MEMORANDUM

TO: The Educational Policy Committee:

Stephen P. Long, M.D., Chair
Frank B. Atkinson
A. Macdonald Caputo
Hunter E. Craig
Allison Cryor DiNardo
William H. Goodwin Jr.
George Keith Martin
Linwood H. Rose
Hillary A. Hurd
Helen E. Dragas, Ex Officio
Robert S. Kemp, Consulting Member

and

The Remaining Members and Senior Advisor to the Board:

The Hon. Alan A. Diamonstein
Marvin W. Gilliam Jr.
Victoria D. Harker
Bobbie G. Kilberg
Vincent J. Mastracco Jr.

Edward D. Miller, M.D.
John L. Nau III
Timothy B. Robertson
Leonard W. Sandridge Jr.

FROM: Susan G. Harris

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Educational Policy Committee on February 22, 2013

The Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia met, in Open Session, at 2:20 p.m., on Friday, February 22, 2013, in the Auditorium of the Harrison Institute/Small Special Collections Library; Stephen P. Long, M.D., Educational Policy Committee Chair, presided.

Also present were the Honorable Alan A. Diamonstein, Marvin W. Gilliam Jr., Edward D. Miller, M.D., John L. Nau III, and Timothy B. Robertson.

Mr. Robert S. Kemp, the Consulting Member, was also present.

Present as well were Ms. Teresa A. Sullivan, John D. Simon, Patrick D. Hogan, Ms. Susan G. Harris, Paul J. Forch, Ms. Susan A. Carkeek, Steven T. DeKosky, M.D., Ms. Donna Price Henry, James L. Hilton, Ms. Colette Sheehy, Thomas C. Skalak, Ms. Nancy A. Rivers, Anthony P. de Bruyn, McGregor McCance, and Ms. Debra D. Rinker.

Mr. George Cohen, Ms. Josipa Roksa, and Ms. Marva A. Barnett were also in attendance as presenters.

Dr. Long began the meeting by welcoming Mr. Rose as the vice chair of the committee. He also spoke highly of the dinner the evening before with the faculty authors who had won awards for their books, and he mentioned how the topic at the table tied into our BOV meetings - what will the University look like in 10 years, will it be the same University that we know or will it be better? The collective view was that we have many challenges we are facing right now, but we also have some exciting opportunities.

Dr. Long congratulated Dean Robert Pianta, who was named the 19th-most influential university-based scholar in the 2013 RHSU Edu-Scholar Public Presence Rankings, published by Education Week. He named eight other University faculty members who were ranked: Carol Tomlinson, David Breneman, Sarah Turner, Michelle Young, James Wyckoff, Daphna Bassok, James Ryan, and Daniel Willingham. Dr. Long also mentioned that 189 of our medical faculty were named Top Doctors in the United States for 2013 - a lot of exciting things going on and the University is maintaining a great presence.

Action Item: Establishment of the Richard Lyman Bushman Professorship of Mormon Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences

The President stated this professorship was sponsored by two anonymous lead donors and others who gave in response to efforts by Religious Studies professor Kevin Hart. The professorship is named in honor of Richard Lyman Bushman, who is considered one of the most important scholars of American religious history of the last half-century.

On motion, the committee approved the following resolution and recommended it for approval by the full Board:
APPROVAL TO ESTABLISH THE RICHARD LYMAN BUSHMAN PROFESSORSHIP IN MORMON STUDIES

WHEREAS, anonymous donors, affiliated with the University and Charlottesville, provided funds to establish the Richard Lyman Bushman Professorship in Mormon Studies, with the purpose of advancing the scholarly understanding of Mormonism at the University of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, Richard Lyman Bushman is the Gouverneur Morris Professor of History Emeritus at Columbia University, and previously the Howard W. Hunter Visiting Professor of Mormon Studies at Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, California, one of the first Mormon studies programs in the country; he is considered one of the most important scholars of American religious history in the last half-century;

RESOLVED, the Board of Visitors establishes the Richard Lyman Bushman Professorship in Mormon Studies in the Department of Religious Studies; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, the Board thanks the donors for their generosity in creating and funding the professorship and congratulates Richard Lyman Bushman for his noteworthy contributions to the study of American religions, particularly Mormonism.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Action Item: New Degree Program: Bachelor of Science in Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences

Provost Simon proposed a new degree program, a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Psychology, to be offered by the College of Arts and Sciences. The College, through the Department of Psychology, currently offers a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Psychology.

The purpose of the new degree program is to promote a STEM-oriented curriculum by (1) encouraging select psychology majors to take upper-level STEM courses, and (2) engaging students in psychological research through more than 65 undergraduate research opportunities. The curriculum has been designed to meet the rigor associated with other B.S. programs at the University.

Provost Simon said the program is designed to attract students interested in a pre-medical curriculum, a STEM-oriented psychology curriculum, and/or pursuing graduate study in psychology. Because the Department of Psychology anticipates that primary demand will be among students already intending to major in psychology, it anticipates no significant impact on faculty workload or course demand. The degree program has been approved by the Committee on Educational Policy and Curriculum (CEPC), the Faculty Senate, and the president. All degree programs must be approved by the Board of Visitors before they can be
forwarded to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) for review and approval.

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

APPROVAL OF NEW DEGREE PROGRAM: BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PSYCHOLOGY

RESOLVED, subject to approval by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, the Bachelor of Science in Psychology is established in the College of Arts and 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:

At the outset, I want to acknowledge yesterday's action by the Board in support of President Sullivan's proposal on faculty salaries. This is a terrific step and we take this opportunity to thank you for your demonstrated commitment to recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty and to maintaining the University of Virginia in the top ranks of institutions of higher education.

Last November, I told you about the Faculty Senate's involvement in the ongoing strategic planning process. I will return to that topic today because the success of this effort is crucial to the future of our University.

The Board's Strategic Planning Committee reported this morning that, drawing on numerous comments and suggestions from a wide range of University constituents through a variety of channels, each of the seven working groups comprising the strategic planning effort has identified several key ideas for further consideration and refinement. In support of this next stage of the strategic planning process, the Faculty Senate is dedicating our annual town-hall-style working meeting on March 4 to a discussion of these ideas and how they might fit into a broader vision for the University. We have invited representatives from each working group to participate and we anticipate a full and frank dialogue with faculty senators and other guests.

A second way we are supporting the strategic planning effort is through dissemination and analysis of the data we collected in our Faculty Senate survey. The survey was done in conjunction with the University of Virginia's Center for
Survey Research. Faculty took the survey in the spring of 2012 and responses were completed last May.

In this brief report, I cannot discuss the results of the survey in detail. Nevertheless, I would like to present a few highlights. I invite you to peruse the full report on the Faculty Senate website, http://www.virginia.edu/facultysenate/survey.html. About 82% of faculty expressed both overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work and overall satisfaction with collegiality at the University. A similar strong majority (81%) were satisfied with the benefits the University provides. Compared to the results of the previous Faculty Senate survey in 2007, there were several areas marked by statistically significant trends toward improvement.

Of particular interest may be the survey’s “time-use” component, which is the first attempt ever at the University of Virginia to measure how faculty use our time. Tenured professors and professors on the tenure track report working an average of 61 hours per week. That same average of 61 hours per week was also reported by full professors. As for division of time, faculty members reported spending on average 33% of their time on teaching, 31% on research, 22% on administration, and 13% on service activities.

The survey also revealed key areas in which the faculty expressed a desire for improvement. In particular faculty expressed concerns over communication and transparency, which echoed the 2007 survey, and pay, which showed up more prominently in this survey, and which you have now taken an important step to address.

Finally, most crucial to the success of the strategic plan is the willingness of faculty to step up to leadership roles and bring our many areas of expertise to the table. I want to describe briefly an important program that the University already has in place for fostering necessary leadership skills for faculty, a program from which the strategic plan can draw and on which it can build.

The program is called Leadership in Academic Matters (LAM), and is sponsored by the Provost’s Office. LAM is dedicated to the proposition that leadership skills in higher education can be taught and that the study of this subject is worthy of the time and commitment of the members of our community. LAM began as an initiative in the School of Medicine in 2004 under the leadership of Dr. Sharon Hostler. In 2009, the LAM program was extended to faculty and administrators from across Grounds. The program is offered once each semester and meets on Monday mornings at Morven.
Session leaders include a number of UVA faculty and administrators as well as guest presenters.

To date, approximately 450 people have completed LAM, and its graduates include many department chairs and upper level administrators, as well as past Faculty Senate chair Gweneth West, our chair-elect, Chris Holstege, and me. Typically, each class or "cohort" has about 30 people, including half from the Health System and half from other schools and administrative areas. My cohort last fall included, among others, surgeons, pediatricians, and faculty from Politics, Religious Studies, Architecture, Curry, and Biomedical Engineering.

Our session subjects ranged from understanding generational differences, to building effective teams, to leveraging difference (led by new Board consulting member Martin Davidson), to handling media interviews, to grappling with University finances, to honing negotiation skills, to holding difficult conversations. We took the Meyers-Briggs test, subjected ourselves to 360 degree evaluations, kept journals, and practiced mindfulness techniques. We learned a great deal about leadership, about ourselves, about our colleagues, and about our wonderful University. And we had fun. The group was engaged and energized, and emerged from the program full of hope in the possibility of change. This spring, another 30 faculty members and administrators will complete LAM ready and willing to step into leadership challenges throughout the University.

With constructive and collaborative dialogue, helpful data, and the expertise, commitment, and wisdom of faculty and administrative leaders, I am confident that we will develop a successful strategic plan that the faculty and the entire University community will embrace enthusiastically.

Critical Thinking Report

Ms. Josipa Roksa led a discussion on U.Va.'s efforts to assess critical thinking among undergraduates. She built on her previous presentations to the Educational Policy Committee, raising questions about the definition of critical thinking and how it might be measured.

Ms. Roksa spoke about the Critical Thinking Assessment Test also known as CAT. The CAT Instrument is a unique tool designed to assess and promote the improvement of critical thinking and real-world problem solving skills. Development of the instrument is supported by The National Science Foundation. She said it is used by a number of our peer institutions.
Ms. Roksa said the CAT team which used data from all institutions predicted an expected CAT score given the average SAT/ACT scores of incoming students. They predicted a score for UVA of 24.56. Our actual score was close to 26; we performed as expected based on our SAT/ACT scores. Another way to try to make sense of the results was to look at benchmarks. Ms. Roska said the faculty have a set of expectations for performance. The level of performance based on these expectations were 25% highly competent, 75% competent, and 90% minimally competent. The actual levels of performance were 25% highly competent, 89% competent, and 99% minimally competent. UVA either meets or exceeds the expected levels of performance.

Since receiving the results, the University has held a workshop conducted by Linda Nilson on critical thinking. The University has created a Course Design Institute (CDI) which includes discussion and breakout sessions on critical thinking. Looking to the future, Ms. Roksa said part of the tasks were to not just assess our students but to also assess the instrument used to come up with the results. After the first use of the tool, faculty members have shared some ideas and concerns they have with CAT. A committee was formed to consider how we measure critical thinking; should we explore discipline-specific approaches? Ms. Roksa said including longitudinal design would compare freshmen to seniors. She said we have that data because some of our freshmen also took the test and we will be able to compare those scores to their scores as seniors.

Ms. Roksa said the results of the assessment were released to the Committee on Educational Policy and Curriculum in the College of Arts & Sciences (CEPC), and to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the School of Engineering (UCC); they are currently reviewing them and developing recommendations.

Hybrid Challenge Grants and Outcomes Report

Ms. Marva A. Barnett, a Professor of French and Founding Director of the Teaching Resource Center (TRC) gave a report on the Fall 2012 Challenge for Newly Hybrid Technology-Enhanced Courses. In July 2012, the Faculty Senate and the TRC invited faculty to experiment with ways to increase student learning. President Sullivan initiated and funded this grant program, which supported select faculty as they transformed 15 existing courses. Both while teaching and after the courses, faculty conducted outcomes assessment studies; they have already disseminated some of their findings. The TRC is in the process of conducting an overall assessment of what they have learned from the Hybrid Challenge.

This was a pilot project from which they learned a great deal, which lessons they will implement as they continue with the 2013-14 Challenge for Hybrid Courses for Engaged Learning.
Dr. Barnett said hybrid courses promote significant student learning by combining in-person classroom experiences with useful technologies. In hybrid courses, students tend to learn more than through traditional lecture courses for several reasons:

- Technological tools enable students to learn basic information outside of class.
- In class, students actively apply what they learned; they generate new ideas, solve problems, think creatively, and interact through hands-on activities.
- The teacher can then coach them and teach in response to their questions and misunderstandings.

The face-to-face interactions include discussions, group work, and live mini-lectures. The web-based or digital technologies are often online course materials and assignments, wikis, blogs, and screen-cast lectures.

She said when the entire course structure encourages students to learn outside of class material that they then use in class to deepen their learning, they are then called “flipped courses” or “flipped classrooms.” These courses are built on concepts such as learning-centered course design, active learning, and technology-enhanced learning.

Ms. Barnett said last July our University faculty responded impressively to the Hybrid Challenge. The selection committee received 41 proposals from 49 faculty in 8 different schools (Architecture, Arts & Sciences, Batten, Curry, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Nursing). Interested faculty came from all ranks, from lecturers to chaired professors. Full and chaired professors submitted over 40% of the proposals (18), and assistant professors submitted a quarter of them.

She said the proposals were so strong that the selection committee and President Sullivan decided to fund nine newly hybrid courses rather than the five originally envisioned. Faculty used their $10,000 grants to support their courses in various ways, including honoraria to teaching assistants for additional work; course equipment and software; and summer stipends to support their intensive, thorough course redesign work. Ms. Barnett said President Sullivan also agreed with the committee to offer a second competition; mini-grants of $1,000 each were awarded to faculty to implement key changes in five hybrid courses.

Ms. Barnett said the breadth of proposals and the faculty involved demonstrate that interest in, and skill with, instructional technologies are spreading widely among our faculty.

With regard to learning assessments, the individual nature of course learning goals, academic disciplines, learning activities, and
assessment instruments, meant that Hybrid Challenge faculty designed varying types of learning assessments. Several teachers consulted with staff at the UVa Center for the Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (CASTL-HE).

Faculty also measured student learning through tests, cases, learning portfolios, papers, speaking exams (in the case of Spanish), blog posts, and other coursework. In some cases, online learning tools enabled the teacher to track and analyze how much students used these learning aids. She said in nearly all these experimental courses, students perceived that they had learned a great deal.

Ms. Barnett said perhaps the most detailed learning-assessment data came from Biology professor Claire Cronmiller. During the past three years, students in her nearly 400-student lecture course have completed the Genetics Concept Assessment (GCA) at the beginning and end of the semester. The GCA is a published, validated assessment test that is used to distinguish between concepts that are well or poorly learned. Professor Cronmiller has four years of comparative data about her students’ learning in BIOL 3010 and has compared her students’ average percent improvement on the GCA. The increase in student scores shows a statistically significantly greater improvement in 2012 as compared to 2009 and 2010. Fall 2011 was an intermediate stage in which she began to incorporate some of the active learning that she used more extensively this past fall.

Ms. Barnett said at the Teaching Resource Center, they continue to gather and analyze data about the successes and challenges of this experiment, from the perspective of all involved. Studies include group debrief meetings and individual interviews with faculty, focus groups with students to probe their perceptions, and analysis of student-evaluation data.

Ms. Barnett spoke briefly on dissemination. She said Hybrid Challenge faculty will teach their hybrid courses at least once more during the next two years. They are deeply involved in rethinking their courses based on their experiences, student feedback, and studies of students’ learning. They are also incorporating hybrid changes into other courses. They have volunteered to consult with other faculty interested in hybrid course design. They are sharing their syllabi with colleagues through the TRC’s website.

She said faculty are disseminating their findings to larger groups in many venues. For example, several shared their experiences and some learning-assessment data at the TRC’s January Teaching Workshop. Some will present at professional conferences and submit articles to journals. They will also offer training workshops for graduate teaching assistants and discuss hybrid courses with colleagues at 4-VA meetings and in departmental faculty meetings.
On motion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

SGH:dr
These minutes have been posted to the University of Virginia’s Board of Visitors website.
http://www.virginia.edu/bov/educationalminutes.html