities, I want to acknowledge and appreciate the Board’s action today in approving consulting faculty members on the Board’s standing committees. As the Rector said yesterday, this is a welcome and meaningful first step toward improving the operation of the Board and the University, increasing engagement between the Board and the faculty, and implementing the concept of shared governance.

I would also like to extend a welcome to our new chief operating officer, Pat Hogan, who as you heard yesterday, met with the Senate this week. We are impressed with Pat’s experience, as well as his commitment to transparency and constructive engagement with faculty, and we very much look forward to working with him as he guides us through the new financial model and other challenges. The Faculty Senate has participated fully in the task forces working to develop the new financial model and we have established a new Finance Committee, which we hope will work with Pat both to help educate faculty about financial matters concerning the University and to offer helpful input into the budgetary process and ongoing evaluation of the new financial model.

I would also like to offer thanks to President Sullivan and the Board for the ambitious plan to improve faculty salaries that was discussed yesterday. Provost Simon updated the Faculty Senate about the plan at our meeting this week and received an enthusiastic response. All of us recognize the importance of competitive salaries for the recruitment and retention of top faculty necessary to keep the University of Virginia in the top ranks of higher education.

Of course, salaries are only one component of faculty well-being. At the next meeting of the Board, we will be formally presenting the results of the faculty survey that the Faculty Senate, in collaboration with UVA’s Center for Survey Research, developed and administered last spring. The survey will provide invaluable data that will help us respond strategically to the recruitment and retention challenges we face over the next five to ten years. In addition, the survey for the first time includes a time-use component, which will help us understand better the many ways that faculty spend our time. The members of our Faculty Recruitment, Retention, Retirement, & Welfare Committee, ably led by Chair Joe Garofalo of the Curry School and past Chair Chris Holstege of the School of Medicine, have put in many hours to make the survey a success, most recently by collating thousands of open-ended written comments from faculty.
One of our most important and active committees is our Academic Affairs Committee, this year headed by Michael Puri of the Music Department in the College. The only Senate committee required to have representation from all of the schools, Academic Affairs must approve all new degree programs. Just this week, the full Senate at its meeting approved a new B.S. degree in Psychology forwarded from the Academic Affairs committee. The Academic Affairs committee also met separately this week to consider several new degree proposals. Recently, the jurisdiction of the Academic Affairs Committee has been expanded, with the encouragement and approval of Provost Simon, to include approval of any curricular or academic programs whose designation appears on a transcript, such as a new Ph.D. concentration within a particular department or school. Along with this expanded jurisdiction comes an expanded workload, and we may need to add senators and other faculty to this committee in the near future. But as Provost Simon mentioned yesterday in connection with the new financial model, although we want to create incentives for new programs to be created, we must be careful not to compromise quality. The Academic Affairs Committee is the faculty gatekeeper charged with ensuring high quality academic curriculum and programming.

I want to say a word about Faculty Senate involvement in the strategic planning effort. I am representing the Senate on the steering committee. In addition, we have our own Planning Committee made up of three subcommittees: Science & Engineering, Global, and Cross-Grounds Synergies. One of the co-chairs of the Cross-Grounds Synergies Subcommittee, Mike Weber, who directs the Cancer Center, is also on the Synergies working group. We hope to be able to coordinate the efforts of our subcommittee with the efforts of the working group. I also hope the other two subcommittees, formed during our previous university planning effort, will be able to make useful contributions to the current planning effort even though these subcommittees do not match up directly with any of the working groups.

Lastly, one of the Faculty Senate’s goals this year is to improve our communications and engagement, not only within the senate and the university but also outside the University. For example, we formed an Electronic Communications task force over the summer, which among other things created a Facebook page for the Senate. In addition, we are considering the development of a faculty senate listserve to facilitate communications with other faculty senates at peer institutions across the country. Finally, we have formed a new committee on Collaboration, Communication and Engagement, headed by past Senate chair Gweneth West, who brings her boundless energy and enthusiasm. Gweneth and I have begun meeting with representatives from staff groups from
across grounds as well as the General Faculty Council, Hillary Hurd, and the Honor Council. We have called our effort "One UVA" and we hope to improve communication and representation throughout the University, including the Board.

I hope I have given you a good sense of the range of activities in which the Senate is involved. We are as engaged as I have seen in my 20 years at the University. We are working hard to move the University forward in a determined, innovative, and collaborative way. We look forward to working with the Board to achieve the University's goals.

Assessment of Degree Programs

Dr. Long introduced Ms. Josipa Roksa, Associate Professor of Sociology and Education and the Associate Director of the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Ms. Roksa said it is important to understand what accreditation agencies are focused on assessing: degree programs. They want to answer the question of the knowledge and skills students should possess at the end of their program of study. There are different views of essential learning outcomes. From the State Council of Higher Education view, quantitative reasoning, writing, scientific reasoning, critical thinking, oral communication, and undergraduate research should be assessed. From the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) view, student learning outcomes should be assessed at the program level by faculty committees. From an employer's viewpoint, oral communication, teamwork, work ethic, critical thinking or problem solving, and written communication skills are very important.

Ms. Roksa said there are two methods for assessing learning outcomes. The indirect method is the students' perceptions of their learning, which is used by the National Survey of Student Engagement. This method is not acceptable to SACS. The second method is a direct method, where students demonstrate learning via some form of standardized test. SACS uses Program Learning Outcomes, where rubrics are used to independently assess final exams or papers. Examples of direct measures of assessing critical thinking are:

- **CLA** - College Learning Assessment - a 1.5 hour test using performance task scoring criteria to measure analytic reasoning, writing mechanics and effectiveness, and problem solving skills using "real-word" scenarios, a library of documents, and an essay.
- **CAT** - Critical Thinking Assessment Test - used by the National Science Foundation - is a one hour, short answer, faculty scored test to measure evaluation, synthesis,
analysis, application, and comprehension skills in knowledge and retention.

- CAAP – Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency
- PP – Proficiency Profile

Ms. Roksa said there is a lot of variation among students within each school, and all schools have some students who do very well and some who do poorly. Improving student outcomes requires feedback. It is crucial to connect student experiences with learning outcomes. There are institutional and program level assessments. In researching her book *Academically Adrift*, she found that 23 percent of CLA growth between 2005 and 2009 occurs across institutions. She commented briefly on CLA scores relative to faculty expectations, reading and writing requirements, student study time, and college majors. She recommended several ways to improve student learning outcomes:

- Promote organizational cultures emphasizing student learning;
- Support assessment endeavors and build necessary infrastructure;
- Work collaboratively on developing feedback loops to improve student learning; and
- Align student support services with the goal of promoting student academic performance.

Regional Accreditation and the Fifth-Year Interim Report

Dr. Long thanked Ms. Roksa for her report and called on Mr. Simon, Executive Vice President and Provost, to provide an overview of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Fifth-Year Interim Report. Mr. Simon gave some background on SACS: Founded in 1895, it is headquartered in Atlanta, and is the regional accreditor for 11 southern states, with more than 800 member institutions. Accreditation is important for both reputation and resources; federal grants are based on accreditation.

Mr. Simon explained that the University submitted its decennial compliance certification in 2006, with its accreditation reaffirmed in 2007. The U.S. Department of Education requires accrediting bodies to consistently monitor institutions to ensure compliance, therefore, SACS initiated the Fifth-Year Interim Report in 2006, which includes 20 standards and a Quality Enhancement Plan Impact Report. The report for UVA is due March 25, 2013. Mr. Simon itemized several of the components of the Fifth-Year Interim Report, stressing that assessment of student learning is a significant component. He listed several things the University requires academic programs to document to assess student learning and institutional effectiveness and showed charts of areas with the largest failure rates.
Mr. Simon introduced Mr. J. Milton Adams, Senior Vice Provost, to report on the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Mr. Adams began with ways to enhance student-faculty engagement. There are two primary objectives for the QEP: making research a fundamental part of the student experience, and incorporating thoughtful public service into the curriculum. By increasing the opportunities for student-faculty research you build research skills, engage your passion, and help students understand how we know something by asking questions, gathering data, and analyzing data. He gave two examples of student teams: one team won an award for developing a new test for whooping cough that will give results within 24 hours, and the other team, studying astronomy and chemistry, discovered a new molecule that is a fundamental building block in biology.

Mr. Adams said the University is incorporating public service into the curriculum in several ways. Many students participate in extra-curricular activities that serve the community. The Provost's Office is trying to build more courses that include a public service opportunity where they can incorporate what they have learned in the classroom; these are called Academic Community Engagement courses. 89 new courses were created in a Jefferson Public Citizen Program. Students from the Jefferson Public Citizen Program engaged in team projects. Teams of four to five students and a faculty advisor propose a service and research project, compete for funding, engage locally or globally, execute the project, and write a paper and present the results to their peers and faculty members.

Mr. Adams described several supporting initiatives to improve student-faculty engagement: increased small classes (less than 20 students) by 243 courses from 2007 to last year, expanded College advising seminars from 10 to 46 sections this year, increased the student-faculty meal program, created the Center for Undergraduate Excellence to facilitate access to research programs, and marketing and communicating all the initiatives better.

He said they are also assessing how well students are learning from these research opportunities. Faculty members independently scored the research projects and the process using a set of metrics. They also tried to assess how students develop cognitively: are we helping them grow in their intellectual approach to what they are doing? They used two published instruments: Learning Environment Preferences (LEP), and Measure of Intellectual Development (MID), which were administered to second and fourth years. Both showed progress from first year to fourth year, with one showing statistically significant progress. This was done as a pilot study using a small number of students.
Mr. Adams described another survey, the Student Engagement in Research Universities (SERU), to assess how well students engage with faculty members in research universities. Students who were engaged in the Jefferson Public Citizen Program outscored the other students who participated in the survey. They also did an indirect assessment using another student survey. This showed that Jefferson Public Citizen Program students and students who took Academic Community Engagement courses understood their place in the community, valued diversity and teamwork, felt they had increased their leadership abilities, and had better career aspirations. They will report these findings to SACS.

Mr. Nau asked the cost of doing these assessments. Mr. Adams said that several people were hired for the Institutional Research Office and to connect with schools. He estimated $150,000 annually to support assessments. Mr. Simon added that faculty time is a substantial commitment and that accrediting agency standards have increased and proliferated, and there are several professional accrediting agencies. There is also pressure from the Department of Education on the accrediting agencies for quality measures to be in place, to ensure federal funds are spent at institutions that meet expectations.

Mr. Atkinson asked if the selection of research and public service as objectives for our Quality Enhancement Plan was the University’s choice. Mr. Adams said there were planning exercises and an all-University retreat that chose those areas for focus. Mr. Simon added that you tend to build on your own institution’s strengths and identity.

Honor Committee Report

Ms. DiNardo began the Student Affairs and Athletics portion of the meeting by congratulating Ms. Patricia Lampkin, Vice President and Chief Student Affairs Officer, for winning the 63rd Thomas Jefferson Award. This is awarded for excellence in service and is well deserved. Ms. Lampkin introduced Mr. Stephen Nash, the Honor Committee Chair, for a report on activities of the Honor Committee.

Mr. Nash said the committee has made engagement with students and faculty their top priority. Understanding how students and faculty interact with the system will help them address any problems that exist. The committee is taking a three pronged approach to better engagement: accessibility, large-scale events, and consistent outreach. Accessibility has improved through a redesigned website, establishing a Facebook page, and creating a Twitter account to better advertise their events. Educational efforts during April final exams and October midterms were increased and an Honor educational module was made mandatory for all new students. Large-scale events included an Honor roundtable discussion, a debate with the Jefferson and
Washington debating societies regarding single sanction, hosted an educational event at the cookout during Homecoming weekend, and co-hosted events with several other student organizations. Consistent weekly meetings with students and faculty are also ongoing.

Mr. Nash said that the Honor Committee has analyzed the results from last April’s largest University-wide student survey. The survey of 5,000 students had a 34% response rate. In sum, 75% of the students feel positively about the concepts, ideals, and values promoted by the Honor System, feel it is an effective system, believe they benefit from the existence of the system, and are informed about the procedures for investigating and trying Honor offenses. The survey results also showed that the committee’s efforts at education and engagement are effective. Those that said they understood the system and had benefits from the system had attended educational events at twice the rate of those that did not feel they benefited or were informed about the system. This shows the importance of the education and engagement campaign.

Mr. Nash said the survey tried to assess the reporting rate of the community by asking if they would report an Honor offense and if their friends would report an Honor offense. About 40% say they would report an Honor offense, with the majority saying it depends on the person involved and if they were unsure. About 40% also said their friends would report an incident. The results show an important partnership between students and professors because 32% said they would report it through a professor or teaching assistant. Deterrents for not reporting an offense: the offense was not serious enough, there was a personal relationship with the student, or they were uncomfortable with permanent dismissal as the outcome. The committee believes these same deterrents would exist for any system or sanction.

Mr. Nash said about 18% of the respondents say they witnessed or were aware of an honor offense, with 23% saying they were not sure, so it could be as high as 40%. Five percent admitted they had committed an offense.

The defining aspect of the Honor System here has been the single sanction. It is important to continue to evaluate the sentiment of the students regarding single sanction. Almost 60% of undergraduate and graduate students fully support or support with some reservations the single sanction policy. They believe it is an important part of the character of the University’s Honor System.

Mr. Nash continued with one issue they have identified: there is a disconnect between the students’ desired ideal and the procedural reality of the Honor System. While 74% feel positively about the system, 63% feel uneasy about dismissal and it is a deterrent to reporting. While 71% feel the system discourages lying, cheating, and
stealing, 41% have witnessed an offense. While 42% say they would report a suspected offense, only 5% have reported an offense.

He said an important part of the Honor System is the partnership with the faculty. From their perspective, three problems prevent participation with the Honor System: the sanction leaves no opportunity to learn from mistakes, the verdicts from juries do not affect those who commit the offense, and the timeliness. Investigations can get bogged down with many delays.

He summarized that the Honor System serves an important function, is our guiding ethical framework, and is an important part of our foundation and character. Through education and engagement, the Honor Committee is trying to bridge the gap of the ideals and the procedural realities of the system.

Ms. Kilberg asked about the rates of reporting being below 50%, yet the majority indicate they support the system. Mr. Nash said other metrics show the success of the system, such as the feeling of safety and trust. He said they need to work on bridging the gap between the ideal and reality. Ms. Kilberg also asked if the jury was randomly selected, leading to decisions without any training. Mr. Nash said that since 1990 students have been able to select random juries, which has been an issue. The Honor Committee members have had extensive training and are elected by the students. He added that with many new faculty members at the University in the near future, it is important to inform them about the importance and the success of the Honor System.

Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) Expansion

Ms. DiNardo introduced Craig Littlepage, Athletic Director, for a report on ACC expansion. He began with some history for why there is movement between conferences. In the mid '90's the NCAA passed a rule requiring that for a conference to host a championship game there must be 12 member institutions divided into two six-team divisions. Another factor was the demise of the College Football Association in the 1980's, which led to television broadcast rights reverting back to the conferences and the schools. There was also an increased number of cable networks, giving schools more opportunities for television broadcasting of games. Institutions increased pressure on their conference to generate revenue, which created conference championship games. Schools looked at a conference for stability, shared academic values, the best opportunities for sharing revenue, and reputational benefits.

Mr. Littlepage summarized some of the major movements in the last 20 years: Big Ten added Penn State in 1990, SEC added 2 schools in 1991 to have 12 members, and the Big 12 was formed in 1994. The ACC
had 8 members in 1990, and was considered the top basketball conference in the country, along with the most lucrative television contract. They added Florida State in 1991, and Boston College, Miami, and Virginia Tech in 2004 to reach 12 members. A conference championship brings in revenue from television, ticket sales, corporate sponsorship, and other events of up to $8-10 million. The ACC expanded again in 2011 by adding Pittsburgh and Syracuse, and Notre Dame in 2012 for all sports except football.

Mr. Littlepage explained the benefits of expanding the ACC: ACC and member brands are strengthened, enhanced media exposure through ESPN, more platforms for broadcasting, more events and more sports, more national coverage, enhanced levels of competition, and overall revenue enhancement. He said the concerns or cons of ACC expansion mostly revolve around the potential impact on our student athletes’ academics. Although the three new schools added recently are out of our natural geographic area, the competitive seasons have not changed and the number of contests has not increased, so it does not necessarily mean additional missed class time. There could be increased travel time, more weekday competitions, increased travel costs, the loss of some traditional rivals (ACC and non-conference), it expands the time needed for championships, and the path to an ACC championship is much more difficult.

Answering a question, Mr. Littlepage said the coaches make the decision of what non-conference opponents they will play, but the conference decides the ACC schedule.

He said to address the main concern of missed class time, the department will need to do a good job of monitoring the academic performance of our student athletes very closely. They will be prepared to take corrective action where needed. Dr. Long asked what resources the department has to deal with missed class time and if there is a projected cost. Mr. Littlepage said the ACC has a committee that will quantify the costs involved. The department works with the coaches in developing the schedule, they look at travel needs and potential classes missed. There is an excellent academic affairs unit that works daily with students in working out their schedules and monitoring their progress in their classes. At the end of the season the department looks at the impact of the travel needs on GPAs. If there is a negative impact they will determine what can be done.

Mr. Goodwin compared the extensive involvement of the Board of Visitors in the 2004 decision to expand the conference with relatively little Board involvement in the expansion decision in 2011. He asked about more Board involvement in the future. Mr. Littlepage said that in 2004 the process was very public, with the ACC conducting site visits, which created the atmosphere of outside entities trying to influence the decision. Afterwards the ACC changed its policy by giving the conference commissioner more discretion on how to expand.
He conferred with the Council of Presidents and they set up a committee comprised of four CEOs, four athletic directors, and 4 faculty representatives, one from each of the 12 institutions. This committee monitors the intercollegiate landscape on an ongoing basis, looking at potential moves, how to protect the ACC ranks, and they regularly report to the CEOs, who then confer with their Boards. This process helps to keep possible changes out of the media, yet communicates with the institutions’ presidents and Boards. Ms. Sullivan added that the Council of Presidents was given a small window of time after the vote to expand to include Pittsburgh and Syracuse to inform their respective Boards. Mr. Goodwin expressed concern that there should be more Board level review before these decisions are made. It was suggested that because this is an important issue, it could be referred to the Committee on Governance of the Board to determine the appropriate roles of the Board and the President.

On motion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
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