

Faculty Senate Meeting
Preparatory packet for
September 19, 2011

Dear Faculty Senators (returning and new),

Welcome to the 2011-12 year of Faculty Senate. I wish to thank all of you for agreeing to serve in a leadership role this year. For those new, the process we adopted last year is that I seek to provide a preparatory packet by Monday night prior to our Thursday meeting to allow time for reflection and consultation. The packet is vetted the previous week through the Faculty Senate cabinet, which advises on the formal agenda for our Senate meetings. Your cabinet puts in many hours in support of committee work and additional meetings so that Senate can run as effectively as possible and I wish to thank them as well for their commitment to this year.

In order to position our meetings so that they function more deliberatively, the prep packet will contain reports to be read (rather than delivered during meeting times) and I ask each Senator to come informed with the perspectives of colleagues within your colleges about any issues or questions the reports may raise. I encourage you to put in place practices at your college level that will facilitate your role as representatives and insure good communication. In terms of managing our meetings, if there are no questions about the reports, we will simply move forward with our agenda.

The packet will also contain any resolutions we plan on offering at Senate meetings for the possible action of the Senate. The relevant committee(s) will provide rationales for the resolutions and the floor will be open for debate and possible vote.

So, in terms of managing your own busy schedules, I ask that you plan sometime late Mondays or early Tuesdays prior to meetings to review the packet, so that you have time for reflection and possible consultation prior to Thursdays.

So that we manage our workload effectively, our Senate agendas will typically have outlined time frames for each agenda item. While I will try to manage these times effectively as Chair, I will insure that no discussion is arbitrarily cut short simply to conform to the schedule. Our role is to be deliberative.

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
September 19th TUC 400
2:30-3:40pm

Approval of June Minutes	2:30-31
Faculty Chair Report (circulated)	2:31-2:35
■ Placement into Nomination and Approval of Faculty Chair Appointment of the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate 2011-12	
Report of the President of the University	2:35-2:50
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Deregulation, Autonomy, And Institutional Restructuring and vote on resolution	2:50-3:20
Discussion of Living-Learning Communities	3:20-3:30
New Business	3:30-3:34
Announcements	3:34-3:35
Adjournment	3:35

Report of the Chair of the University Faculty
For September 19, 2011

One of my roles as Chair is to provide a brief statement on behalf of the University Faculty to the Board of Trustees at each of their meetings. I am copying here below that message in full since it covers an overview for our new Senate year.

Report to the Board of Trustees
Richard J. Harknett, PhD
Chair of the University Faculty

September 12, 2011

Dear Madam Chair,

It is my pleasure to report to you on the activity of the University Faculty as we begin the 2011-12 academic year, which promises significant changes for the university. Of course, this year the faculty will be engaged with the momentous transition of our curriculum to a semester calendar. As we had promised several years ago when the decision was made, we have sought not simply to add a few weeks to courses, but rather use this unique institutional moment to examine our courses and programming so that the curriculum at the university has been transformed to new standards of depth, rigor, and interdisciplinarity where possible. This effort will be on-going this year as we develop individual advising plans to guide students through the new curriculum. There will be heavy lifting at the department level to insure a smooth transition. We will culminate the planning with a Faculty Retreat in the Spring quarter at which all faculty will come together in their departments to discuss and work on collaboratively their course syllabi to secure for us our true transformational moment.

Simultaneously, we are involved with the Provost's office with the development of our Academic Master Plan, which will strategically orient our academic goals and priorities at the university level. The AMP has the potential to enhance fundamentally the effectiveness of resource allocation so that we leverage the points at which excellence does and can intersect across our campus. It has the potential to shape our efforts toward cross-college and cross-disciplinary collaboration and coordination and raise it to a level we have not achieved in the past.

In addition, faculty input has continued on the Chancellor of Ohio's plan for enterprise universities and we remain in close coordination with the President's office in the development of constructive input that may help to develop an opportunity for advancing our public research university mission with enhanced affordability, accessibility, and greater impact on state-wide goals including workforce development, economic growth, and demographic stabilization. The faculty are as well intently tracking the electoral process of Issue 2, which could have significant impact on the functioning of our campus and our currently well-designed and functioning system of shared governance.

Finally, on the "big activity" list, we will come together as a faculty intellectually on October 25th immediately following the All-University Faculty meeting in our second annual Faculty Assembly to examine and discuss the intersection of interdisciplinarity and applied learning/research, which UC2019 has cited as areas of strength at UC. The Assembly will follow President Williams annual address on the State of the University. We will be inviting you as Trustees to participate if you can.

Of course, these major issues will not crowd out the day-to-day faculty effort to advance university efforts through our integrated decisionmaking system that includes eight Standing Faculty Senate and tens of all-university committees. It is my analysis after a year in this position and speaking to faculty across the State of Ohio that UC stands out as a model of effective governance and informed decisionmaking and that the degree to which faculty and administrative offices work effectively together to advance institutional goals is unmatched. I wish to thank the Board of Trustees directly for their commitment and support of this system, because it truly is working very well. I also wish to thank President Williams and his leadership team, including Senior Vice Presidents Ono and Ambach, for their focus on elevating the academic profile and outcomes on our campuses through effective collaboration with faculty expertise. Most importantly, I wish to thank the faculty who have committed to service in the expectation that their expertise can help position UC institutionally for great success. It promises to be an exciting year for the University of Cincinnati and we are ready to go.

Faculty Appointments of to ad hoc and new university Committees:

One manifestation of the solid functioning of our shared governance environment is that administration offices regularly and readily turn to me as Faculty Chair and request advice, appointment, and election of faculty to university decisionmaking committees, which in some cases formal Senate involvement is not proscribed. This is a healthy development that requires an efficient response process to be in place. In all cases, in line with by-laws and practice, I consult with cabinet and determination is made as to whether appointment or election is a more suitable process of selection. In the case of ad hoc assignments, our default will be to appointment in which we are matching faculty expertise to the committee role requested. In the case of continuing roles, our default will be to election and appointment mix. If the role is facilitated through direct linkage with Senate Standing committees, we will seek to appoint Senate committee members or chairs (of course all of these faculty have been elected to those positions in the first place). Where the roles are new or stand alone, we will place those positions into our electoral cycle for All-University Committees. It has been our assessment that the electoral approach is strengthened by seeking to keep it as much as possible limited to the Spring quarter for the subsequent year, thus avoiding a never ending series of emails requesting faculty to run for continuously held elections. To avoid this, when new roles arise during the academic year, we will try to turn to the electoral process of the previous year and draw on faculty who meet the expertise needed and stood for election and in cases where none are available, seek through consultation with cabinet and others, faculty who can be appointed for a limited basis until an election is held. In just this past month, we have expanded faculty input with appointments to the search for a new VP International, Taskforce on Academic Integrity, and a new structure for Strategic Enrollment Management.

Academic Master Plan:

As Chair of the Faculty, I have been sitting on the AMP Coordinating Committee and working all summer on the AMP (once a week meetings). I had also been appointed to Chair the AMP Faculty Working Group. I am now sitting on the UC2019 Steering Committee, which will also review the AMP during the Fall at the VP, Dean, and Director level. This is a cover explanation from Kristi Nelson concerning the timeline on AMP:

“The Academic Master Plan (AMP) was launched last fall in conjunction with the President’s UC2019► strategic plan. We established the AOC+ working group—consisting of more than 30 senior leaders from every corner of campus—to provide key input into the overall process. Other feedback then came from the entire campus community (via the AMP website) followed by reports from the working groups of faculty, students, staff, and administrators. At this point, the AMP Coordinating Team produced a visioning document for discussion with key stakeholders. The finalized visioning document (Phase 1) was posted to the AMP website in April 2011 and the opportunity to provide feedback was sought from the UC Community.

Phase II (the action steps and business plan to operationalize our goals and priorities) of the AMP was initiated in April 2011 with an extended working session for faculty, students, staff and administrators. The working groups developed action steps that were then forwarded to the AMP Coordinating Team, which has been working over the summer to synthesize and structure an enormous collection of ideas and information that has emerged from the UC community.

We are now entering the vetting stage of Phase II. The draft action steps (see attached) are being distributed to the President, the UC2019► Steering Committee and the Deans. The Steering Committee is scheduled for a feedback session on September 12. The Deans will have two opportunities to discuss the draft action steps: 1) On September 14, at the Council of Deans meeting; and 2) On September 21, we will use the second part of the AOC meeting to discuss the draft with the AOC+ working group.”

(Provost will preview AMP at the Faculty Governance Bootcamp)

The Draft document will then be released to the entire university community by Sept. 27th for review and comment. At that point, we will have relevant Senate Standing Committees review the document (Academic Affairs, Budget & Priorities, Research & Scholarship, IT, Human Relations, and Planning) and develop input from their particular committee charges. We will dedicate the October 13th Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the reviews, discuss constituent reactions, and provide input to the Provost Office on the document. I ask all senators to consider setting up input sessions (or email input) from their college colleagues from the 27th-October 10th. All committee and Senator input must be sent to me by noon October 10th and will be placed into the prep packet for our meeting on the 13th. The Provost’s overall timeline is to present the AMP to the BOT in late November (my understanding, not for endorsement of vote since it is an academic plan, but as an information session). The AMP will begin to shape university-wide planning at the college and department levels and represents a major shift in the manner in which UC has operated, so Senate consideration of the plan is very important.

Carryover Implementation of last year’s resolutions:

Emergency Preparedness – a new video sequence module is being put together and when completed will be distributed to faculty via the UC safety website.

Taskforce on Smoking – Taskforce was created as Senate recommended and work is commencing. We expect a report this year.

Taskforce on Academic Integrity in 21st Century—taskforce membership is being organized and the Taskforce will be chaired by Adrienne Lane and report to Academic Affairs in January.

University Faculty Semester Conversion Curriculum Retreat – resolution calls for a planning committee to be formed in coordination with the Provost Office. Retreat is scheduled for April 13th (third Friday of Spring Quarter). Need 2 faculty from senate and a third as Chair along with 3 from Provost office. Working on this and will report.

Faculty Senate Offices

I am currently meeting with University Planning on the prospect of new offices for Senate committee meetings. There is a possibility of better space being made available for the Senate. I will have information when I have firmer news.

Faculty Regalia rental

I am currently in discussions with VP Mitchel Livingston to discuss an alternative to faculty regalia rental for graduation. The bill annually for rentals is over \$23,000 and cannot be sustained moving forward over the long-term. However, VP Livingston does not wish to see a decline in faculty participation. Cabinet has discussed a proposed subsidy plan that would allow faculty to purchase their regalia. The dual goal is a coordinated phase out of the rental support without diminishing faculty turnout – a subsidized purchase program could be a cost-effective option. I will update you as this becomes more concrete..

Honorary Degree nominee October 31, 2011

I have now been asked to sit on the Honorary Degree committee as Faculty Chair and cabinet approved my request to institutionalize a recommendation annually coming from Senate perhaps via our Research & Scholarship Committee.

Living-Learning Residences (DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE MOTION FROM FLOOR)

In another step toward elevating academic experiences on campus, housing via Student Services is proposing Living-Learning Houses as options for on-campus housing. There will be a call for proposals for next year. While Faculty Senate need not evaluate the proposal, endorsement of the concept, if we so wanted, is being sought in order to bolster attention when the call for proposals come out. The attached document below is being provided for information only. If a Senator is so inclined a motion of general support for such a concept maybe entertained from the floor during the meeting.

ACTION ITEM

DAIR Committee Report

This action item is the main agenda issue for the Senate meeting on the 19th. The DAIR committee has provided a direct and brief report on the Chancellor's plan.(See report section below). During the Summer, I was in regular consultation with President Williams and senior leadership and participated in efforts to provide input to the Chancellor so that the planning process around the Enterprise University concept remained flexible and potentially beneficial to

our mission as a public research university. We have placed the DAIR's report in full on the agenda and Cabinet has endorsed the recommendations of the report in the form of a resolution. We are asking for full Senate consideration of this resolution. It is our view that passage of this resolution will allow us maximum flexibility to remain active on this issue as the State legislature takes this up during the year and position the University leadership to be effective on this issue..

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

DAIR REPORT

TO: University Faculty Senate
FR: Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Deregulation, Autonomy, and Institutional Restructuring (D.A.I.R.)
RE: DAIR Committee Review of Chancellor Petro's Enterprise University Report
September 5, 2011

Introduction

The DAIR Committee was originally formed and Charged in Winter Quarter 2011 to examine issues related to preliminary planning in the Ohio State Legislature involving the concept of "Charter Universities." The Committee provided a twenty-five page report titled, UC: An Ohio preeminent 21st Century Public University to the entire University Community at the All-University Faculty Meeting on May 24, 2011. The report is available on-line at http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/facultysenate/senate/docs/alluniversityfacultymeeting/DAIR_revisedreportMay202011.pdf

On August 11, 2011, the Office of the Chancellor released, *An Enterprise University Plan for Ohio* available at: <http://www.ohiohighered.org/enterprise-university-plan>, which had been mandated by the State Legislature for release no later than August 15th.

The sixty-two page report proposes criteria to establish so-called "enterprise universities", or "international enterprise universities." These schools would ostensibly be given greater autonomy in return for less state funding and oversight. Details of how this might be implemented are admittedly not fully defined in the plan. In reviewing the criteria suggested, it appears that UC would qualify for both of these new designations. Unfortunately, based on our own internal research, the actual savings that could be achieved are relatively meager: less than one-tenth of one percent of the university's total annual budget (approximately \$250,000 saved set against potential state investment loss of \$30 million). Therefore, the opinion of the committee is that the advantages of such a designation would not outweigh the potential costs.

To summarize, the consensus of our committee is that the Enterprise University plan, as currently presented in the Chancellor's initial report, would not produce a net benefit to UC or its stakeholders. While the committee finds several of the ideas in the report conceptually appealing, including the desire to unburden universities from costly regulations as a means to make the universities more cost efficient, and the effort to enhance the universities' role in workforce development, the Enterprise University plan, as currently proposed, is unlikely to produce actual savings that could enhance academic programming or affordability for students. In fact, it likely will lead to tuition increases combined with operating cuts—the same pattern we have seen for the last two decades.

Discussion

The committee finds that the education-specific goals for Ohio, including accessibility, affordability, and retention of university graduates choosing to live and work in the state, are

laudable. These goals could indeed be assisted with tax credits for graduates who find employment, both for in-state and out-of-state students. The “fit“ for encouraging Ohio’s economy, i.e. training students with a range of contemporary skills and general knowledge for a changing global economy, accords with the ongoing Academic Master Plan, and ongoing restructuring, being implemented at UC. The particular strengths of UC should be explored in relationship to these goals to the degree that the Enterprise Plan could ultimately be fine tuned to address accessibility, affordability, retention of graduates in Ohio, thus growing an educated citizenry and a more prosperous workforce.

With regard to some specific regulatory proposed changes, a few are worth more careful consideration. For example, altering transparency provisions in administrative meetings could invite unwelcome suspicion of routine deliberation and cause unnecessary controversy. Any provision which abrades the bond of responsibility to Ohio citizenry, including parents ,students, donors and alumni for any state university, “damages the brand” to use marketing terms, and should be reconsidered or deployed with caution.

Relative autonomy in exchange for a reduction in SSI funding has quite limited utility, as our report in May documented. Moreover, the university’s independence and consistent amount of continued state funds are subject to change, in terms of state politics and revenue levels. This has already been proven in similar compacts in the New Jersey and Virginia systems, again as our May report indicated. Tuition setting autonomy is also limited by the overall economy, as well as the expectations of Ohio students and parents. Based on review of reforms in other states, finding the right balance between tuition and operating state mandates is the critical relationship (rather than viewing the relationship as subsidies versus mandates, because decreases in state investments will lead likely to tuition increases).

Conclusion

The university and state need to work together in an environment that is re-ordering resources and needs in a number of global contexts, in terms of economic and social policy. This partnership will insure that state universities meet their responsibility to offer affordable and accessible education to Ohioans, as well as general expertise to the state’s business and larger communities.

The bond between universities, communities and citizens is our real “brand.” As institutions are questioned, the university must act to guarantee stability of purpose and presence, where all “stakeholders,” in terms of policy, money, academy and society can trust us. Further study is needed, with more precise definition of goals and means. The key is to focus on the goals and work together to achieve them.

In presenting the Plan on August 11th, Chancellor Petro suggested that the document was a “starting point for conversation and dialogue.” The DAIR Committee advises that in coordination with the Office of the President and the Senior Vice President of Administration and Finance that the Faculty Senate remains engaged with the topic and encourages the University of Cincinnati to provide Chancellor Petro input and suggestions that will produce an outcome that advances the mission of the University of Cincinnati as a public research university.

Committee Recommendation

The DAIR Committee recommends that Faculty Senate resolve to,

Remain engaged with the Chancellor's Plan for Enterprise Universities as discussions progress around its possible legislative development;

Encourage President Williams to continue to seek Faculty Senate counsel on the plan as it develops;

Recommend that President Williams seek to provide Chancellor Petro with input and suggestions that will produce an outcome that advances the mission of the University of Cincinnati as a public research university and leverages the entire University System of Ohio to provide accessible, affordable educational opportunities of the highest quality.

Sent on behalf of Karen Faaborg:



Honors Committee
University of Cincinnati
P.O. Box 210062
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0062

614 University Pavilion
Phone (513) 556-3233
Fax: (513) 556-5269

DATE: September 1, 2011

TO: Members of the President's Cabinet
University Deans

FROM: Karen Faaborg
Chairman, Honors Committee

RE: Invitation for Nominations for the
Honorary Degree and Award for Excellence

On behalf of the University of Cincinnati Honors Committee, I would like to invite you to submit nominations for the Honorary Degree and the Award for Excellence to be considered for presentation at the June 2012 commencement.

To facilitate the nomination process, the Honors Committee requires a preliminary proposal letter of approximately 500 words detailing the nominee's achievements and the reasons why these achievements should be honored along with a narrative biographical statement and/or CV. **Preliminary proposals for nominees to be considered for award presentation at the June 2012 commencement ceremony must be submitted by October 31, 2011.**

The committee will review the preliminary proposals submitted and respond to all nominators. If the committee judges the candidate to be worthy of further consideration, the nominator will be requested to provide the documentation required for the formal nomination procedure. **Formal nomination packets for nominees to be considered for award presentation at the June 2012 commencement must be submitted no later than December 21, 2011.**

Information regarding the Honorary Degree and Award for Excellence statement of purpose, criteria, documentation requirements and submission of nominations via the preliminary proposal and complete nomination packet can be accessed online at: www.uc.edu/awards.

Questions can be directed to Susan Stringer in the Office of the Board of Trustees by phone at (513) 556-3233 or via email at susan.stringer@uc.edu.

Residential Houses: Call for Interdisciplinary Living-Learning Community Proposals University of Cincinnati

Purpose

UC seeks to create new communities within its residence hall system that will appeal to and serve the needs of baccalaureate-level students admitted to the university for fall 2013 and beyond. These students will be well prepared for college, possessing both broad and deep learning interests. The new residential communities or “Houses” selected through this call-for-proposal process will be designed to appeal to this highly capable student population. Proposals must support students with interdisciplinary learning interests (as captured in themes like leadership, sustainability, innovation, social justice/civic responsibility, thriving cities, healthful living, global engagement). The specific student population intended to reside in the House must be identified within the proposal; the House concept will necessarily be designed in ways that this target population finds compelling and that will result in filling the House’s designated living space with residents who are committed to supporting the House community.

What is a Residential House?

Residential Houses are living-learning environments that assign a group of interested students to live within a defined university housing area in order to interact around a specific learning focus or common purpose, typically an interdisciplinary academic or professional development theme. Each “House” community, regardless of its assigned physical structure, has a well-developed framework and culture for interaction that incorporates clearly defined learning goals, expectations for student resident participation, specialized activities designed to accomplish stated goals, and opportunities for reflection as well as public sharing of accomplishments. The required learning framework is supported, in partnership with Resident Education and Development, by significant and committed involvement from faculty and staff with expertise related to the House’s interdisciplinary focus. If the House learning framework incorporates enrollment into a specified set of courses it may also be classified as a Learning Community and involve the Center for First Year Experience and Learning Communities as one of its partners.

Proposal Process

Proposals should be submitted electronically to:

Residential House Proposal Review Committee
c/o Dawn Wilson, Director
Resident Education and Development
Dawn.Wilson@uc.edu
(513) 556-6485

Complete proposals include a cover letter and the completed proposal worksheet. Proposals will be reviewed by a representative committee including faculty, students and staff drawn from

Residence Hall Association and Student Government, Division of Student Affairs, Resident Education and Development, University Housing and Dining Services, Center for First Year Experience and Learning Communities, and faculty appointed by the Office of the Provost in consultation with Faculty Senate.

The proposal review process is a two-tiered process. Tier 1 review focuses on evaluation of the proposed Residential House concept. The committee will review the submitted proposals to determine which of them best meet the intended purpose, learning framework, and requirements outlined in this call. Only proposals rated highly by the review committee will be invited to participate in the Tier 2 review process. Tier 2 review focuses on sharpening the concept and fully developing the execution-related details necessary to make a final determination as to whether implementing the proposal is doable or not. The Tier 2 process begins with a review meeting between the applicant(s), select members of the review committee, and other potential partners. A second written proposal is not necessary, although applicants may be required to submit supporting documentation or to make programmatic decisions that will effectively alter the original proposal. The information submitted in the original proposal (cover letter and proposal worksheet) will focus the Tier 2 initial review meeting discussion and subsequent steps. Successful proposals will result in the formation of a partnership agreement and implementation plan with Resident Education and Development, University Housing, and other pertinent partners.

Proposal and Implementation Timeline

- Call distributed: September, 2011
- Notification of interest (optional): October 1, 2011 through November 1, 2011
 - Potential applicants may contact Dawn.Wilson@uc.edu to be added to a distribution list to receive notifications about resources, including information sessions, which may be useful to applicants as they develop their proposals.
- Proposals due: January 18, 2012
- Proposals selected for advancement to Tier 2 review: February, 2012
- Tier 2 review meetings begin: March, 2012
- Proposal selections finalized: June, 2012
- House implementation agreement(s) finalized: July 2012
- House(s) marketed through new student recruitment activity: Begins August, 2012
- House(s) offered through University Housing application processes: Begins November, 2012

Requirements

1. Be conceived around and support an interdisciplinary learning theme.
2. Enable students to explore diverse perspectives and to engage with people from diverse backgrounds

3. Engage students with a real-world problem, ideally including an experiential learning, civic, or community engagement component.ⁱ
4. Engage students in a variety of interactions and specialized activities, projects, or experiences to establish and support the House's identity, residential culture, and framework for learning. Examples:
 - a. House community-building activities, including social functions, traditions, or rituals
 - b. Workshops, guest presentations, or special events
 - c. Excursions to cultural sites/events, professional settings/meetings, or other theme-relevant locales
 - d. Projects that engage residents in the community
 - e. Enrollment in a specified set of courses
 - f. Participation in a specified student organization
5. Incorporate the goals and required activities outlined in the university's overarching residence hall program^{ii,iii} as well as expectations for student adherence to the university's residence hall policies and procedures^{iv}.
6. Incorporate the university's target learning areas for first-year experience^v
7. Provide avenues for documenting community and individual resident accomplishments including sharing these achievements in a public forum. Examples:
 - a. News reports developed in conjunction with UC's Governmental Relations & University Communications personnel
 - b. Performances, exhibits, or showings held in public spaces or to which the public is invited
 - c. Websites, blogs, or electronic portfolios
 - d. Entries into academic or professional competitions
 - e. Submissions to present at conferences or professional meetings
 - f. Entries into or sponsorship for campus-based events, activities, or traditions

Frequently Asked Questions

- **Will Residential Houses replace current UC residence hall offerings?**
- **What learning environments are currently offered in UC residence halls?**
- **Can Residential Houses be developed for upper-year students?**

The Review Committee is particularly interested in proposals that focus on first-year students, yet recognizes that limited upper-year student participation may be desirable to accomplish desired outcomes. However, proposals that emphasize upper-year target populations are least likely to be successful in this initial call due to space constraints in university housing facilities. UC's obligation to house first-year students from outside a 50-mile radius of campus is paramount. Successful proposals will reflect that obligation to serve our first-year students.

- **What size target student population is required in order to forward a viable proposal?**

The size of the target population should be, at minimum, approximately double the number of bed spaces available in the "House" community.

Resources

External

[ACHUHO-I](http://network.acuho-i.org) (<http://network.acuho-i.org>)

The Association of College and University Housing Officers - International is the preeminent professional association that supports and promotes the collegiate residential experience. The University of Cincinnati holds an institutional membership.

[The Collegiate Way](http://collegiateway.org) (<http://collegiateway.org>)

O'Hara, Robert J. "The Collegiate Way: Residential Colleges and the Renewal of Campus Life". The Collegiate Way website. <http://collegiateway.org/>. Retrieved 2011-08-31. A portal featuring information, about the residential college idea. The Collegiate Way seeks to improve campus life by creating small, faculty-led residential colleges within large universities.

[Learning Communities National Resource Center](http://www.evergreen.edu/washcenter/)
(<http://www.evergreen.edu/washcenter/>)

Located within the Washington Center for the Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, and housed at The Evergreen State College, this resource center provides information about institutions across the United States that offer learning community programs including a national directory and a bank of resources on implementation and assessment.

[National Resource Center](http://www.sc.edu/fye/) (<http://www.sc.edu/fye/>)

The National Resource Center for The First-year Experience and Students in Transition is the premier international resource for efforts to improve student learning and transitions into and through higher education. NRC provides opportunities for the exchange of practical, theory-based information and ideas through the convening of conferences, teleconferences, institutes, and workshops; publishing monographs, a peer-reviewed journal, an electronic newsletter, guides, and books; generating and supporting research and scholarship; hosting visiting scholars; and administering a web site and listservs.

[NSLLP](http://www.livelearnstudy.net/home.html) (<http://www.livelearnstudy.net/home.html>)

The National Study of Living-Learning Programs (NSLLP) assesses how participation in Living-Learning Programs (LLPs) influences academic, social, and developmental outcomes for college students.

[The Residential Learning Communities International Clearinghouse](http://pcc.bgsu.edu/rlch/index.php)
(<http://pcc.bgsu.edu/rlch/index.php>)

This collection of information about residential learning communities, including an online director of over 180 communities, is sponsored by Bowling Green State University.

Internal

[The Center for Community Engagement](#)

[The Center for Service Learning and Civic Engagement](#)

[The Center for First Year Experience and Learning Communities](#)

[The Learning Assistance Center](#)

[Housing and Food Services](#)

[Integrated Core Learning](#)

[Resident Education and Development](#)

ⁱ Experiential learning intentionally interweaves theory with practice and is delivered in at least one of the following formats: service learning, student research, study abroad, interdisciplinary collaborative, co-op, internship, clinical, or student teaching. Additional ways to emphasize community connections include: a) co-curricular experiences that may include service but are not captured in the aforementioned curricular components that define UC's experiential learning, as well as, b) courses or activities that emphasize civic commitment or exploration but do not include forms of direct service.

ⁱⁱ Resident Education and Development has specific requirements, implemented by the Resident Advisor, for engaging students through programming that supports: a) diversity and multicultural understanding, b) faculty interaction with residents for more informal (out-of-classroom) yet educationally productive learning and mentoring, c) learning and academic success, and d) student development. RED chooses to use Chickering and Reisser's seven vectors—developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy towards interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, developing integrity, developing purpose, and establishing identity—as its primary theoretical foundation for articulating programmatic alignment with student development theory.

ⁱⁱⁱ Residential community norms are communicated by RED staff in multiple ways including through required periodic meetings with resident groups, in this case with "House" residents. In addition, the Residence Hall Association is the student government unit of the undergraduate residence halls; each residence hall area elects a student council in accordance with its constitution. Each resident student pays a small activity fee each academic term to support RHA activities and programs.

^{iv} The purpose of rules, policies, and procedures in residence halls is to maintain an environment that supports the fulfilling of the university and RED missions. The processes by which that environment is maintained should promote community development, foster the personal development and responsibility of individual students, promote respect and civility, and maintain the dignity of all persons involved. For example, specific policies and procedures have been developed around alcohol and drug use and incidents of violence and damage. For a complete listing of pertinent policies and procedures contact RED or University Housing offices.

^v The university faculties have approved four first-year student target learning areas as part of UC's general education requirements. These learning areas also serve as the first touch point in UC's signature approach to education, Integrated Core Learning, and should be emphasized

in coursework, co-curricular activity, and experiential learning. 1. UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT. Students connect with UC's collegiate life so that they can experience the diverse cultural opportunities, resources, and people who are part of our premier, urban, research university. We aim for students to find their place here and develop a sense of belonging. 2. INTELLECTUAL AND SELF-MANAGEMENT SKILLS. Students are introduced to and experience the intellectual life and expectations of the university. Students will immediately begin to enhance the critical thinking, communication, information literacy, and other skills that provide them with a foundation for success at UC and in life after graduation. 3. PROFESSIONAL AND CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY. Students engage in the professional imperatives and civic responsibilities of educated persons in a 21st century world. They will investigate issues and problems, propose solutions, and explore how to make a difference by applying what they are learning, in the various disciplines they study, to make the world a better place. 4. INTEGRATED LEARNING. Help students to consistently connect and apply what they learn in various courses and settings to new situations to support a more holistic understanding of the world's complexities.