

11-9-2006

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-11-09

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-11-09" (2006). *All Committee Minutes*. 99.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/99

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

APCAS
Approved Minutes
November 9, 2006

Members present: J. Biddle, M. Schmitz, R. Penno, A. Seielstad, L. Simmons, D. Parker, R. Wells, D. Bickford (ex officio)

Due to a lack of a quorum, no action could be taken on the minutes of 9/28/06 and 10/19/06.

Announcement

1. A new chair for APC needs to be elected at the 11/30/06 meeting. Biddle will be on sabbatical, and out of the country for some of Winter term. Nominations for chair should be sent to Biddle by November 27, 2006; Biddle will prepare a ballot for the APCAS meeting on November 30.
2. Academic professionalism and UD's constitutional notion of "shared governance" need to be examined. A draft of "**Statement of Philosophy The Academic Profession**" might be the place to start.

Discussion

1. 2007-08 Calendar. Each member of APCAS has the opportunity to review the Calendar Committee's minutes and recommendation. A straw-vote via email was conducted; the vote was 8 yes, 1 no and 1 "I'm not thrilled, but..." The urgency for this is driven by the publication deadline. The Provost's Council must approve the 2007-08 calendar on November 28; ECAS must make its recommendation by November 13. APCAS believes there are significant academic issues that it should consider; however, given the current time constraints, we approve this as a one-year only calendar. Broader issues for an academic calendar will become a major agenda item for APCAS in the Winter term.
2. The second draft of Phase 2 for *HIR* was discussed and amended—DRAFT #3 is included below. Three issues common to all WGs were discussed:
 - 1) Process for selecting representatives. Do WG chairs need to go through Deans and Chairs in order to appoint members?
 - 2) Length of service. If a Senator's Senate term expires in May, can she/he continue on the WG in order to provide continuity? (It is assumed that newly elected Senators will be added.)
 - 3) What is the process for adding WGs to deal with the "implication" issues identified by the WGs?

DRAFT #3
Charge to APCAS Working Groups (WG) on *HIR*

GUIDING PROFESSIONAL PRINCIPLES

- Curricular change is a faculty responsibility

- Neither the Provost nor the Deans have the level of responsibility for the curriculum as does the faculty.
- Neither ECAS nor APCAS has the responsibility for “doing the work” of curriculum design, revision, or development as does the faculty.
- Therefore, the goal of the *HIR* review process is to move the work to the faculty as soon as possible.

PLAN

By 11/30/06, answer the question of Phase 1 and determine plan for addressing Phase 2

PHASE 1 “Does the Senate believe that the MEWG captured the ideals of a university education in the Catholic and Marianist traditions? If so, I respectfully request that

PHASE 2 “the Senate take appropriate action on the document through its committee structure in order to generate a set of recommendations regarding specific programs, infrastructure, faculty development, and resources necessary to realize the educational aims and learning outcomes.”

Although the APCAS has designed a two-phase process regarding *HIR*, the goal is to engage in an integrative and holistic study. The Catholic and Marianist Tradition provides UD not only the ground for these recommendations, but also the generative culture for ongoing exploration. As the report states on p. 9:

As well as reflecting the discussions initiated by the Working Group, these recommendations draw upon other work on the curriculum being done by the First Year Team, the Humanities Base Committee, the Cluster Coordinating Committee, the Committee on General Education and Competencies, and faculty involved in various academic excellence initiatives funded by the provost. These recommendations are also designed to advance the seven strategic goals set out in A Vision of Excellence.

CHARGES COMMON TO ALL WGs

- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

MEMBERSHIP

- Each WG will be chaired by a member of APCAS. The core membership of each WG will be determined by the APCAS.
- Other Senators can volunteer for the WG or their choice.
- Other Senators can nominate non-Senate members (nominations to be sent to WG chair).
- Each WG should invite members from key stakeholder groups.

TIMELINE

An Interim Report is due from each WG by May 1, 2007. The *HIR* Steering Committee's report will include any changes in the charges for the WGs as well as more specific guidelines for the final report due in December 2007.

OVERSIGHT

The **HIR Strategic Task Force Steering Committee**, led by APC members with representatives from Student Development and Campus Ministry, will monitor the necessary steps to encourage holistic and integrated work across the Working Groups; it will also monitor the "infrastructure and implication" issues identified by the Working Groups. The Steering Committee will also function as the "writing committee" for the final version of *HIR*.

Working Group #1

First Year Seminar, Humanities Base, and General Education

Membership

David Darrow and Chris Duncan, Co-Chairs

APC, LLC, Humanities Base, K. Webb, K. Henderson, CM, SD, Senators, students

(Because of the scope of its charge, WG #1 might need to establish subcommittees.)

Charge

- Develop a 3-hour First Year Seminar (FYS) reflective of the attached recommendation.
- Develop model to align Learning-living communities (LLC) and Humanities Base Program (HBP) over four years.
- Develop model to conceptually expand the HBP to include the new FYS and the incorporation of the lines of inquiry from Arts Study, Science, and Social Science.
- Develop model for incorporating the lines of inquiry from Arts Study, Science, and Social Science.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timeline

- April 2007: an interim report on FYS and the alignment of LLC & HBP.
- December 2007: any revisions to the interim report and the model for expanding the HBP and for incorporating the lines of inquiry from Arts Study, Science, and Social Science.

Focus

VI.A. Recommendations for the first year of study

1. Revise **first-year seminars** substantially to become academically challenging courses that foster engaging academic inquiry and reflection and orient students to the nature and purposes of a University of Dayton education. First-year seminars should be designed to promote the core learning outcomes, especially in scholarship, diversity, community, and vocation. They should also be coordinated with the Humanities Base Program. Some seminars may be offered in conjunction with first-year learning-living communities. First-year seminars should require that students begin construction of academic portfolios and also offer opportunities for service-based learning, focused partly on the campus community. First-year seminars would also be powerful vehicles through which to promote student learning about health and personal discipline in the context of students' educational development. In order to achieve these aims, first-year seminars should be expanded in curricular significance, either by counting for 3-4 semester hours of General Education credit or through linking with General Education courses. Ideally, these should be small, interdisciplinary, writing-intensive courses. The University should explore the possibility that writing-intensive seminars might replace one of the English composition courses in the first year. Collaboration with the Libraries, Student Development, and Campus Ministry will be essential to future development of first-year seminars. [Learning outcomes 1, 3-4, 7]
2. Revise the **Humanities Base Program** to lay the foundation for all core learning outcomes for the common academic program and to facilitate coordination with the objectives of first-year seminars and first-year learning-living communities. In particular, all Humanities Base courses should contribute to students' examination of faith traditions and to their academic encounters with diversity. As expressed in the current Humanities Base goals, all Humanities Base courses should actively support consideration of global perspectives. [All learning outcomes]

VI.B. Recommendations for the first and second years of study

1. Expand **Arts Study** offerings for first- and second-year students. Some of these courses should be coordinated with first-year seminars, Humanities Base courses, and first-year learning communities. Some Arts courses might be coordinated with proposals below for the second or third years of study. Study of, and active participation in, the arts provide uniquely powerful occasions to explore modes of inquiry, reflection, and experiential immersion in the world that advance the proposed student learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]
2. Incorporate **scientific inquiry**, as pursued in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, and technology, more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry using the methods of these fields should be pursued in some first-year seminars. Some introductory science courses in General Education should be coordinated with courses in the Humanities Base or with first-year courses in the social sciences or arts. Courses that explore the distinctive methodologies and habits of mind in scientific fields advance learning outcomes for scholarship, community, practical wisdom, and critical evaluation of our times. Scientific inquiry is also inherently a form of global, transnational learning that relies on collaborative, communal work. [Outcomes 1, 4-6]
3. Incorporate **social scientific inquiry** more deliberately in the first and second years of study. Inquiry that employs methods of the social sciences should be pursued in some

first-year seminars and should be coordinated with other first- or second-year courses in General Education. Courses that develop the habits of mind necessary for critical study of human societies are potentially germane to all of the proposed learning outcomes. [All learning outcomes]

The preceding recommendations do not mean that the General Education Program's present emphasis on humanistic inquiry should be diminished. Rather, these other forms of inquiry should be explored more deliberately in the first and second years of study as complementary with, and in relation to, forms of humanistic inquiry and reflection.

VI.E. Recommendations concerning educational infrastructure

The proposed student learning outcomes also support recommendations concerning the educational infrastructure that makes possible the development and delivery of the common academic program. The following recommendations are fundamentally important for the realization of the educational aims proposed in this report.

1. Expand structures and coordination of opportunities for **learning and living in community**. These should include, but by no means be limited to, learning-living communities for first-year students. Opportunities for multi-year learning communities should also be explored as vehicles through which third- and fourth-year students can exercise academic leadership in the campus community and contribute to younger students' academic development. Values and skills for learning and living in community should be developed, in part, in the context of engaging the culture and structure of the student neighborhood in both academically guided and religiously grounded ways. This recommendation requires faculty-development support for planning of the curricular elements of learning communities and for expanded collaboration with Student Development and Campus Ministry staff on co-curricular programming. [Learning outcomes 2 and 4]

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #2

Service Learning, experiential learning and Multidisciplinary/Interdisciplinary Programs

Membership

Andrea Seielstad, Chair
APC, Senators, Fitz Center, Campus Ministry, students

Charge

- Develop new model for anchoring service learning in the curriculum.
- Develop principles and template for multidisciplinary minors, self-declared clusters, and problem-based, interdisciplinary courses.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.

- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timelines

- April 2007: Interim report on the models, principles, and formats for service learning, multidisciplinary minors, self-declared clusters, and problem-based, interdisciplinary courses.
- Dec. 2007: Final report for the above with any necessary modifications given the Interim reports from other WGs.

Focus

VI.C. Recommendations for the second and third years of study

1. Expand curricular and co-curricular offerings in, and support for, **service learning**. In the second year of study, service-learning opportunities should be focused substantially on the City of Dayton and the Greater Miami Valley; in the third year, service learning should be coordinated especially with study abroad or cultural immersion programs. Programmatic structures and pedagogical methods for integrating service experience with academic inquiry, scholarship, and reflection should be promoted. Support for faculty and staff who deliver and coordinate service-learning programs must be increased significantly. The expansion of service-learning programs must proceed with particular attention to respect for the dignity of community partners and the integrity of the University's relationships with them. [Learning outcomes 3-7]
2. Expand and facilitate **multidisciplinary minors and self-declared clusters** as successors to the current thematic cluster requirement. The goals of the thematic clusters are worthy, but their realization could be achieved more meaningfully through either multidisciplinary minors or student designed, self-declared clusters. Such multidisciplinary, integrative structures should focus on addressing real human problems and needs in light of critical evaluation of these times. They should also assist students in their on-going vocational reflections. There may also be a role for occasional course clusters that examine issues of special relevance to our times. Integration could be supported through an expanded student portfolio. Support for development and coordination of multidisciplinary minors would need to be increased significantly. [Learning outcomes 5-7]
3. Create **problem-based, interdisciplinary courses** in General Education designed especially for second- or third-year students. Such courses would aim at developing practical wisdom and critical evaluation of these times. They should develop familiarity with forms of technological and economic analysis, as well as with critical modes of ethical, social, and ecological inquiry, including Catholic Social Teaching. Such courses could belong to multidisciplinary minors or to self-declared or occasional clusters, and should be linked both to the Humanities Base and to majors, where feasible. [Learning outcomes 5-6]

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #3 Intercultural Learning

Membership

Chair to be determined

APC, Senators, IST curricular sub-committee, A. Anderson, and consultation with Enrollment Management, students

Charge

- Develop new model for curricular revisions to incorporate and expand international and intercultural study.
- Collaborate with WG 1 and 4 regarding objectives for global learning.
- Collaborate with Enrollment Management on identifying the implications of expanding opportunities and expectations for the study of foreign languages.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timeline

- April 2007: Interim report on the models, principles, and formats for expanding international and intercultural study; report on the implications of expanding opportunities and expectations for the study of foreign languages.
- Dec. 2007: Final report for the above with any necessary modifications given the Interim reports from other WGs.

Focus

4. Expand opportunities for **international and intercultural study**, including curricular revisions to promote **global learning**. Objectives for global learning should be incorporated in all multidisciplinary minors and in many capstone courses, in addition to the Humanities Base. Cultural immersions should incorporate explicit links to the curriculum in order to promote academically-informed reflection and analysis. Opportunities for and incentives to promote **study of foreign language** should be developed wherever possible for each academic unit. [Learning outcomes 3-4, 6]

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #4 Student Scholarship and Culminating Experiences

Membership

Darren Parker and Rebecca Wells, co-chairs
APC, Senators, Honors and Scholars, representatives from each school and division, students

Charge

- Develop principles and models for expanding student scholarship throughout the common academic program.
- Develop principles and models for creating capstone experiences in the majors and for general education.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timeline

- April 2007: Interim report on the models, principles, and formats for expanding international and intercultural study; report on the implications of expanding opportunities and expectations for the study of foreign languages.
- Dec. 2007: Final report for the above with any necessary modifications given the Interim reports from other WGs.

Focus

VI.D. Recommendations for the fourth (or final) year of study

1. Develop a culminating **capstone seminar or project in each major**. Such a seminar or project would aim at promoting scholarship and culminating reflection on vocational discernment and life plans. Such a course or project should also aim to integrate study at various levels in General Education with study in the major. An expanded student portfolio could document such integration and vocational reflection. [Learning outcomes 1 and 7]
2. Create **multidisciplinary capstone course(s) in General Education**. Where feasible within a course of study, such a capstone course could support the previous recommendation, helping to develop and integrate culminating study in General Education in relation to the major. An expanded portfolio system could again be valuable for such a course. The course would also be linked clearly to the Humanities Base and could provide students opportunities to build upon a multidisciplinary minor or self-declared or occasional cluster. The course should emphasize all core learning outcomes. Where feasible, it could be coordinated with capstone seminars in the majors. General Education requirements may need to be modified in order to accommodate such a multidisciplinary capstone in General Education. [All learning outcomes.]
3. Develop and expand structures for requiring, coordinating, funding, and reviewing **student scholarship**. Undergraduate research programs would need to be developed that

are appropriate to serve each unit's majors. A portfolio structure could be helpful for coordination and review of student scholarship. [Learning outcome 1]

Recommendations for the common academic program, and especially the third and fourth years of study, should be pursued in ways that support valuable relationships between undergraduate and graduate education, so that undergraduates will be well prepared for graduate work and so that the University's emerging strategies for graduate education are well coordinated with its approach to undergraduate education.

The foregoing recommendations [section VI.A-D] all require substantial investment in faculty development for curricular design and pedagogical innovation, and should inform criteria for faculty hiring.

(NOTE—VI. and VI. F & G to be attached)

Working Group #5
Faculty Development
Communication (W'07)
Pedagogy (F'07)

Membership

Jack O'Gorman, Chair
APC, Senators, Faculty Development Committee, students

Charge

- Review and analyze the current language used to describe UD's programs to any and all audiences. (Recruitment materials, PR, bulletins, web sites, etc., etc.)
- Develop principles and models for aligning academic advising with *HIR*.
- Develop principles and models for creating and funding faculty seminars to enable UD to reach and sustain the revisions/recommendations of all the WGs.
- Develop principles and models for reconfiguring physical spaces to facilitate student learning and sustaining the revisions/recommendations of all the WGs.
- Determine appropriate working relationships with existing UD teams/committees/working groups or individuals.
- Determine an efficient and effective size and structure for the WG.
- Determine appropriate membership beyond the core established by APCAS.
- Identify critical connections/overlaps with other WGs and/or recommendations. These interrelationships should be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.
- Identify educational infrastructure issues to be forwarded to the *HIR* Steering Committee on a regular basis.

Timelines

- April 2007: Interim report on how UD currently communicates its programs.
- Dec. 2007: Final report addressing new content and language; models and principles for academic advising, faculty seminars, and physical spaces.

Focus

VI.E. Recommendations concerning educational infrastructure

The proposed student learning outcomes also support recommendations concerning the educational infrastructure that makes possible the development and delivery of the common academic program. The following recommendations are fundamentally important for the realization of the educational aims proposed in this report.

2. Strengthen structures, support, and faculty preparation for **academic advising**. More effective and better supported academic advising is essential for developmentally sensitive delivery of the common academic program, for meaningful integration of learning across disciplines, for integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, and for sustained reflection on vocation. An expanded portfolio system could facilitate student interaction with advisors. Tools for evaluating academic advising by faculty should be developed and incorporated into reviews for performance, promotion, and tenure. Academic advisors should also work in tandem with the mentoring activities carried out through Student Development and Campus Ministry. [All learning outcomes]
3. Create and fund **faculty seminars** to develop proposals for key elements of a revised curriculum. Possible areas for faculty study might include undergraduate scholarship, the Catholic and Marianist context for the components of the first-year curriculum, service learning and community-based learning, global learning, or pedagogies for experiential learning in multiple fields. Where possible, faculty seminars should build upon recent faculty development efforts in scholarship, curriculum, and pedagogy. Such seminars would be well suited to the University of Dayton's faculty culture and would be likely to yield thoughtfully developed, innovative pilot programs. [All learning outcomes]
4. Reconfigure **design and assignments of classroom space and course schedules** to facilitate student inquiry, collaboration, and reflection. Successful coordination among courses or between courses and co-curricular experiences also requires creative scheduling and use of space. Protected opportunities for reflection, community building, service activity, or prayer should be created. The busy, distraction-filled environment of the campus otherwise will preclude the deep forms of engagement recommended in this report. The new master plan for the campus should place high priority upon the architectural implications of this report. [All learning outcomes]

Just as the recommendations presented here will require investment in faculty development, they also entail substantially expanded collaboration between faculty and staff, especially in Student Development and Campus Ministry, as well as significantly increased staff support in general.

The Working Group recognizes that the recommendations presented in this section are ambitious and will require thoughtfully prioritized and sensitively planned implementation. Planning for implementation falls outside the scope of the Working Group's charge. However, the ambitious character of the recommendations reflects the high aspirations for the University and its students that were expressed consistently and repeatedly by the many faculty and staff who contributed to this project.

NOTE—THESE SECTIONS WILL BE ATTACHED TO THE

SPECIFIC CHARGE FOR EACH WG.

VI. Recommendations for programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development; implications for faculty work life and university resources

The Working Group offers the following recommendations concerning academic programs, educational infrastructure, and faculty development as preferred ways to advance the educational aims and student learning outcomes proposed for the common academic program. These learning outcomes reflect an educational approach that must attend carefully to undergraduate students' academic and personal development over the course of a four-year degree program. Recommendations in the first four sub-sections [VI.A-D] are organized in relation to the developmental progression of students' academic experience. The Working Group recognizes that "year of study" does not constitute a discrete developmental stage. Rather, the concept is used to provide a practically manageable way of highlighting certain appropriate points of emphasis along students' four-year educational experience at the university. The final three sub-sections [VI.E-G] identify features of educational infrastructure, faculty work life, and investment of university resources that must be addressed if the recommended programmatic and pedagogical changes are to flourish and the proposed educational aims are to be vital and sustainable.

As well as reflecting the discussions initiated by the Working Group, these recommendations draw upon other work on the curriculum being done by the First Year Team, the Humanities Base Committee, the Cluster Coordinating Committee, the Committee on General Education and Competencies, and faculty involved in various academic excellence initiatives funded by the Provost. These recommendations are also designed to advance the seven strategic goals set out in *A Vision of Excellence*.

VI.F. Implications for faculty work life

Curricular and co-curricular revisions motivated by the educational ideals expressed in this report will require special investments of faculty members' time, talent, and energy. Unless faculty members have the time, funding, and support needed to take meaningful ownership of the programmatic revisions recommended here, the resulting curricular changes will lack academic depth and vitality and will become unsustainable. The following implications for faculty work life are, therefore, particularly important for the flourishing of Catholic, Marianist education at the University of Dayton.

1. Significant contributions to major curricular-revision efforts must be recognized and rewarded appropriately in **annual performance reviews** if faculty commitment to these efforts is to be sustained for the long term. Significant faculty involvement in experiential, inquiry-based learning outside the classroom and the integration of co-curricular activities with the curriculum should also be recognized and rewarded in annual merit reviews.
2. **Reviews for tenure and promotion** likewise must give appropriate recognition to significant faculty contributions to major curricular revisions. This does not mean that

standing responsibilities of tenure-line faculty members to be active and productive scholars and contributing members of their departmental, university, and professional communities should diminish. Rather, significant contributions to curriculum revision and co-curricular planning must be supported generously (e.g., through course releases or summer salary) so that faculty working toward tenure or promotion have sufficient time and receive due recognition for such activities.

3. **Faculty workload expectations** may need to be revised in light of the demands imposed by the initiation of major pilot projects in the curriculum and co-curriculum.

VI.G. Implications for resources and coordination

The recommendations presented in this report carry substantial implications for university resources. If these recommendations are to be implemented effectively, the University will need to consider reallocation of current resources and major investment of new resources. The Working Group's study of the history of the current General Education Program revealed that, according to key faculty and administrative advocates for the program, the resources needed for the program to reach and sustain over time its full potential were never realized. Future work on the common academic program should benefit from the lessons of this history.

1. Effective multi- or interdisciplinary curriculum development and teaching, integration of curricular and co-curricular learning, creation of new seminars, and the development of innovative pedagogies suited to these projects will require increased **budgetary support** for new full-time faculty lines and for faculty development, as well as for expanded support staff in such critical areas as service learning, international and intercultural learning, and Residence Education.
2. **Budget models**, including means of accounting for delivery of student credit hours, will need to be revised in order not merely to permit but also facilitate faculty collaboration across departments, programs, and academic units. Many promising collaborative initiatives in the past have died in their early stages because of the inflexibility of current budget models.
3. Funding for effective **coordination** of pilot programs and their eventual full-scale implementation will also be required. The work of coordinating programs of the proposed nature and scale will need to be performed collaboratively by faculty members, staff, and administrators alike. Coordination of these programs with other University initiatives will be important and may also require additional resources.