

Chair Roegner, Vice Chair Cirino, Ranking Member Ingram, and members of the Senate Higher Education Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding SB 1. My name is Kim Bartley. My background includes being a university lecturer, a former Chief Marketing Officer, a volunteer on various community boards, a mother, wife and a grandmother. My education includes an undergraduate degree in Communications from Marywood University and an MBA from The Ohio State University. I am retired and for the past 9 years, I have been a lecturer at a state university. I intend to present points of view regarding the proposals outlined for your consideration before voting on SB 1.

I believe in solutions. The question is how we arrive at the objectives for the solutions so they can be measured and continually improved. Since objectives are not stated, but implied, my observations and suggestions are based on assumptions as to the intent. My personal decision-making process for recommendations is analysis, research and collaboration with a variety of opinions and debate.

I acknowledge that I am not qualified to discuss all aspects as I am neither full time lecturer nor tenured, nor an administrator who can address the challenges presented to them in carrying out the proposals, so others can address those issues and concerns. I am here to clarify, I hope, what we do as educators in universities and colleges as the bill seems to present some misconceptions about us and the students. These thoughts are based on my personal experience with about 900 students over the time I've taught. As with most of us, a LinkedIn or Google search will give you more detail.

First, students coming into universities should not be underestimated in their abilities to form their own opinions. Studies show that open and safe environments with the opportunity to

debate and learn from others are essential. My class is designed to encourage exploration of various processes and procedures in managing a system, as well as adapting and developing systems. Since today's work is comprised of many different systems, I require students compare a variety of systems and ask them to come to their own conclusions. I enjoy reading their thoughts. I use it to develop students' confidence to be able to articulate their own thinking. SB1 tends to suggest that parents and students are unable to choose for themselves and that a law is needed to govern their intellectual curiosity. SB1 implies by the manner it presents the changes that parents, the community and K-12 education are not doing their jobs and adding a class in American Civics at the college level is the solution.

Specifically, suggesting we need a class as defined in SB 1 for Civics and American history. A search online answers that question on Department of Education and Workforce website as it states that to graduate from high school "Students must include a ½ unit of American history and ½ unit of American government". This additional requirement would be a waste of money for students and their families to pay for at the university level and is redundant. In another area, the SB 1 bill suggests that syllabi aren't available, yet a review of Rule 3357:15-13-35 Course syllabus for universities includes that information i.e. faculty name, class purpose, contact information etc. is standardized already and available, usually in advance, and required by law already to be presented to students on day one of the class.

What is confusing to me is that students are considered adults at the age of 18 according to Ohio law so what is SB1 purpose or objective of these thoughts in SB1? Universities already have ways for students to critique faculty and even issue complaints. Today's students easily navigate websites and use the tools designed to support their academic life and it would seem these are redundant 'needs' in this legislation. I am confident that review of the public institutions would provide you with the evidence of this as well. If the concern is for students under 18, then perhaps

that should be presented as to those under 18 and their guardians, to clarify the audience this bill is concerned.

Finally, as someone who worked with a variety of companies, leading many different teams, continual education and foundational education work together to build a great place, like Ohio, to work and live.

In conclusion, if an assignment was given to a student about SB1, I would include several standards – research or data which they attribute to their recommendations, a set of objectives expected to be achieved by these changes and what of this research supported their opinions and their conclusions.

Therefore, I suggest the following recommendations as a course of action to “The Advance Ohio Higher Education Act”. I propose what is needed is more rigor around a process for improving, continually, our higher education using the 5-year timelines for reports but conduct more analysis and gather data for that 5-year timeline and policy change proposals. So, I propose the following.

Objective one: Identify and then, if necessary, improve the current university policies with regard to complaints from students and faculty.

Objective two: Identify what improvements are needed for the current methods of communicating course requirements and educational rigor i.e. syllabus.

Objective three: Review the current High School requirement for American civics and history and adapt that curriculum to reflect what is in this bill.

Objective four: Create a 5-year review plan to continually update and evaluate the quality of the higher education within Ohio Institutions through a task force to work together and collaborate on

objectives, measures and actions which will advance higher education. Ask business leaders, faculty and students to present you with proposals that have been researched and are based on research and study of the problems which this document doesn't articulate but infers.

Based on my assessment, feedback and proposal, I encourage you to vote "NO" on SB 1.