For those of us who have seen many seasons come and go, it is easy to remember the days when the U.S. Post Office was the only option available through which to send letters and packages. AT&T was the only phone company of any size, and the choice of an automobile probably boiled down to your favorite among Ford, GM or Chrysler brands. Local grocery stores offered basics and not much more, and small clothing stores dotted the squares around our nation’s county courthouses.

Over the course of recent decades, the amazing proliferation of product choices in virtually every category from clothing, food, package delivery, phone services, and even universities has given consumers more options for their money. Markets, by and large, are driven by more options offered by more competitors who try their best to distinguish their products or services favorably in the minds of potential customers and rise above the clamor to occupy some space in those customers’ minds. Customers have so many choices; companies pay dearly when they misread tea leaves, and potential customers choose their competitors.

In this tough competitive environment, a company either has to have very low prices or find a way to differentiate itself—be inexpensive or find some way to build value for which customers are willing to pay. As recently reminded by Charlie Brown, Jack Trout, the marketing guru, offers the dictum: “Differentiate or die.” A company (or a university) can’t be
different if it tries to be the same as competitors and cannot be unique if it truly isn’t one of a kind.

So, now to the essential question, “what makes Sullivan University truly different?” In the market for competing college education values, how Sullivan University chooses to distinguish itself and rise above the din may be the fundamental concern over the next couple of years. Some evidence suggests that the differential advantage, at least to some extent, has eroded over the past several years. Some liberal arts colleges are becoming more entrepreneurial and career-focused while public universities are learning to compete as state government financial support declines. Now more than ever, distinctions which once clearly segmented public, liberal arts, and career schools are fading; the waters are muddy now and are just getting muddier as time goes on.

Recently, the Sullivan University System released The Sullivan University System Strategic Plan, which is the most formal statement to date of our System’s approach to address the fundamental question of “what makes Sullivan University truly different.” Divided along the lines of providing Board-directed strategic directions, strategic goals, and recommendations for key initiatives, the SUS Strategic Plan speaks to future directions SUS and Sullivan University are likely to take. These strategic directions are briefly outlined below:

- A Clear Focus: “The vision of SUS is to be the ‘preferred’ regional career university system with leading edge offerings in technology, hospitality, healthcare, business, and graduate studies serving a diverse national and international student population.”

- On Student Success: “Increase student success by: (1) developing admissions procedures that attract students and accurately assess student preparedness; (2) delivering quality instruction through the recruitment, retention, and professional development of an outstanding faculty; and (3) providing superior institutional support that facilitates achievement of educational goals.”

- On Educational Programs: “Build on the success of the System’s unique strengths and high-performing, career-focused educational programs” by continually changing, improving, innovating, and updating SUS programs to ensure career-focused education and career-based relevancy.

- On External Relations: “Proactively engage in the public policy and political arenas related to protecting equality of educational opportunities for all students, defending the integrity of pri-
vate-sector education, and promoting career-oriented education” by managing a set of strong strategies and activities to communicate the SUS story.

- On Educational Program Portfolio Management: “Continue the innovation and development of new initiatives related to fast-growing, high-demand careers” by following “…a systematic strategy for identifying new programs and discontinuing unprofitable and/or unnecessary programs.”

- On Marketing Strategy: “Attract qualified students interested in SUS unique career-focused programs through enhanced marketing strategies” supported by a substantial budget and designed to “target optimal opportunities to increase enrollment and achieve a sustainable competitive advantage.”

- On Educational Value-Added: “Ensure quality, market-relevant, outcomes-based, and career-focused educational values for our students by closely tying curriculum development and evaluation with employers’ workforce needs.” As appropriate, “ensure SUS programs...include comprehensive competencies as determined by industry subject matter experts. This strategic direction entails crafting detailed job profiles which include the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by graduates to perform at the levels required by employers within the following areas: (1) occupational/technical skills; (2) ‘soft skills’ like critical thinking, team work and computational skills; and (3) applicable industry-recognized credentials.”

- On University-Industry Partnerships: “Improve student employment success by organizing and cultivating business and industry partnerships and increasing opportunities for graduates” by building “…a culture and reputation of recognizing SUS as the ‘preferred’ regional career university system.”

- On Fiscal Strength: “Attain financial benchmarks through conservative stewardship of the institution’s resources” and adopt key financial benchmarks for budgeting and control purposes.

The challenge before Sullivan University is nothing short than to transform how we gain, retain, educate, and place students. For gaining students, the challenge is to attract students while accurately assessing student preparedness to perform well in academic programs based on their capabilities, aptitudes, and career goals. For retaining students, the challenge is to develop a more seamless associate-to-bachelor degree progression and to build greater value for students which persuades them to complete their programs of study and possibly even stay to gain additional, complementary competencies. For educating students, the challenge is to double down on
the basic value proposition Sullivan University extends to all students as a “career university.” Meeting this goal may first require revamping existing programs to include industry-recognized credentials and clearly established knowledge, skills, and abilities which will help our students better compete for jobs. For placing students, the challenge is nothing short of assisting graduates to obtain positions lucrative enough to make the cost of a Sullivan University education worth the price tag.

Jack Trout refers to proliferation of choice as a “cruel tyrant” which tends to make commodities out of goods of all types; these goods range as broadly as toothpaste, contact lens types, bottled water brands, TV screen sizes, and even colleges and universities. Building a strong brand—whether that brand be a university or something as mundane as toothpaste—requires doing a few things right. First, understand the context of choices made by potential customers; these choices are made in the context of competitors trying to persuade potential customers by making arguments of their own. Second, find the differentiating idea or a compelling value proposition, the implicit promise made between a company and a customer, and build favorable distinctions. Third, look for ways to create value in as many facets in the educational services we offer as economically as feasible. Quite frankly, it isn’t enough just to say “we’re better” and communicate a message; creating value sometimes takes going back to the drawing board and starting with conceptualizing the service offering within the context of the value proposition. Finally, building a strong brand requires effectively communicating the value proposition to potential customers.

While the SUS Strategic Plan provides a broad context within which to better conceptualize the Sullivan brand, putting the plan into action requires support and participation from all areas of within the University. Starting with the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), we should look to reinforce the plan by tying the QEP effort to some combination of gaining, retaining, educating, and placing students. When conceptualizing new programs and re-conceptualizing existing programs, the first challenge comes with creating a compelling value proposition and designing those programs with an eye toward gaining students, retaining them until program completion, educating them on the basis of clearly defined competencies, and placing them well to gain economically value-added jobs. The challenge put before Sullivan University by the Sullivan University System Board of Directors is truly nothing short of making ourselves into that university positioned well in the minds of our students, the employers who hire our students, and the communities within which our students live and work as the preferred career university in the region.
Because my brain has a right and left hemisphere, I am both creative and intuitive (right-brain), but also more organized and systematic (left-brain). In fashioning this report, my left-brain prompts me to start – and to end, with a quotation from the great polymath, Churchill (WSC). Here goes: .... regarding our 2015 compliance report – to paraphrase WSC, who – when signing off his letters to his wife, Clemmie – would, in turn, paraphrase Napoleon to Josephine,

“the health of the emperor (read, here instead: ‘the health of the compliance report’) is excellent.”

We are approximately six months out from the September 2014 due date and have made very good progress. Quantitatively – as noted in the table at the end of this report, the total number of items is up from 440 (195.4 MB) a quarter ago, to 1,190 (632.4 MB) now. That equates to 235 (176.73 MB) PDFs last quarter versus 788 (581.19 MB) PDFs at present. NOTE: we are reaching a critical mass with content so it will not grow as exponentially after this quarter. However, another daunting subproject looms on the horizon, i.e.: updating all current content.

In last quarter’s Academic Illuminator, I mentioned that the university had obtained the latest Web 2.0 technology: Xitracs™ Plus assessment and compliance software. As I then explained, I had begun using this software’s Xitracs Standards™ module to prepare to web-publish the Sullivan University’s 2015 SACSCOC compliance report. Use of that system continues. By the end of this quarter, submission of all subject-expert NARRATIVE and EVIDENCE content – and its corresponding copyediting, should (fingers crossed!) be completed. As of this writing (February 14, 2014), approximately 75-90% - up from my estimate of 60% at this time last quarter - of the content has been submitted, duly uploaded and assiduously copyedited.

Unfortunately, the QEP - which is not submitted with the compliance report in September 2014, but is submitted some weeks prior to our onsite visit in February 2015 – and several other important and difficult standards’ content (e.g., 2.5 and 3.3.1.1-5 Institutional Effectiveness; 4.5 Student Complaints; and, the standards dealing with intellectual property and academic freedom issues) are still hanging fire. Submission of much of the remaining content is being delayed by behind-the-scene changes to our internal processes to better align them with the standards. So, just as Werner Heisingberg’s (or, for Dr. Udoh and his faculty, the Heisingbug effect) famous uncertainty principle postulates, the very effort of doing something (i.e., writing the compliance report) impacts the results; and, writing our compliance report has caused us to re-examine internal processes impactful of those results.

Qualitatively, the vetting, to which I alluded last issue, continues in another form, i.e.: Dr. Kimberly Daugherty, PharmD, BCPS, Professor and Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs and Assessment, Sullivan University College of Pharmacy, and Mr. David Tudor, Dean of Academic Affairs,
Sullivan Lexington, have – as I mentioned last time, initially vetted narrative and evidence content to the SACSCOC’s own criteria represented by standard-specific “Relevant Questions for Consideration,” which appears in the very helpful SACSCOC Resource Manual. Their efforts have produced many critically-important comments, which they have embedded in Xitracs as color-coded at-the-head-of-narrative assessment critiques. This embedding will allow follow up reviewers to reflect on any possible corrective content those critical comments might generate.

Having completed the initial copyediting cycle – less some narrative/evidence that is still to be submitted, I am now re-editing content in reaction to the aforementioned vetting comments. While I am recycling seriatim back through the standard, I am often re-petitioning the initial subject-expert for supplemental content. At the same time, I am also enlisting the SU SACSCOC Steering committee (Dr. Marr, Dr. Miller, Dr. Swenson, Dr. Pina, Dr. Daugherty, Ms. Barbara Dean, Mr. Tudor, Mr. Keene, and others) to review content and vetting comments. This initial Steering committee review is being conducted piecemeal by email, by which I – or a deputy, emails several standards to the committee each week. Once the first-order SACSCOC-Resource-Manual vetting has been completed, a second-order layer of vetting will be conducted. That second-order vetting is based on standard-specific comments submitted by other universities in the form of Focus Report responses to problems, which their SACSCOC offsite committee had with their content. We have built a Focus Report library for the same standards for which we will soon be submitting content and narrative. So, à la the maxim of felix culpa, we hope to glean valuable insights from the mistakes (culpa) of others, to improve our content. Then, we are also conducting a third-order vetting using the SACSCOC Manual for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation. This manual differs from the SACSCOC Resource Manual as night does to day; i.e., the former provides non-compliance insights for each standard, while the latter provided compliance insights. As a consequence, we hope to profit from another cycle of critical assessment vetting.

Earlier, I alluded to “another daunting subproject looms on the horizon, i.e.: updating all current content.” To date, narrative content has referenced the 2012-2013 Sullivan University catalog. The 2014 version of that catalog is soon to be published, which will precipitate a massive swapping out of the previously end-noted evidence in Xitracs. Library staff is preparing a XITRACS SWAP-OUT FORM with end-noted catalog references in order to facilitate this process. Once completed, that swap-out moves us incrementally closer to having a final draft ready for one last final review by corporate.

In reaction to all the vettings, the overall compliance document is being iteratively refined and polished. Additionally, some potential access problems have been identified and corrected, e.g.: internal web-based evidentiary files, which will not upload for any potential off-campus SACSCOC reviewer, are being converted in Xitracs to quick-uploading PDFs. At present, the internal URLS2PDFS subproject seems complete, although the overall document still features 176 public URLS as evidence. Comprising about 90 standards or parts of standards, the document features a 1000+ PDFs as evidence. So, there is a lot of evidence. Once internal SU stakeholders have conducted all their reviews, a draft will be reviewed by corporate and – per-
haps, by one or more extramural consultants. To organize all these editorial processes, I continue to submit my weekly status report to Dr. Marr and Dr. Miller in the form of the updated ASSIGNMENT sheets, with which many of you are keenly aware. Ultimately, however, to complete all these processes, I am dependent - like Blanche Du-Bois from Tennessee Williams' 1947 Pulitzer Prize-winning play A Streetcar Named Desire - upon the kindness of you, my colleagues, to provide content. I am keenly aware that as Nassim Nicholas Taleb states in his best-selling business book, Antifragile, “don’t try to teach birds to fly” – that is, you know what is going on and how important each of you are to the end result. The project management calculus being used to generate a final compliance report is dependent on all of us - all of us dutifully performing our jobs each day to improve student-learning impactful operational and academic processes as part of an ongoing, integrated, institutionwide, data-based (per standard 2.5) culture of assessment (for more on that subject, please see my article from two quarter ago). And, all of us, knowing instinctively that we are making a difference – but, as I often remind departmental presenters at the Planning, Evaluating, Consulting Committee (PECC) meetings, all the good things you do every day need to be documented and reported as part of our 7-step continuous improvement circle (CIC) institutional effectiveness process.

In his Summa, St. Thomas Aquinas stated that “an agent does not move except out of intention for an end.” Through the kind agency of all of you, the end of the compliance process will be that Sullivan University is reaffirmed to 2025. To conclude (and to complete my left-brain cycle): Churchill famously said that: “Success is not final; failure is not fatal: it is the courage to continue that counts.” I praise your commitment to continue to move Sullivan University forward – both, by means of what you do every day, and also by what you are doing to assist me and the university with the compliance report.

**Summary of all XITACS Evidence Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.43 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.08 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPG</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>15.2 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>581.19 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF ALIAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.87 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.66 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPTX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.99 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.48 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLSX</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.99 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total files:** 1019 632.4 MB

**Total items:** 1190 632.4 MB

This submission will require approximately 634.4 Megabytes of storage space.
Student Retention

Did you get the answer you were looking for?

(A question of communication and response time to student concerns)

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

Have you ever been in a situation where you found yourself in need of an answer and, even with all your technical ability with the internet, were unable to find the answer? Have you ever reached out to a help desk and found yourself sitting on the other end of the phone and growing impatient? Have your ever been given an answer and walked away saying that the provider of the answer given did not have a clue about your need?

These questions are posed to begin the concept of perception in what we as instructors think as communication and what our students think of as communication. In general the Career College and private school sector does a pretty adequate job according to our students. In a recent survey by Noel Levitz (the company used by Sullivan University with predictive indexing our students) 59% of students responded favorably to this question: “Faculty provide timely feedback about my progress in a course.” This is 9 percentage points better than private four year college/universities and 13 percentage points better than four year public college/universities. Noel-Levitz (2013). 2013 National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report. Retrieved from https://www.noellevitz.com/papers-research-higher-education/2013/2013-national-student-satisfaction-and-priorities-report

If, as the data indicates, this is true at Sullivan University that still leaves 41% of the population who feel that we don’t provide timely feedback. The renowned scholar C.S. Lewis stated “What you see and what you hear depends a great deal on where you are standing. It also depends on what sort of person you are.” The moment in time where each of us comes in contact with our student is telling of the outcome of the event. Have you ever been frustrated after speaking with a student thinking that they just weren’t listening? Have you ever thought that what you were saying wasn’t getting through? Where you ever confused when you found out a student was upset when you thought you got back to them in a timely manner? All these are questions of perception.
I would opine that each of us, as we have seen the numbers at our campuses diminish recently, are more highly aware of the need to communicate and are more sensitive to the absence of those in our classes. It is all a measure of perception. Why is it that we feel this way? I would suggest that it is where we are standing. We all are a product of our history and see things through those filters created by that history. The same is true for our students. What we perceive as timely communication and clear direction may, by the student, be perceived as late and harsh or overwhelming, etc...

Many of us pride ourselves in being good communicators, in fact, in our courses in conflict resolution we teach listening skills to enable the individual to become a solution facilitator. Even those highly trained individuals will be taken aback at times as they realize they are misunderstood by others. So it is offered that you remember four thinks happen in every contact you have with a student:

- One, what you think you are preparing to say. This action of composition goes on while in the midst of coping with all other life events going on inside you.
- Two, what is actually said. This action involves all of your bodily activities such as voice intonation, body position, eye contact or lack thereof, volume and tone.
- Three, what is heard. What the receiver of your words actually takes in.
- Four, what the receiver perceives that they heard. This action takes place with all the other activities of life swirling in their heads.

Studies in this human condition done by Shorp, Hunsaker, and Robinson indicate that even in the most perfect world 75% of the time a person is distracted, preoccupied or forgetful. Is it any wonder that our students, who are not schooled in good listening techniques, often miss our point? The study also points out that we hear 125 to 250 words a minute yet the human brain thinks at a capacity of 1000 to 3000 words a minute. Allen, M.P. (2012, 10 April). Reaching out and reaching in... The Priester Conference 2012. Retrieved from http://www.slideshare.net/hmstone/marin-allen-priester2012 it is recommended that we all be more aware that the clarity of our message is present when talking with a student(s).

Just food for thought! Over my history with the faculty at our campus locations I have learned to appreciate the level of student centered concern present in most. I also know that many things pull at each of us every day. As we strive to make Sullivan University one of the best places to learn in this region of the country it is hoped that this information gives you a better understanding of what is going on with you and your student and that it will better help us all reach that 41% that don’t quite understand what we are trying to do to help them.
Academic Council Highlights

By

Nick Riggs

As chair of the Academic Council, I am pleased to present another edition of Academic Council Highlights (ACH). The goal of ACH is to keep faculty and other interested parties informed, on a quarterly basis, about the workings of the Academic Council (Council) and matters it addresses.

In Academic_Illuminator_ACH_Article_Four_April_2013, I provided a lengthy list of matters the Council considered in 2012. Recently, I was reading a web article entitled, Building a Better Faculty Senate, http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/29/faculty-discuss-ways-improve-senate-effectiveness-aaup-conference, (accessed February 3, 2014). In the article, the following comment appears: “There are too many senates where the only thing they do is respond to administrative initiatives.”

This statement caused me to go back to my April 2013 article to see if I could recall how many of the items listed were initiated by the administration and how many of them were proffered by the faculty. Accepting the fact that academic deans and directors are first and foremost faculty members, I revisited the list and added which institutional constituent (A = administration; F = faculty) brought the matters to the Council for deliberation and action. Here’s the list with that information added (based solely on my personal judgment and recall):

- Attendance policy (A)
- Master course syllabi (A)
- Master course outlines (F)
- Faculty absences (A)
- Video recordings (F)
- Technology issues (F)
- Quality Enhancement Plan (A)
The number of items initiated by the administration (11) barely surpassed the number of items proffered by the faculty (10). What this says about the faculty representatives on Sullivan’s Council is that they are more proactive in presenting matters for consideration than is typical on most faculty senates. This information should give all university constituencies, and particularly its faculty, a good feeling. Kudos to the Council and all of its members!

As I always conclude this article - rest assured that the Council has lively debate and discussion at all meetings and regularly sends important matters to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for consideration and requested action. With that in mind, please don’t hesitate to send me an item for Council deliberation at nriggs@sullivan.edu. The Academic Council is here to serve you!

Submitted 02/13/2014
Policy Review

The Federal Credit Hour Definition

by

Anthony Piña, Ed.D.

Dean of Online Studies

One of the more far-reaching and often misunderstood recent actions of the U.S. Department of Education is the 2010 Federal definition of the credit hour. As reported by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, Sullivan University’s regional accrediting body, the definition is:

“For purposes of the application of this policy and in accord with federal regulations, a credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates:

1) Not less than one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time OR
2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required outlined in item 1 above for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.”

This definition has had an impact at Sullivan University. For example, in order to comply with the Federal credit hour definition, some of the faculty serving as subject matter experts for Sullivan University Online have been called upon to increase the quantity of content in the online master courses that they develop.

Many groups within the higher education community have expressed concern that the definition is too dependent upon “seat time,” rather than student learning outcomes; that it could stifle innovation and that it did not ad-
equately take into account that “in class” and “out of class” are not relevant to online learning. The U.S. Department of Education has attempted to address some of these concerns on its website.

I would like to take this opportunity to clarify a few items regarding the credit hour definition that are relevant to Sullivan University:

1. The Federal credit hour definition is used for awarding Federal student aid and other Federal program purposes. It does not prevent institutions for awarding academic credits based on other measures. For example, a university could offer a course worth 6 credits toward a degree program, but award 4 credits of Federal student aid using the Federal definition.

2. The Federal credit hour definition does not affect an institution’s ability to award credit for national examinations (e.g. CLEP, DSST), local bypass exams or prior learning assessment portfolios.

3. The Federal credit hour definition does not require that a course meet a prescribe number of hours per week. Many courses, such as practicum, externships and doctoral dissertation, require a larger amount of out of class work. The important thing is that the TOTAL amount of student work approximates one hour of in class and two hours of out of class student work per week.

4. Courses that meet for less than an 11-week quarter increase the weekly student work so that the total is the same as if it was delivered during an entire quarter.

5. For online courses, the Dept. of Ed. states: “An institution that is offering asynchronous online courses would need to determine the amount of student work expected in each online course in order to achieve the course objectives, and to assign a credit hour based on at least an equivalent amount of work as represented in the definition of credit hour.”

References


Calendar Of Events (Lexington)
Spring 2014 Quarter

New Student Registration................................................................. March 25–26, 2014
New Student Orientation ................................................................. March 27, 2014
First day of Classes ................................................................. March 31, 2014
Evening Faculty Orientation (9:10 pm, Oak Room)................... March 31—April 4, 2014
Last day that a student can enter an online class.................. April 3, 2014
Faculty In-Service (10 am, Oak Room) ........................................ April 4, 2014
Last day that a student can enter a day class* .................. April 7, 2014
Last day that a student can enter an evening or weekend class ....... April 10, 2014
Academic Council Meets (2:00 pm, Louisville) .................. April 17, 2014
Spring Graduation Ceremony (Southeast Christian Church, arrive by 8:30 am) . April 26, 2014
Last day that a student can withdraw and still receive a “W” . May 16, 2014
Academic Council Meets (2:00 pm, QEC) . May 22, 2014
Memorial Day ................................................................. May 26, 2014
Adult Open House ................................................................. June 7, 2014
Break ................................................................. June 16-29, 2014
First Day of Summer classes .................................................... June 30, 2014

*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.
Five Questions For...

Josh Simpson
Chair, English Department
Sullivan University, Louisville

For this installment of “Five Questions For...,” we interviewed Josh Simpson. He is the Chair of the English Department at Sullivan University. Josh has been teaching at the University level since 2001, and has been with Sullivan University since 2004.

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

I’m from Lancaster (Kentucky, not Pennsylvania!), a tiny town in the central part of the state. I earned my undergraduate degree from Berea College and my master’s degree from Eastern Kentucky University. Currently, I am working on a PhD in the humanities at U of L.

2. What do you like the most about teaching? What do you find the most challenging?

One of the most rewarding aspects of teaching is helping students develop skills (and, in some cases, viewpoints) they will draw from for the rest of their lives. I’ve had a number of great teachers who, in the span of an hour, changed the way I think about life. Being part of a person’s intellectual development is a tremendous responsibility, but one which is highly gratifying.

3. What are your goals in your educational career?

I really enjoy researching and writing, and these are skills I plan to develop into the future. There is no shortage of theory and literature out there (a lot of it mediocre and misguided at best), and I’d hopefully like to offset at least some of it over my career.

4. Do you have any advice for new educators?

Like just about everything in life, teaching is a lot harder than it looks. It’s very rewarding, but it’s definitely not for everyone. The best advice I could offer a new educator is to be fair and to always try and create a positive classroom environment. Very little learning takes place when students dread coming to class.

5. What hobbies or interests do you have in your off time?

These days, I spend most of my free time hanging out with my eighteen-month old son, Charlie. In addition, I’m a huge music fan, and I try to catch as many live shows as I can each year. While my wife isn’t a huge jazz fan, Charlie is proving to be, so I must be doing something right!
Out of the Archives

By Cara Marco

June Grad Enters Programming Position

The vast world of computers in recent times has been strictly a "man's world" but along with many other young women Nancy Monroe, a June 1967 graduate of Sullivan, is breaking this sex barrier. Since graduation Nancy has accepted a job, as a Computer Programmer, with Citizen's Fidelity Bank.

She is now a Computer Programming Trainee at Citizen's Fidelity Bank's data processing center. Nancy will earn the highest starting salary of any female graduate in the history of Sullivan College.

Nancy was able to acquire this job through Sullivan's placement program and Mr. George Pat Green, Citizen's Fidelity called Sullivan in search for women programmers and Nancy was recommended. She scored such a high grade on their employment test that they called her back a week later, interviewed her and employed her to begin work on July 5. Following her graduation and preceding her new job, Nancy rewarded herself with a one-week vacation to Florida.

During her stay at Sullivan she was active in helping her IBM instructor in preparing grade reports, worked afternoons at General Hospital's Accounting Department, and led all students in her freshman class on the advanced placement tests.

Nancy was such an outstanding student that upon her entrance she was able to by-pass Accounting I, English I, Word Study and Developmental Reading. She was the top business graduate at Clarksville High School (Indiana), in 1966 and was chosen as the Top Freshman in the 1966 SBC freshman class.

Where is Nancy Monroe now? The world needs to know!
T H E  A C A D E M I C  I L L U M I N A T O R

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.

Questions, comments, requests for article coverage, and article submissions may be sent to editor Nathan Ragland, at nragland@sullivan.edu.

N O T E S  T O  T H E  F A C U L T Y

- Sullivan University has hired a new Director of Institutional Research, Dr. Mark Wiljanen. He will be spearheading the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan. Welcome aboard!

- The Library’s annual survey of students will be conducted this quarter. Please remind your students to complete the online survey when it becomes available. The Library appreciates your support!

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

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

- A new Catalog was recently published at the University. It is located at http://sullivan.edu/CampusVue/All/docs/current-catalog.pdf.