

Testimony of Jill Clark, PhD, MS

Before the Senate Higher Education Committee
Senator Kristina Roegner, Chair

February 9, 2025

Chair Roegner, Vice Chair Cirino, Ranking Member Ingram, and Members of the Higher Education Committee:

My name is Jill Clark, and I am a professor of Public Affairs at Ohio State University, where I have taught for thirteen years. I am also the Director of Undergraduate Studies for our college. I do not represent Ohio State University, but rather am submitting testimony as a private citizen in opposition to Senate Bill (SB) 1.

I find many of the provisions in Senate Bill 1 to be problematic, including unfunded mandates, administrative micro-managing, and inefficiencies resulting from duplication of systems already in place. Here I will review just a few reasons for my opposition. Our college already has in place an evaluation system. It is already common practice that educational units at universities have in place a process for evaluating teaching that is tailored to that unit, including peer review. Every semester, I am part of a team that personally reads all student feedback and peer reviews of our instructors and determines courses of action to address issues that arise with faculty instruction. Therefore, the unnecessary redundancy and micromanagement imposed by SB 1 will impose an administrative burden on universities, colleges, and individual units already accomplishing the task of teaching evaluation, while simultaneously requiring each of these levels of governance to incur a financial burden to create these additional administrative processes. As such, **I request the committee to modify the provision around evaluation section, allowing boards of trustees to maintain or modify existing current evaluation systems.**

Next, I request the committee **remove the section on degree program elimination, which contains arbitrary metrics, and replace it with a proposal to study the issue.** I already conduct an annual review process that assesses all our degree programs. This process, again, is tailored to our unit.

Lastly, our college already provides students with model course syllabi. Requiring our unit to post individual syllabi that already use our model is yet another unfunded mandate and essentially duplicates our efforts since individual courses already use our model syllabi. Further, posting of detailed syllabi brings intellectual property rights into question. Therefore, **I request the committee modify SB 1 to allow for the posting of model or general syllabi.**

In closing, I am fortunate to chair our undergraduate curriculum committee, serving alongside students, faculty, and staff who are dedicated to our educational mission. **I invite any Members of the Higher Education Committee to join me during our curricular meetings to see our effective and transparent processes in action and to ask questions.** Moreover, I would be happy to take any Members of the Higher Education Committee through the onboarding process I use for new students, faculty, and staff who are joining our curricular committee. Onboarding establishes the purpose of our curricular committee and introduces members to our process. Again, the provisions related to teaching evaluations, degree assessment, and posting of detailed syllabi are only some of the reasons I strongly oppose SB 1. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.