

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE *of* DENVER
Academic and Student Affairs Subcommittee
Wednesday, May 18, 2011
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
CN 301

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Approval of March 16 Academic & Student Affairs Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

III. ACTION ITEMS

- a. *Handbook for Professional Personnel* Proposed Revisions:
 - i. Faculty Evaluation Revision – Section V – Vicki Golich
 - ii. Full-time Non-Tenure Line Faculty Revision - Section IV.G.1.b. – Vicki Golich
 - iii. Appendix A Revision – Theatre – Joan Foster
 - iv. Appendix A Revision – Art – Joan Foster
- b. Plus/Minus Grading – Kamran Sahami

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. Franchise Ownership Program Internal Structure – Mick Jackowski
- b. Committee Charges
 - i. ASA Subcommittee – Michelle Lucero
 - ii. Meeting times – Michelle Lucero

V. REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

VI. FEEDBACK ON MEETING

- a. Did we cover the agenda items?
- b. What should the chairperson do more (or less) of?
- c. What can we do differently at future meetings to improve effectiveness for you?
- d. What two things do we need to pay more attention to?

VII. ADJOURNMENT

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE of DENVER
Academic Affairs and Student Services Subcommittee
Wednesday, March 16, 2011
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
CN 301

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m.

Board of Trustees Present:

Trustee Antonio Esquibel, Trustee Michelle Lucero, Faculty Trustee Hal Nees, Student Trustee Kat Cammack

Metro State Personnel Present:

Stephen Jordan, President; Luis Torres, Deputy Provost; Sheila Thompson, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs; Judi Diaz Bonacquisti, Associate Vice President, Student Services; Loretta Martinez, General Counsel; Joan L. Foster, Dean, School of Letters, Arts & Sciences; Kathy Heyl, Acting Dean, School of Professional Studies; John Cochran, Dean, School of Business; Bruce Morgeneegg, Associate Dean, School of Professional Studies; Rae Shevalier, Associate Dean, School of Letters, Arts & Sciences; Linda Lang-Peralta, Associate Dean, School of Letters, Arts & Sciences; Art Campa, Associate Dean, School of Letters, Arts & Sciences; Ali Thobhani, Executive Director International Studies & Interim Chair of African & African American Studies; Mark Potter, Director, Center for Faculty Development; Antonio Bellisario, Assistant Professor, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences Department; Renée Ruderman, Associate Professor, English Department; Cindy Carlson, Chair, English Department; Robin Quizar, Professor, English Department; Clay Daughtrey, Chair, Marketing Department; Scott Sherwood, Professor, Marketing Department; Marilyn (Cookie) Hetzel, Chair, Theatre Department; Megan Euler, Production Manager, Theatre Department; John Dienhart, Chair, Hospitality, Tourism & Events Management; Nicole Taylor, Paralegal to General Counsel & Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trustees.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Approval of January 19 and November 17 Academic Affairs & Student Services Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

1. Minutes from November 17, 2010 – approved
2. Minutes from January 19, 2010 - approved

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. Global Environmental Field Problems Study Abroad Course– Ali Thobhani

1. Dr. Thobhani introduced Professor Bellisario from the Earth & Atmospheric Sciences Department and complimented him for taking the initiative to create this course on the global environmental field problems in Chile. The course focuses on environmental issues and runs from the end of July through the beginning of August. The goal is to introduce environmental issues and field techniques to the students.
 - Trustee Nees recommended approval by the Board of Trustees.

b. Theatre Program Fee Request – Joan Foster

1. Dean Joan Foster introduced Marilyn (Cookie) Hetzel, Chair of the Theatre Department, and Megan Euler, Production Manager. The fee request to increase the program fee was posted on the department call board, in classes and on the department FaceBook page. All responses were to approve the fee increase. Chair Hetzel only wants to charge course fees that meet the needs of the students.
 2. The department currently has approximately \$3,300 in expendables such as materials and supplies, but the needs are growing. The fee increase would add another \$3,000 to the program fee budget.
 - Trustee Nees recommended that the Program Fee Request for the Theatre Department go forward for approval to the Board of Trustees.
- c. Linguistics major – Joan Foster**
1. Dean Joan Foster introduced the English Department Chair, Cindy Carlson, who explained that there are only two Linguistic programs in the state; Metro State and CU Boulder. The program is filling a gap and is not redundant since it strengthens the students for a masters program. The coursework for two separate minors have been combined to become a major; the major will not require new resources, but will utilize the existing courses. The program was lauded for implementing the feedback that they received throughout the curriculum process.
 - Trustee Nees moved to recommend approval of the Linguistics major to the Board of Trustees
- d. Behavioral Sciences 2 Concentration – Joan Foster**
1. The Sociology, Anthropology and Behavioral Science Department is proposing a new concentration that will focus on serving students pursuing elementary education teacher licensure. Faculty in the Sociology, Anthropology and Behavioral Science Department collaborated with the faculty in the Teacher Education program to develop this new concentration. It has been modified to increase rigor and stay current with the Colorado state licensure standards.
 - Trustee Nees moved, Trustee Lucero seconded, to recommend approval of the Behavioral Sciences 2 Concentration to the Board of Trustees.
Approved.
- e. Sport Industry Operations Certificate – Kathy Heyl**
1. Acting Dean Kathy Heyl introduced RuthAnn Nyhus, Chair of Human Performance & Sport who explained that the Certificate proposal was created out of student and industry demand; it is a 21 hour certificate, which is another option for people in the business-end of sports. Examples of jobs would be in marketing, sales, operations; mostly in professional sports. This gives students a specialization.
 - Trustee Nees moved, Trustee Lucero seconded the motion to recommend approval of the Sport Industry Operations Certificate to the Board of Trustees. - Approved
- f. Tourism Management Concentration – Kathy Heyl**
1. Acting Dean Kathy Heyl, introduced John Dienhart, Chair of Hospitality, Tourism & Events who explained the history of the change in the Tourism and Events concentration. The tourism association is establishing industry standards. There has

been substantial change in the areas of ecotourism and sustainability and substantial growth in the events management area. Splitting the current Tourism and Events concentrations into two separate concentrations will more effectively meet the needs of students entering the tourism and events industries. The new concentration meets the industry's request for students entering the job market.

2. Dr. Dienhart explained the HTE degree which consists of 39 hours of core courses with a 20-24 credit hour concentration in hotel, restaurant, tourism or events. Students decide which concentration they would like to pursue. Some students minor in marketing or the social sciences.
3. There are approximately 50 students in the Tourism major with 150 in the Events major. There is currently one full time faculty member and four industry people that come in to teach courses.
 - Trustee Lucero moved, Trustee Nees seconded the motion to recommend approval of the Tourism major to the Board of Trustees. Approved.
4. Trustee Lucero asked if the committee could supply a description of majors, minors, concentrations and certificates for board members.
 - A list of definitions of major, minor, concentration and certificate will be added to the next subcommittee agenda as an information item.

g. Events Management Concentration – Kathy Heyl

1. Trustee Lucero motioned, Trustee Nees seconded the motion to recommend approval of the Events Management Concentration to the Board of Trustees. – Approved.

h. Sales Certificate – John Cochran

1. Dean John Cochran introduced Professor Scott Sherwood, Marketing Department, who explained that the Sales Certificate program was developed as an outreach program for the community. The program provides a niche that is missing for professionals and in the teaching of marketing students.
2. Professor Clay Daughtrey developed a well-thought out program that has enhanced the marketing degree to provide certification for people that already have the degree. There is a demand within the industry for sales people that are prepared for sales before they are hired.
3. It costs \$100,000 to hire a sales person; \$50,000 of that goes into training wherein only 50% are retained. Many companies recruit on campuses for marketing students that have a sales minor/certificate or major. There are 2,000 specifically trained students competing for 2 million sales jobs. Metro State would be the only program within the region. No additional faculty resources would be required.
2. Trustee Nees motioned, Trustee Lucero seconded the motion to recommend approval of the Sales Certificate Program to the Board of Trustees. – Approved

i. Sabbatical Leave Recommendations – Luis Torres

1. Dr. Luis Torres, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs, informed the committee that the application process for sabbatical leave for the 2011-2012 year has closed. There are eight sabbatical requests for Dr. Jordan to review. Seven faculty were granted sabbatical leave this year, and the Provost is recommending eight faculty for next year.

Each professor can choose one semester at full pay or the full academic year at half pay.

2. Faculty is encouraged to apply for extra funds to cover the cost of materials or travel. This year there are extra requests in the amount of \$18,000 for travel and supplies. There are five faculty from LAS and three faculty from the School of Business that have been recommended for sabbaticals. Many of the projects are already in progress; the faculty need time to focus on their projects. A sabbatical can be career changing for the faculty member.
3. Professor Renée Ruderman gave an overview of her sabbatical in Germany where she was invited to teach, continue her research on her German background, and write poetry. She has co-authored an article about her experience in Berlin. There has been a tremendous impact on her teaching, research and Metro's international reputation resulting from her sabbatical. Affiliate faculty usually substitute in the courses where a faculty member is out on sabbatical. Faculty may apply for a sabbatical every seven years and the application numbers are limited.
3. This report was moved to be an information item so Dr. Jordan can review the sabbatical information prior to it going to the board.

IV. REPORTS

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. General Studies Update – Joan Foster

1. The board had requested regular updates on the General Studies Program revisions. Dean Joan Foster reviewed the timeline that detailed the General Studies activities and communications by semesters.
2. The Task Force is working on policy development and proposals for General Studies. Workshops are available so the faculty is aware of how to make the proposals. The Task Force should be done with their work by the end of this semester. Members of the Task Force are available to meet with faculty one-on-one when they are writing a proposal. Dr. Foster has requested the Chairs in LAS to submit their proposals by the end of this semester.
3. The Curriculum Guidelines and Procedure, the "Purple Book," which is the handbook on how curriculum is proposed, will be updated. Dr. Foster will draft the materials explaining the guidelines.
4. The requirements will be "Banner enforced" with the catalog year and registration holds. Junior and Senior students are currently being strongly encouraged into their math courses, which will open up seats to first-year students and sophomores in the future.
 - It was the consensus of the committee to forward the General Studies Update to the Board of Trustees as an information item.

b. Faculty Evaluation Task Force Update -- Mark Potter

1. Dr. Mark Potter, Director, Center for Faculty Development, reported on the Faculty Evaluation Task Force, chaired by Provost Vicki Golic. Information that was given as a presentation to the Faculty Senate was included in the Agenda. The Task Force has

- presented to the Faculty Senate five times, keeping them updated on their progress and benefiting from their feedback.
2. The Task Force currently has placed the focus of their efforts on the pre-tenure stage of faculty evaluation; a standard candidate would apply for tenure and promotion in the sixth year of their career at Metro State. The approach is heading towards a portfolio process instead of the current dossier process. Faculty will “put their best foot forward” by selecting materials for review that feature their most significant accomplishments. Pre-tenure faculty will be evaluated every year, but the committee is moving away from annual evaluations for tenured faculty.
 3. The Task Force is recommending moving away from evaluations in the calendar year, moving to the academic year evaluations in their place. Faculty is currently evaluated twice in a disconnected evaluation system. Dossiers are currently submitted in years two and six with annual evaluations in February that follow the calendar year that are misaligned with the academic year process.
 4. The recommendation is to have three areas of evaluation – teaching, scholarly activities and service. Academic advising would become part of the teaching evaluation. The Task Force recommended that the college move forward with a pilot, online system (Digital Measures) for faculty to submit documents where they can be stored for future use. Faculty will submit their curriculum vitae and their Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI) every year for the reviewers to view their progress. The faculty will choose their best materials for review, but must have something to present in each category. The Task Force is working on establishing a maximum number of documents that a faculty can include in the portfolio.
 5. Trustee Nees commented that online courses are an ongoing problem for student ratings; there is always a very low response rate. The Task Force is not including those ratings with ratings for the face-to-face courses. They are working on finding a solution to mitigate the problem.
 6. The Faculty Senate RTP committee will be involved in years three and six. Dr. Jordan explained that the emphasis on the third year is because our current process of evaluating a faculty member in their fourth year is too late for any changes to take effect. If corrective action is necessary, it is too late for professional development. The current process of evaluation in the faculty member’s second year is too early to give constructive feedback. The new process will provide better feedback and decisions. Next year, faculty in their sixth year of teaching at Metro will remain on the dossier process.
 7. The goal of the Task Force is to have the new plan implemented in Fall 2011 for the submission of portfolios and utilizing the online tool. The existing department guidelines will stay the same during the revision; departmental guidelines will be revised for the spring of 2012 semester.
 8. Dr. Luis Torres explained that the dossiers are stored in one room; the reviewers have to come to campus to read them on the weekends. Digital Measures will allow flexibility for the reviewers to read the portfolios at home or in their office. Dr. Potter pointed out that there will be a shift in assembling materials for the faculty member;

there won't be the page numbers and table formatting that is currently a large burden in assembling the dossier.

c. Quick Start program report -- Judi Diaz-Bonacquisti

1. Associate Vice President, Judi Diaz Bonaquisti, updated the committee on the pilot program with Community College of Denver (CCD). Metro State has many students with remedial needs. CCD has created accelerated courses for Metro students that allow them to catch up in a semester; which allows the students to advance more quickly with less expense.
2. There were 65 students in the pilot with very successful results. Eighty percent of the students that participated in the Metro-only cohorts registered to come back to Metro in the spring. There are fewer new students in the Spring semester; the same amount of sections have been requested from CCD for next Fall semester.
3. A consultant will be brought in to provide more targeted information. This is a promising pilot that is closing the achievement gap for many students. They plan to add math cohorts in the future. It is not Metro State's mission to provide the remedial courses; it is better for the student to be in an environment with the support that they need.
4. Trustee Nees pointed out that Metro students are embarrassed to admit that they are taking classes at the community college. Dr. Jordan suggested that the right strategy might be to offer the mid-level courses with a fee for support services.

VI. REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

VII. FEEDBACK ON MEETING

- a. Did we cover the agenda items?
- b. What should the chairperson do more (or less) of?
- c. What can we do differently at future meetings to improve their effectiveness for you?
- d. What two things do we need to pay more attention to?

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The committee adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM III.a.i. **Revisions to Faculty Evaluation – Section V of the *Handbook for Professional Personnel***

BACKGROUND:

At the 2009 Board of Trustees Retreat, the Trustees granted Provost Golich a two year time period to engage in a substantial revision of Metro State's faculty evaluation system. All indicators pointed to the fact that it was badly broken and needed to be revised to align more closely with best practices – based on research – across the country. A task force representing all tenure-line faculty ranks and reviewer levels was convened in late 2009 and has been working on a plan for this revision ever since. Although the task force has not completed the entirety of its work, it has completed the most complex and difficult part of the process – the review and evaluation of tenure-track faculty during their first six years as they move toward their candidacy for tenure. We have already begun the work, based on these changes in the evaluation for tenure, to revise the evaluation for promotions and post-tenure review. Our last task will be to address Department Chair evaluations. The task force made presentations as the proposed changes were being developed at Faculty Senate meetings; the principles and conceptual ideas have also been presented at the Board of Trustees 2010 Retreat and at subsequent meetings of the Finance and Academic and Student Affairs Committees. It also submitted the changes in Section V of the *Handbook for Professional Personnel* for full vetting by General Counsel and discussion with the Deans and with the President. Finally, the changes were put to a vote of all tenure-line faculty; that vote yielded 265 votes – over half of the tenure-line faculty; of these 222 (83.8%) voted in favor of the changes, and 43 (16.2%) voted against. The *Handbook* committee met and voted in favor of the changes.

RECOMMENDATION:

We now seek review and approval by the Academic and Student Affairs Board of Trustees Committee. The proposed changes are attached. The following describes the key changes made; the revisions are attached:

1. Faculty members will submit a Portfolio rather than a Dossier for review and evaluation. Portfolios permit individuals to put their best case forward, whereas Dossiers require everyone to submit the same materials.
2. The contractual obligations language has been moved from this section as we all agreed this belongs some place else.
3. The criteria have changed from four areas – teaching, advising, professional development, and service – to three areas – teaching, scholarly activities, and service; advising has been moved into teaching per definitions in section E.1.a. These three areas are

carefully defined in section E. In addition, we have included an “Other” section because we know that many tenure-track faculty do engage in other kinds of significant work, including, but not limited to, service as Department Chairs and Directors of various units.

4. Portfolios are to include the following:
 - a. A single Narrative statement, “which presents a reflective self-assessment, highlights accomplishments, and indicates plans for the future” vs. multiple, one-page descriptions of work accomplished.
 - b. An annotated *Curriculum Vitae* that provides brief explanations of work completed or underway, as well as links to relevant items when possible vs. a simple *Curriculum Vitae* where items are only listed.
 - c. All Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI) vs. all Student Evaluations of Teaching. The task force wholly revised and upgraded the SRIs based on the research literature (*see attached*).
 - d. All previous review letters and any relevant responses by the faculty member.
 - e. All reassigned time evaluations and reports (if relevant).
 - f. Additional materials for review. In years three and six, faculty members may now choose four-to-nine items, two of which must be from the Teaching category and one each from the Scholarly Activities and Service categories vs. being required to include all documentation.
 - g. Faculty members must include one summative Peer Observation vs. Peer Observations of 50% plus one of all courses taught. The Peer Observation must be conducted by a trained faculty member vs. being conducted by untrained faculty members.
5. Annual reviews of tenure-track faculty take place on the Academic Year vs. the calendar year, and they are cumulative reviews building toward tenure candidacy vs. one-year snapshots of accomplishments. Please see the attached matrix to see who will be involved in the reviews and what it to be included in each Portfolio.
6. The review cycle is moving from one where the 2nd and 4th years were high stakes reviews in addition to the 6th year to one where the 3rd year review will be the only pre-tenure candidacy high stakes review. This will allow candidates to do what is needed to earn tenure, whereas a 4th year problematic review does not really provide a candidate enough time to do what is needed to earn tenure.

7. It is clearly stated in Section D.8. that the President may extend a faculty member's probationary period toward tenure in the case of extenuating circumstances.
8. Departmental Guidelines will still refine the criteria for performance in each area as determined by disciplinary standards. However, they will now be written as Guidelines geared toward attaining tenure vs. Guidelines for single year performance. These Guideline revisions should be completed by the end of the 2011 calendar year.
9. At the level of the Department, review committees are now defined as "Department/Peer Review Committee"; this is to ensure that, in cases where there are not enough tenured faculty to constitute a minimum Department Committee of three persons, the Department can look to cognate disciplines to constitute a Peer Review Committee.

Review Process for Reappointment and Tenure

	Reviewers	Materials for review*
Late Spring 1 st Year	Chair Dean Provost [†] President [†]	Annotated <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>
Fall 2 nd Year	Chair Dean Provost President [†]	Annotated <i>Curriculum Vitae</i> All Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) Narrative Statement, 1-3 pages Review Letters from Year One
Fall 3rd Year	Department/Peer Review Committee Chair School RTP Committee Dean Faculty Senate (College) RTP Committee Provost President	<i>Annotated Curriculum Vitae</i> All Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) Narrative, 2-5 pages All previous review letters and responses All reassigned time evaluations and reports Additional materials for review (minimum of 4, maximum of 9)
Fall 4 th Year	Chair Dean Provost [†] President [†]	Annotated <i>Curriculum Vitae</i> All Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) All previous review letters and responses Documentation addressing progress on areas of concern, if necessary
Fall 5 th Year	Chair Dean Provost President [†]	Annotated <i>Curriculum Vitae</i> All Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) All previous review letters and responses Documentation addressing progress on areas of concern, if necessary
Fall 6th Year	Department/Peer Review Committee Chair School RTP Committee Dean Faculty Senate (College) RTP Committee Provost President	<i>Annotated Curriculum Vitae</i> All Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) Narrative, 3-8 pages All previous review letters and responses All reassigned time evaluations and reports Additional materials for review (minimum of 4, maximum of 9)

NOTES:

*Additional materials can be requested by any level of review

[†] Only if a non-retention recommendation

AGENDA ITEM III.a.ii: **Clarifying Language for Full-time Non-Tenure Track Line Faculty – Section IV.G.1.b. of the *Handbook for Professional Personnel***

BACKGROUND:

Current *Handbook* language provides vague language describing this category of faculty. They are distinguished from Category I faculty, who are tenure-line, and from Category III faculty, who are part-time. In recent years, Metro State has commonly referred to all Category II faculty members as “Visiting Faculty,” a practice which does not align with the norm at institutions of higher education where Visiting Faculty is a title reserved for faculty members, who really are serving the institution for a defined time, typically limited to no more than two years.

The new language delineates eight different designations of Category II faculty and carefully articulates roles and responsibilities for each:

1. Visiting Faculty;
2. Professional-, Executive-, Artist-, Musician-in-Residence;
3. Lecturer;
4. Senior Lecturer (typically distinguished from Lecturer by years of service);
5. FRIP (Faculty Recruitment Incentive Program) Lecturers;
6. Research Faculty (supported by external grants);
7. Clinical Faculty (typically found in Nursing and Teacher Education); and
8. Other.

A second key element of this *Handbook* language change is that Lecturer and Senior Lecturer workloads are now shifted from 4/4 to “5/5 teaching; recommend no more than three preparations per semester and no expectation of scholarly activities other than that related to maintaining currency in discipline, *or* 4/4 teaching load with service and scholarly activities,” the latter to be negotiated with Department Chairs in consultation with School Deans.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend approval; document attached.

Section IV.G.1.

a. Category II Faculty

- (1) Category II faculty members are employees at will, in accordance with state law (Section 24-19-101 et seq, Colorado Revised Statutes). As such, their employment may be terminated at any time without prior notice, in the discretion of the President.
- (2) Category II faculty members may be temporary or ongoing, full time or part time employees. They may hold honorary academic rank and perform instructional and advising duties similar to Category I faculty, in addition to a variety of other duties, including administration. However, Category II faculty members are not eligible to be considered for or awarded tenure or promotion in academic rank.
- (3) Category II faculty employment provides the College with the flexibility to design faculty positions with combinations of duties and qualifications that are outside the traditional limitations imposed by the need to earn and retain tenure.
- (4) Category II faculty provide the College with the ability to appoint to instructional positions, and compensate appropriately, people whose qualifications to teach may not specifically meet the academic requirements that apply to Category I and Category III faculty members. Examples include, but are not limited to the following: Experienced and accomplished practitioners in the many fields where they can appropriately enrich the academic experience of our students and provide a link to the work communities they represent; recent graduates of doctoral programs, seeking experience and opportunity; or faculty whose program or grant requires service for more than the calendar year. The following descriptions of appropriate titles and workload are intended to capture the wide range of Category II faculty designations and duties:
 - (a) **Visiting Faculty** with rank determined by Appendix A degree level considerations, years of service, and academic accomplishments.
 - (i) Temporary appointment for exchange scholars or national or international scholars on leaves from their home institution or for recently retired scholars from other institutions of higher education who become available for one semester or one academic year. Rank determined by rank at home institution.
 - (ii) Temporary appointment to fill a vacancy in open tenure-line.
 - (iii) Duties: negotiated but, teaching default is 4/4; other assignments as needed may be appropriate.
 - (b) **Professional in residence, executive in residence, artist in residence, musician in residence or other title created by negotiation and tailored to unique qualifications of candidate.** May be ongoing or temporary, above, to take advantage of short term availability of nationally or internationally known expert or practitioner.

- (i) Used to recruit and/or retain candidates with exceptional practical experience who may or may not have usual terminal degree qualifications.
- (ii) Renewable yearly based on performance evaluation.
- (iii) Duties: negotiated but normal 4/4 teaching with service to college and community expectations.
- (iv) Criteria:
 - (a) Currency in discipline;
 - (b) PD support at chair and dean discretion.
- (c) **Lecturer** - Category II full time position for a faculty member who has credentials, which, at a minimum, meet Appendix A Instructor requirements.
 - (i) Generally for use in departments with high service teaching loads; position primarily devoted to teaching multiple sections of lower-division or introductory courses.
 - (a) Positions depend on available funding.
 - (b) This type of category II appointment is intended to increase full time coverage above the targeted 60% T/TT coverage target.
 - (ii) Duties:
 - (a) 5/5 teaching; recommend no more than three preparations per semester and no expectation of scholarly activities other than that related to maintaining currency in discipline, *or* 4/4 teaching load with service and scholarly activities;
 - (b) Scholarly activity support at chair and dean discretion.
- (d) **Senior lecturer** – Category II full time position for a faculty member who has credentials, which, at a minimum meet Appendix A Assistant Professor requirements.
 - (i) May be used to fill a potential TT line especially under tight budget conditions
 - (a) Positions depend on available funding
 - (b) This type of Category II appointment is usually intended to increase full time coverage above the targeted 60% T/TT coverage target.
 - (ii) Duties:

- (a) 5/5 teaching; recommend no more than three preparations per semester and no expectation of scholarly activities other than that related to maintaining currency in discipline, *or* 4/4 teaching load with service and scholarly activities;
- (b) Scholarly activity support at chair and dean discretion.
- (iii) **Lecturers** with a total of six years (at least three of which must have been consecutive and at least one of which must have been within 18 months of the senior lecturer appointment) of exemplary service to Metro State at that rank, may be reappointed as a Senior Lecturer, based on a recommendation from department faculty, the department chair, the dean and the provost. If promoted to a Senior Lecturer, the salary will be adjusted to reflect the new title.
- (e) **FRIP (Faculty Recruitment Incentive Program) Lecturers** – Category II full time position created to help encourage the attainment of the two major objectives of the MSCD Affirmative Action program:
 - (i) The fostering of a multicultural campus and the appreciation of diversity; and
 - (ii) The improvement of employment opportunities for all underrepresented faculty.
 - (iii) Special Conditions:
 - (a) Before a FRIP appointment can be made, there must be a tenure-track position available and allocated by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
 - (b) As with all temporary faculty appointments, only the President is authorized to offer a contract.
 - (c) FRIP participants will be a *temporary term appointment for one academic year*. Subsequent term appointments are subject to the absolute discretion of the College.
 - (d) A FRIP candidate must have a minimum of a master's degree or the equivalent in the appropriate field of study, and must be able to demonstrate admission to an accredited terminal degree or doctoral program in that field. Strong preference will be given to those applicants who have achieved candidacy at their doctoral institutions, i.e., those who have passed comprehensive/preliminary examinations and completed all required course work, leaving only dissertation requirements to meet in order to receive the Ph.D.
 - (iv) Duties: 3/3 teaching load and progress toward degree. Performance of FRIP employees will be evaluated. Teaching effectiveness and progress towards

the degree will be assessed among other factors including currency in discipline.

- (v) Academic Development Awards provide financial support up to a maximum of \$10,000, over a maximum period of five (5) years to cover reimbursement for tuition and fees, dissertation expenses, and/or other incidental expenses associated with the completion of a participant's terminal degree requirements and/or other academic special conditions as defined in the participant's employment contracts. This award limit will not include the cost of any equipment assigned to the FRIP participant. Other PD support at chair and dean discretion. The \$10,000 does not apply to reassigned time; the latter is part of the instructional workload assignment.
- (f) **Research Faculty** – hired via grant or other “soft” funding (e.g., contracts)
 - (i) Duties determined by the grant
- (g) **Clinical Faculty** – (NOTE: As with Section 2 above, which describes a range of “Professional in Residence” kinds of Category II faculty, the title of “Clinical Faculty” is intended to be flexible enough to apply to a variety of disciplines where this time of “field supervision faculty” are the norm – e.g., nursing, teacher education, social work, etc.). Thus, clinical faculty titles are designed to comply with criteria defined by accreditation associations, such as the Colorado State Board of Nursing (CSBN).
- (h) **Other:** Special cases where duties, compensation, and title are mutually determined by contract. Should be rare, and tied to providing the College flexibility to design faculty positions with combinations of duties and qualifications that are outside the traditional limitations imposed by the need to earn and retain tenure. Such positions can also be instructional positions that meet special needs of the college or for people whose qualifications to teach may not specifically meet the academic requirements that apply to Category I and Category III faculty members. Example: Bill Gates desires to teach CIS or CS or business leadership courses.
- (5) Category II faculty members may apply for Category I vacancies as they arise. These applications will be considered on their merits, under the same criteria as all applicants.
- (6) **Recommended Full Time Faculty Deployment** – of the 60% Full Time Faculty,
 - (a) No more than 10% should be Lecturers/Senior Lecturers
 - (b) No more than 10% should be Visiting Faculty
 - (c) A minimum of 80% should be Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty

AGENDA ITEM III.a.iii.: Appendix A Change for Theatre

BACKGROUND: During the last two academic years, the theatre department has attempted to add courses in Advanced Sound, Specialty Stage Makeup, Dance for Theatre, Theatrical Projection Systems, and Theatre Business. These classes have been put on hold due to the lack of qualified candidates in the affiliate pool who have the current minimum MA degree and experience, expertise, or training in these specialty subject areas. Within the theatrical industry, these specialty areas do not require advanced degrees.

The theatre department is under review for first time accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) and many of these class offerings were discussed during the accreditors' site visit or addressed in the site visit report.

The following quote is from the National Association of Schools of Theatre Handbook and Procedures Manual. "NAST recognizes the Master of Fine Arts as the appropriate terminal degree for performance, design/technology, and playwriting faculty. At the same time, the Association recognizes that some highly qualified artist-teachers may hold other academic degrees; others may not hold any academic degrees. In such cases, the institution should base appointments on experience, training, and expertise at least equivalent to those required for the master's degree in the appropriate field."

The current policy does not allow us to hire highly experienced and qualified niche instructors for specialty courses who do not meet the current minimum degree requirements. The current requirement of a minimum MA degree is prohibitive. By creating a broader and deeper applicant pool we will be better placed to identify and hire quality candidates.

This change was initiated by Dr. Marilyn Hetzel, and vetted with Dr. Joan L Foster, Dean – School of Letters, Arts and Sciences; and National Association of Schools of Theatre Site Visitors: Dr. Robert Hansen, Associate Dean - College of Arts and Sciences, University of North Carolina at Greensboro and Dr. William J. Doan, Associate Dean - College of Arts and Architecture, Pennsylvania State University

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend approval; document attached.

Appendix A: Theatre, Page 17

Current *Handbook* language

FIELD	INSTRUCTOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
Industrial Design	B + 2	M + 4	M + 4	M + 4
Journalism	B + 6	M + 6	M + 6	M + 6
Technical Communications	B + 8	M + 6; or D	M + 6; or D	M + 6; or D
Theatre (relevant work experience must be professional)	M	MFA + 3; or M + 4; or D + 2	MFA + 4; or M + 5; or D + 3	MFA + 5; or M + 6; or D + 4
Women's Studies	M	D	D	D

Proposed new *Handbook* language:

Instructor: **B + 8**

Assistant Professor: MFA + 3; or M + 4; or D + 2

Associate Professor: MFA + 4; or M + 5; or D + 3

Professor: MFA + 5; or M + 6; or D + 4

AGENDA ITEM III.a.iv.: Appendix A Change for Art

BACKGROUND:

During AY 2009-10 a national search was conducted to hire a tenure-track faculty into the Art Education program of the Art Department. Ten applications were received. Three were qualified per current Handbook language. A hire was not made. Opening the qualifications as requested here will allow for recent graduate candidates to apply for such positions. A similar change was made in the Art History area and that in turn yielded three outstanding hires – all of whom were recent graduates, or in the process of completing dissertation.

The current policy does not allow us to be competitive in the field. The requirement of “+3” years experience is prohibitive. By creating broader and deeper applicant pools we will be better placed to identify and hire quality candidates (particularly at the start of their professional careers).

This change was initiated by Professor Greg Watts, Chair of the Art Department, and has been discussed with the following: Assistant Professor Rachael Delaney (Art Education faculty); L.A.S. Dean, Dr. Joan L. Foster; Provost/VPAA, Dr. Vicki Golich; Dr. Percy Morehouse.

RECOMMENDATION:

We recommend approval; document attached.

Appendix A: Art Education

Current *Handbook* language?

Anthropology	M	D	D	D
Art (New Media)	B + 3	M (Art) + 6 or MFA	M (Art) + 6 or MFA	M (Art) + 6 or MFA
Art Education	MA + 3; or MFA + 3	MFA + 3; or D + 3	MFA + 6; or D + 6	MFA + 10; or D + 10
Art History	M	D	D	D
Art Studio	M	MFA	MFA	MFA
Biology	M	D	D	D

Proposed New *Handbook* language:

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full
Art Education	M; MFA	ABD; MFA	D; MFA +6	D; MFA +10

AGENDA ITEM III.b: **Adoption of a Plus/Minus Grading Scheme**

BACKGROUND:

Metropolitan State College of Denver currently uses a whole-grade-only grading scheme. As described in the accompanying documents from the Faculty Senate, the faculty have long sought to adopt a more sophisticated plus/minus grading scheme that is more commonly found in four-year institutions of higher education.

The Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee conducted year-long research into adopting the new grading scheme and fully vetted the idea with the Senate and the Student Government Assembly. The Faculty Senate voted overwhelmingly to adopt this new grading scheme.

RECOMMENDATION:

We recommend approval; document attached.

FACULTY SENATE



Friday, March 18th, 2011

Dear Provost Golich,

This letter is to inform you in writing that the Metropolitan State College of Denver Faculty Senate passed the following resolution on a plus-minus grading system at its general assembly on March 16, 2011. Over the course of the academic year, the issue was vetted with the students at the college through the Student Government Assembly and with the Administration through its representatives on the Faculty Senate Academic Policies Committee. The resolution passed by a vote of 54 to 11 with no abstentions (83% in favor), which represents the largest margin in the 16-year history of this issue. The Faculty Senate looks forward to your written response to this matter.

!-

The Faculty Senate, in accordance with the preference poll of our students and the unanimous vote of support by the Student Government Assembly Legislative and Executive Branches, recommends that Metro State institute a plus/minus grading system based on the scale indicated below. Programs that currently require a C or better in a course for credit in a major would honor a C- or better for credit. Programs would have the option to revise their criteria to C, if deemed appropriate for the discipline.

Letter Grades with Decimal Equivalents:

**A+ (4.00), A(4.00), A-(3.67), B+(3.33), B (3.00), B-(2.67),
C+(2.33), C(2.00), C- (1.67), D+(1.33), D (1.00), D- (.67), F(0.00)**

-!

The Faculty Senate is committed to working with the administration in developing new protocols for shared governance and we look forward to charting the this course collectively. A brief history of the +/- issue along with the rationale behind it and the unanimously approved SGA resolution (SR 11-09), follow.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kamran Sahami
Faculty Senate President

Cc: Dr. Stephen M. Jordan, President of the Metropolitan State College of Denver
Dr. Larry Worster, Faculty Senate Vice President
Dr. Noah Fritz, Faculty Senate Secretary

History of Consideration of a Plus/Minus Grading Scheme at MSCD

Circa 1995-1996, in conjunction with a surge of nation-wide research, MSCD Faculty proposed adopting a “plus/minus” grading scheme. This was not implemented.

The Faculty Senate discussed a plus/minus grading system in October 2005. In March 2006, the MSCD Faculty Senate voted to support (33/25) a “plus/minus” grading scheme that allowed individual faculty to choose to assign plus/minus grades. Grade points corresponding to individual grades were proposed as follows:

Additionally, the motion stipulated that students would be required to have a 2.0 GPA to graduate and to maintain their academic standing with regard to financial aid, athletics, and other activities. Policies that require a “C” would differentiate between a “C” and a “C-”.

This proposal was presented to the office of the Provost and subsequently put before the President’s Cabinet. This group voted to form a task force to further study the impacts of implementing such a system. The President’s Cabinet (circa April 2006) recommended approval to implement the plus/minus grading system in Fall 2007. An administrative decision on this policy does not appear to have been made before the installation of a new Provost/Vice President, and the issue was reviewed by the (new) Provost’s office. Ultimately, this proposal did not take effect.

Arguments considered by the committee.

Proponents of plus/minus grading point to several advantages of the system. Among these are:

1. All of the other four-year-with-graduate-school institutions in Colorado use plus/minus grading. All follow the scale proposed above, with the exception that CU-Boulder has an A+ grade with associated 4.0 quality points. Of the four-year state colleges, two have whole letter grade systems. Adams State uses plus/minus grading.
2. Plus/minus grading allows for more accurate representation of students’ performance.
3. Plus/minus grading makes it easier to assign grades in borderline cases. The existing system is seen by many faculty see the current whole letter grading system too restricting.
4. Plus/minus grading may be used to reduce grade inflation. The research on this indicates that a small dip in overall college GPA of less than .05 may occur following a change, mostly to students at the very top and very bottom of the GPA range.
 - a. Current percentages:
 - i. Business: A: 24%; B: 32%; C: 21%; D: 6%; F: 7%; NC: 3%
 - ii. LAS: A: 33%; B: 27%; C: 15%; D: 5%; F: 7%; NC: 6%

iii. Prof Studies: A: 46%; B: 24%; C: 10%; D: 3%; F: 7%; NC: 3%

iv. Overall: A: 35%; B: 27%; C: 15%; D: 3%; F: 7%; NC: 3%

Source: OIR Datebook: 2006-2007

5. With plus/minus grading, students are less likely to perform “just well enough” to make an A, B, or C. The greater continuity of possible grades means that students are awarded the grades appropriate to their performance in a course.
6. A move to plus/minus grading is consistent with national trends. Over the last 40 years, institutions have move more often in this direction.

Some common objections to plus/minus grading:

1. There is no overwhelming need to change in the system.

Response: As whole grades are part of the plus-minus system faculty who have no need for pluses and minuses, or do not choose to assign pluses and minuses, can continue to give whole grades. It is important to restate that the scale for grades in a course is the prerogative of the faculty member and their respective departments. Grading in some courses may be more qualitative in nature, so that a finer distinction of grades than the existing letter grades is unnecessary.

2. The assignment of minuses can have a negative effect on minimum requirements for GPA and financial aid.

Response: It is true that a student who needs to maintain a 2.0 grade average cannot do so by consistently earning C-minuses (which would result in a grade point average of 1.67). Research shows that the GPA of students on the lower and higher ends of the grading spectrum are impacted most significantly. It seems entirely appropriate that students who are not achieving well enough would be brought to the attention of college services to help these student be successful. Students who need to maintain a B or C average would be in the population whose GPAs are not significantly impacted by the change.

3. The use of a plus/minus grading system could lower GPA's for “A” students. The concern is that top students might be less competitive than they have been for graduate school, fellowships and other achievements based on GPA.

Response: This is the flipside of arguing that plus/minus grading is potentially a tool to combat grade inflation. The effect on top students, however, is at least as likely to be positive. Top students who receive the occasional B are much more likely to benefit from the B+ grade. Also, faculty who now assign very few A's may be more willing to assign A minuses. In any case, given that all of our peer institutions use plus/minus grading, this change would increase the equity of comparisons for students from different universities.

4. The implementation of plus/minus grading will lead to more grade appeals.

Response: There is no mention of this phenomenon in the research literature.

The proposed motion is deliberately brief. An implementation schedule is not specified, so that the appropriate administrative offices will not be subjected to difficult time schedules for implementation. This will also allow sufficient time for departments, colleges, and programs to assess the effects of the changes and develop any necessary catalog changes; and administer a communication plan to the College community.

The Office of the Registrar has stated the College must have an adequate implementation timeline that includes all administrative offices, as indicated above. In addition, the new policy may have an impact on the CAPP system if the grading rules change. For example, if the recommended minimum grade of C for each course to count in an academic program remains unchanged, there will not be a major impact on the CAPP system. However, if the minimum grade changes to a C-, there will be implementation challenges regarding deferring degrees during the implementation process. Other impacts to students may include financial aid, academic standing, Veteran students, and athletes needing to meet NCAA requirements. The Registrar strongly recommends communicating this proposal to Banner Managers so that system owners can start thinking about the impact of the change.

AGENDA ITEM IV.a.: Franchise Ownership Program Internal Structure

BACKGROUND:

The Franchise Ownership Program joins investors, franchisors and entrepreneurs in a model that allows people to realize their dreams of business ownership. This initiative is the first higher education program that not only provides training for franchisees, but needed start-up capital as well.

We accomplish this goal by creating private equity funds that allow passive investment in a portfolio of franchises. These dollars are directed to individuals trained in six-week workshops by the Center for Innovation to launch their new businesses. Investors earn a return and simultaneously help people who otherwise would never become entrepreneurs if not for this program.

To enable this undertaking, a C-Corporation and related LLCs will be created under the Foundation, allowing the Foundation to maintain its non-profit status while housing a for-profit investment vehicle. The law firm of Davis, Graham, & Stubbs developed the included internal structure we will review.

AGENDA ITEM IV.b.i: Academic & Student Affairs Subcommittee Charge

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the Academic and Student Affairs committee is to review and make recommendations to the Board regarding academic and student issues, including but not limited to the addition of new academic requirements, programs, degrees, majors and fees, significant changes in policies, and other areas essential to the academic endeavor of the College and the welfare of its students. The Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs shall serve as staff to the committee.

AGENDA ITEM IV.b.ii. Academic & Student Affairs Committee Meeting Dates

BACKGROUND:

Proposed 2011- 2012 Meeting Dates

- August 31, 2011
- November 30, 2011
- February 1, 2012
- April 4, 2012
- June 6, 2012