Graduate Council
Metropolitan State University of Denver
February 25, 2016 at 11 am in SSB 324
AGENDA

Attending: Jinous Lari, Cipriana Patterson, Kim Starr, Nancy Sayer, Kevin Zeiler, Marlee Kobzej, John Hathorn, Clay Daughtrey, Nicole Vowles, Bill Gustashaw, Bernice Harris, Mike Kornelsen, Christian Itin, Paula Martinez

I. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 28, 2016**

   a. **approved**

II. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
   A. Website—stuff's up, not very pretty but getting there
   B. Research support specialist position moving to search and screen, would like a GC member, starting first week of April--John to represent
   C. MSW targeting 240 headcount for 16-17 school year
   D. Finalize Graduate Council Curriculum Committee members
      a. Joe Bailey from SWK
   E. Director of Graduate Studies search
      a. Reopened, closing on March 2

III. **OLD BUSINESS**
   A. Policy for non-degree graduate offerings
      a. Approved
      b. Marlee to add to website
   B. Policy for bankruptcy
      a. Jinous clarified that the programs are cash but our system is accrual—John to modify proposal
      b. The review of bankruptcy should not be just a review of cash but a ratio of various items
         i. Shouldn't go straight from running to bankruptcy—should have a performance improvement plan if program isn't maturing in a positive way
         ii. Budget office looks at programs every semester, if issues are indicated then discussion should take place. If after 4 cycles of no improvement then review should happen somewhere—GC, deans, provost? If there are issues, perhaps a meeting with other programs to discuss improvement plans.
            1. What happens to faculty, staff if program is determined bankrupt?
   C. Catalog wording regarding non-degree seeking admission guidelines

a. Admissions was not in favor of cutting the whole thing
b. Proposed language presented and approved. Christian to get it added to catalog.
D. Initiative to develop graduate learning outcomes - TABLED
E. Best practices regarding graduate teaching load - TABLED
F. Revision to the graduate program approval process to include wording regarding the college/school's financial responsibility
   a. Review to happen on an annual basis but payback might not have to happen until year 3
      i. i.e. end of year 1 projected to be in the hole $100,000 but it's actually $110,000—college would be responsible for the difference
         1. could come from a loan from the college, from the $1M pot from the U, etc.
         2. will review on case by case basis and make determination of where the money will come from
   b. add a general statement about being deficient and having to pay
   c. MBA and MHA grandfathered in without this
G. Proposal on profit sharing for all forms of graduate programs
   a. Determination of profit
      i. Cipriana, John and Kim to determine
   b. How is the profit to be split?
      i. Think about this and come back next time with ideas

IV.NEW BUSINESS
   A. College level tuition for non-degree offerings
      a. Each college determines its own
   B. Graduate Studies Conference – Postmortem
      a. Split into two sessions next time—those who are thinking of launching, those who already have a program
         i. Calling it something other than a conference was suggested and then gearing the topics toward specific audiences
            1. Faculty meeting
               a. Get the Center for Faculty Excellence involved
            2. Administrators meeting
      b. Thought of moving this to a monthly meetings with different topics was suggested
   C. Employee tuition assistance policy
      a. Currently, all Auraria campus employees can take 6 UG credits and tuition is waived
         i. Should this be opened up to graduate courses? Should this remain all Auraria employees or just MSU Denver employees

        b. HR is also is looking into this
    D. Online application process update
        a. no update

Budget Committee:
    1. Overhead recovery rate

REPORT OF A REQUESTED FOCUSED VISIT FOR CHANGE, Advancement Section, February 1 – 2, 2010
From page 2-3:

Because of the high likelihood that present expectations for revenue generation in the Master of Social Work may likely fall short of program expenses at the start of the program, the administration of the College and the Department have agreed to develop a plan for sustainability, which will illustrate how MSW program expenses will be met if student enrollment and retention do not start off as robustly as predicted. This alternative graduate education support plan is an important element in preparing the College to successfully launch the MSW and other graduate programs.

This institution has moved with unusual rapidity to embrace and integrate graduate education into three of its current undergraduate programs. The three new proposed master's degree programs generated considerable discussion on campus, but consensus was reached very rapidly. While the institution is commended for being nimble and responsive to the needs of its constituent groups the institution should also recognize that there is a risk that any dissent that may be present may not have had an opportunity to be heard and addressed, and that pockets of concern and non-support may remain within the institutional structure in the process of implementation. This attention to airing and valuing diverse views on graduate education is particularly important, since there were indications that the College could consider other master's level programs in the future.

In this context, the College is encouraged to give additional consideration for how it will evaluate and report on the success of the MSW, MPAcc, and MAT programs, so that its experience informs future decisions, directions and processes. Again, resource planning for graduate programs is imperative…

A revised strategic plan needs to be prepared that plans for the College achieving the Hispanic Serving Institution status, developing graduate programs, establishing evaluation and reward system for faculty teaching in graduate programs, and for the President's "urban land grant" focus and direction for the college, including continued elimination of interim positions…

The team had concern that the professional development for faculty involved in graduate education has not yet been given enough attention. Faculty in the Department of SW for instance, are largely untenured, with minimal teaching experience at the graduate level. As the institution and department plan faculty hires in the near future, strong consideration should be given to hiring faculty at the associate level, who have a Ph.D. and teaching experience at the graduate level…

Faculty and administration are encouraged to continue the discussion about best practices for graduate education in terms of faculty workload, salaries and expectations of faculty associated with graduate education and to translate their awareness into informed actions. For example, they can create some policies to shape and drive decisions about faculty associated with graduate education so that Departments can attract and retain appropriately educated and committed individuals with enough expertise and talent to guide the graduate programs through what is a challenging and unpredictable startup period.

Higher Learning Commission Progress Report on
Master's Programs Metropolitan State College of Denver
September 1, 2011, page 9

The [visit] report goes on to say that the progress report should address the following issues: As the College continues to expand its graduate programming, a more expansive viewpoint will be needed to assure that graduate programs are consistently thought of as central to the educational mission and reflected in the strategic plan. As an institution that has traditionally focused on delivering high quality undergraduate programs to its service area with a faculty focused on teaching, the leadership of the institution must consider the additional needs of faculty involved in graduate programs, especially in terms of their involvement in scholarly and professional development activities. Proper supervision of graduate students can require special consideration to reduction in teaching to accommodate the added advisement and supervision that normally accompanies graduate teaching.

Approval process for non-degree graduate offerings

This document details the phases for the adoption of non-degree graduate offerings. Each section in this document details the purpose, required documentation and the applicable process. The Graduate Council strongly suggests that an academic unit that is considering offering graduate courses discuss this with their academic dean and the associate vice president of curriculum and academic effectiveness (VP of curriculum).

The phases are:

Phase 0:   The concept review,
Phase I: The business plans,
Phase II: The curriculum development phase,
Phase III: The approval phase, and
Phase IV: The implementation phase.

Phase 0: The Concept Review

Purpose: This phase is a request to plan. The intent is to give the appropriate academic Dean and the Provost the information needed to make a decision on whether or not the proposed offering should proceed to Phase 1.   Ratification of this phase <u>does not</u> guarantee that the offering will be approved in Phase 1 or subsequently.
Documentation: A one page description, approved by the department, must be submitted to the academic dean.
Process: The concept review must be approved by the department, the appropriate dean, and the Provost.

Phase I: Business Plans

Purpose: The task in Phase 1 is to develop an in-depth analysis on the viability of the proposed non-degree graduate offerings. The Development Committee of the Graduate Council is available to help the faculty prepare the needed information and plans for further approval. This phase must show that the proposal is self-sustaining from its inception. The college/school will be responsible for funding any deficit that the graduate offering may incur. The decision to end the process of planning for a graduate offering can still occur after the review of the documentation required in Phase I.
Documentation:
    a. A detailed proposal, approved by the department and the appropriate academic dean, must be submitted to the Graduate Council.
    b. The proposal should include at least the following:
        i.   The mission and goal of the offering.
        ii.   Completion of the abridged break-even analysis and a rationale for the tuition rate.
        iii. Overview of market trends including employment opportunities.
        iv.   Course title or description, admission criteria, completion requirements and anticipated start date.

        v.   Industry and competitor analysis.

      vi.   An acknowledgement from the Dean that the college/school will be responsible for funding any deficit.

Process: The detailed proposal must be approved by the department, the appropriate dean, Graduate Council, the Provost, and the President

Phase II: Curriculum Development Phase

Purpose: The development phase involves the completion of the necessary steps for approval of the curriculum for the proposed courses. This phase should also include the development of an infrastructure plan to ensure that the program operates as intended when it is launched.

Documentation:

a. The academic unit will need to prepare a curriculum packet as per the *Curriculum Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures* manual for approval of the proposed curriculum.

b. The academic unit should consider completing an infrastructure plan that addresses any applicable operations such as admissions/marketing, registrar/financial Aid, transfer services, IT, facilities (space needs), faculty/staff hiring, and any budgeting issues.

Process:

a. The curriculum process is detailed in the *Graduate Curriculum Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures* manual.

b. The infrastructure plan is an internal document that is developed to ensure an efficient implementation of the program.

Phase III: Approval Phase (This phase can run parallel with Phase II)

Purpose: In this phase all the applicable approvals are obtained. This includes the Board of Trustees (BOT), the Colorado Department of Higher Education, the Higher Learning Commission and any other specialized accreditation requirements.

Documentation: This is determined by the relevant accrediting body and the BOT.

Process:

a. BOT approval is to be sought after Phase I.

b. The process for external accreditation is determined by the applicable body.

Phase IV: Implementation Phase

Purpose: Once all the applicable approvals have been obtained, then the academic unit can publicize and implement the courses. The objective of this phase is to complete all the necessary steps for the courses to go live and includes promoting/marketing the program, recruiting faculty if applicable, and overseeing the admission process.

Documentation: The recommended infrastructure plan developed in Phase II should be the template for this phase.

Process: The processes necessary to complete this phase are to be determined by the academic unit. The Development Committee of Graduate Council is available to advise and assist if necessary.

Non-degree-seeking Admission Guidelines

Students may be admitted to any of the ~~graduate degree~~ programs with a non-degree-seeking status. For detailed information, refer to the non-degree admissions policies and procedures located on the program's website and/or specific program's section of the catalog. Non-degree-seeking students ~~are only eligible for up to a total of 9 attempted semester hours,~~ do not qualify for financial aid~~,~~ and must re-apply and pay a new application fee in order to become degree-seeking. ~~Applicants must also meet degree-seeking requirements; however, c~~Completing coursework as a non-degree-seeking student does not guarantee admission into a degree-seeking program.

THE BANKRUPTCY MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

This document sets out the policies regarding the bankruptcy monitoring process and, if deemed necessary, the bankruptcy implementation process for graduate programs and offerings at MSU Denver.

1. The bankruptcy monitoring process

The academic literature is replete with numerous bankruptcy prediction models which are appropriate for publicly traded companies. Since MSU Denver is not a publicly traded entity and since the accounting system for the graduate programs is not accrual based, this requires some adjustments to the proposed variables to be used at MSU Denver. Table 1 lists variables that have been used in bankruptcy models and which can be modified to fit the unique characteristics of MSU Denver's graduate programs. A number of the variables in bankruptcy models cannot be replicated for the MSU model as they use market data (market value of equity/book value of debt) or accrual accounting information that is not appropriate (working capital/total assets).

It is recommended that if one or more of the triggers decreases for two consecutive years then either a performance improvement plan should be implemented or bankruptcy should be declared.

Table 1: Bankruptcy triggers		
Actual variable in original model	**Suggested variable for MSU**	**Interpretation**
Retained earnings/Total assets	Cumulative surplus/(Cash balance or debt balance)	If these ratios are increasing over time then the likelihood of bankruptcy decreases
Net income/Total assets	Income before profit-sharing/ (Cash balance or debt balance)	
Revenue/Total assets	Gross revenue/ (Cash balance or debt balance)	
Log of (market capitalization/Total market capitalization of all listed companies)	Log of (Number of students in the program/Total number of graduate students)	
	Log of (Credit hours for the program/Total credit hours for all graduate students)	
Cash flow/Interest payments	Cash flow/Interest payments	
References: Altman, E. I. (1968). Financial ratios, discriminant analysis and the prediction of corporate bankruptcy. *The Journal of Finance*, *23*(4), 589-609. Bijnen, E. J., & Wijn, M. F. (1997). Corporate Prediction Models, Ratios or Regression Analysis. *Ratios or Regression Analysis (Undated)*. Shumway, T. (2001). Forecasting bankruptcy more accurately: A simple hazard model*. *The Journal of Business*, *74*(1), 101-124. Zmijewski, M. E. (1984). Methodological issues related to the estimation of financial distress prediction models. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 59-82.		

2. Bankruptcy procedures

Students faced with the closure of a program must be given the option to continue their education and training in order to obtain their certificate or degree. This can be achieved by either (1) providing a teach-out plan to the students so that they can complete their studies at MSU Denver before it closes the program or by (2) entering into a teach-out agreement where arrangements are made for students to complete their studies at another state-approved school which offers substantially the same training. A teach-out is intended to fulfill the original contract between the closing program and the student.

Steps:

1. Develop a teach-out plan or agreement and obtain all appropriate approvals,
2. Comply with Section 6, Discontinuing an Academic Program, of the *Graduate Curriculum Guidelines, Policies and Procedures* manual,
3. Create a detailed budget analysis for the shut-down period,
4. Cease incurring all discretionary costs,
5. Clearly articulate when committed costs will be eliminated, and
6. Identify the source of funding for any shortfall.

From section 6 of the *Graduate Curriculum Guidelines, Policies and Procedures* manual:

Discontinuing an Academic Program

Requests to discontinue programs are substantive curriculum changes processed at all internal levels of review and approval. Notification is submitted to the state and HLC. Both the state and HLC require departments to specify a "teach out" plan to assist currently-declared students in completing the program. It is critical that proposals to archive a program are accompanied by concise letters of support from all programs and offices affected directly or indirectly.

From the Higher Learning Commission's website:

The Higher Learning Commission will provide its approval if the following are met: 1. The teach-out plan provides for equitable treatment of students by ensuring that they are able to complete the educational program in which they were enrolled immediately prior to the notification in Institutional Situations Requiring Submission of Teach-Out Arrangements within a reasonable period of time; and 2. The teach-out plan provides for prompt notification of additional charges to students, if any. If the Commission approves a teach-out plan that includes a program accredited by a specialized or professional accreditor, the Commission shall notify that accreditor.

The Commission may require that an institution submit a teach-out agreement for the Commission's review and approval in conjunction with its teach-out plan. In addition, any affiliated institution that enters into a teach-out agreement with, or on behalf of, another institution, regardless of whether that institution has presented a teach-out plan to the Commission or is accredited by the Commission, shall submit the teach-out agreement to the Commission for approval prior to its implementation. The Commission will provide its approval if the following are met: 1. The teach-out agreement is with another institution that is accredited by or holding candidacy with an agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and, where appropriate, that it is an eligible institution for Title IV financial

aid; 2. The teach-out agreement is consistent with all applicable state and federal regulations; the teach-out institution has the necessary experience, resources, and support services to provide an educational program that is of acceptable quality and reasonably similar in content, structure and scheduling to that provided by the institution closing or ceasing operations; demonstrates that it can provide students access to such programs and services without requiring them to move or travel substantial distances; and is stable, carrying out its mission and meeting all obligations to existing students; and the teach-out agreement is fair and equitable to students and provides students with reasonable opportunities to complete their education without additional charges and includes a notification provision to ensure that students have complete information about the tuition and fees of the institution conducting the teach-out.

Graduate Program Approval Process

This document details the five phases for the adoption of a new graduate program and it includes an estimated timeline for the process. Each section in this document details the purpose, required documentation and the applicable process. The Graduate Council strongly suggests that an academic unit that is considering a graduate program discuss this with their academic dean and the Graduate Council.

The five phases are:

Phase 0:   The concept review,
Phase I: The academic and business plans,
Phase II: The development phase,
Phase III: The approval phase, and
Phase IV: The implementation phase.

Phase 0: The Concept Review

Purpose: This phase is a request to plan. The intent is to give the academic Deans and Graduate Council the information needed to make a decision on whether or not a new master's program shall proceed to Phase 1. If a new program will not be supported, the process should be stopped before the faculty invests significant time to fully develop plans for a program.   Approval to plan does not guarantee that the program will be approved in Phase 1 or subsequently.

Documentation:

a. A short prospectus (less than five pages), approved by the department and the appropriate academic dean, must be submitted to the Graduate Council by the designated deadline.
b. The prospectus should include at least the following:
    i. Description overview
    ii. Capacity to run program (i.e. faculty, staff, resources). Please include information about faculty expertize and an overview of the proposed curriculum.
    iii. How program meets the University mission
    iv. Market demand (include employment opportunities)
    v. A description of the impact on existing undergraduate programs
    vi. Information that identifies the:
        1. Potential generation of revenue (basic projections of size of program, number of students X credit hours X price),
        2. Anticipated start-up needs (i.e. space, marketing, equipment) with estimated costs, and

3. Anticipated annual program needs.

(The Graduate Council Budget Committee will prepare an abridged break-even analysis.)

Process:

a. Immediately following the designated deadline, the Graduate Council chair will forward a copy of all of the prospectuses to the academic deans. The Graduate Council's recommendation to the Deans is that no more than 8 programs go forward to Phase I.
b. Deans' Decision:
    i. Within 1 month of the designated deadline, the Graduate Council chair will call a meeting of the deans for the purpose of deciding which proposals should advance to Phase I.
    ii. Those programs that are not forwarded to Phase I can re-submit their updated prospectus in the following review cycle.

Phase I: Academic and Business Plans

Purpose: The task in Phase 1 is to develop an in-depth analysis on the viability of a new graduate degree. The Development Committee of the Graduate Council is available to help the faculty prepare the needed information and plans for further approval. The decision to end the process of planning for a graduate program can still occur after the review of the documentation required in Phase 1.

Documentation:

a. A detailed proposal, approved by the department and the appropriate academic dean, must be submitted to the Graduate Council by the designated deadline.
b. Phase 1 proposal should include at least the following:
    i. Detailed budget and break-even analysis (should include a narrative for each item, also please include assumptions – see appendix 2).
    ii. Return on investment for students (i.e. placements).
    iii. Independent validation of market trends.
    iv. Industry and competitor analysis.
    v. Program description which should include at least the following:
        1. The mission of the proposed program,
        2. The goals of the program,
        3. Key features,
        4. An overview of the proposed program assessment process,
        5. Course descriptions,
        6. Admission criteria,
        7. Graduation requirements, and

8. The rationale for the proposed tuition.
vi. Course scheduling and rotation plan.
vii. Faculty/staff plan (i.e. reassigned time, program coordinator, field coordinator, administrative support).
viii. Elaboration from Phase 0, (i.e. how program meets the University and Graduate mission).
ix. Anticipated start date.
x. An acknowledgement from the Dean that the college/school will be responsible for funding any deficit over and above the amount detailed in the break-even analysis.

Process:

a. Within 2 months of the designated deadline, the Graduate Council will rank the programs based on their established criteria (see appendix 1 for the rubric).
b. Graduate Planning Committee's (GPC) Decision:
    i. Within 6 weeks of the designated deadline, the Graduate Council chair will call a meeting of the GPC for the purpose of deciding which proposals should advance to Phase II.
    ii. Once approved by the GPC, the program has the green light to enter Phase II.
    iii. Those programs that are not forwarded to Phase II can re-submit their updated Phase I documentation in the following review cycle.

Phase II: Development Phase

Purpose: The development phase involves the completion of the necessary steps for approval of the curriculum for the new program. This phase also entails the development of an infrastructure plan to ensure that the program operates as intended when it is launched.

Documentation:

a. The program will need to prepare a curriculum packet as per the *Curriculum Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures* manual for approval of the proposed curriculum.
b. The program will need to complete an infrastructure plan (operations) that addresses at least the following, if applicable:
    i. Admissions/Marketing,
    ii. Registrar/Financial Aid,
    iii. Transfer Services,
    iv. IT,
    v. Facilities (space needs),
    vi. Faculty/staff hiring, and
    vii. Budgeting issues.

Process:

   a. The curriculum process is detailed in the *Curriculum Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures* manual.
   b. The infrastructure plan is an internal document that is developed to ensure an efficient implementation of the program.

Phase III: Approval Phase

Purpose: In this phase all the relevant approvals are obtained. This includes the Board of Trustees (BOT), the Colorado Department of Higher Education, the Higher Learning Commission and any other specialized accreditation requirements.

Documentation: This is determined by the relevant accrediting body and the BOT.

Process:

   a. BOT approval is to be sought at the end of Phase II which ordinarily will be the June 20xx-1 BOT meeting.
   b. The process for external accreditation is determined by the applicable body.

Phase IV: Implementation Phase

Purpose: Once all the necessary approvals have been obtained, then the academic unit can implement the program. The objective of this phase is to complete all the necessary steps for the program to go live in August 20xx and includes promoting/marketing the program, recruiting faculty if applicable, and overseeing the admission process.

Documentation: The infrastructure plan developed in Phase II should be the template for this phase.

Process: The processes necessary to complete this phase are to be determined by the program. The Development Committee of Graduate Council is available to advise and assist if necessary.

Proposed Timeline: (the launch year is denoted as 20xx)

April 1, 20xx-2: Phase 0 submitted to the Graduate Council.

May 1, 20xx-2: Deans' decision on which programs to move forward, if any, and a maximum number based on University resources.

September 15, 20xx-2: Phase 1 submitted to the Graduate Council.

November 15, 20xx-2: Graduate Council completes ranking of proposals.

December 31, 20xx-2: Phase I approved/denied by the GPC.

January - May, 20xx-1: Phase II completed.

June, 20xx-1: BOT approval at their June meeting.

July-Dec, 20xx-1: CCE, HLC and any additional accreditation approvals.

December, 20xx-1: Phase III completed.

March, 20xx: Graduate program information included in the 20xx catalog.

May, 20xx: BOT approval of tuition at their May meeting.

August, 20xx: Phase IV completed and classes begin.

<u>Appendices</u>

Appendix 1. Graduate Council rubric link

Appendix 2. Detailed budget and break-even analysis link

From: Epper, Rhonda [mailto:Rhonda.Epper@ccd.edu]
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 9:51 AM
To: Golich, Vicki <vgolich@msudenver.edu>
Cc: Bender, Angela <abender6@msudenver.edu>; Berry, Amanda <aberry11@msudenver.edu>; Davies, Patty <Patty.Davies@ccd.edu>; Matthews, Jennifer <Jennifer.Matthews@ccd.edu>
Subject: CCD Faculty Discount at Metro?

Hello Vicki,

As you know, HLC released its new faculty qualification guidelines last October, and there are many CCD faculty who will need to take up to 18 graduate credits by September 2017 in order to meet the new guidelines. We are in the process of determining how many faculty are affected, how many graduate credit deficiencies they have in the discipline prefix in which they are teaching, and whether they wish to obtain the needed graduate credits in order to continue teaching at CCD after September 2017.

We have found your employee tuition assistance policy (http://www.ahec.edu/for-ahec-staff/human-resources/current-employee-information/msu-denver-tuition-reimbursement-program/), which generously extends the benefit to CCD employees. But my understanding is this only applied to undergraduate courses. I was wondering if MSU Denver might consider some kind of discount for CCD faculty who need to take graduate level courses to meet the new HLC guidelines before Sep 2017?

This will also affect many of our concurrent enrollment instructors. While we would love to be able to assist them as well, they are not technically CCD employees (although they are credentialed to teach as adjunct faculty). Our first priority is our 100+ full-time faculty, followed by our 400+ adjunct teaching faculty. Again, we do not yet know how many faculty or how many graduate credits they need, but we will have that number within the next month. I just wanted to reach out and see if this is something MSU Denver might consider helping us with.

Thank you, and hope all is well with you!

Rhonda

Rhonda M. Epper, Ph.D.
Vice President for Academic Affairs |Provost | Office of the Provost
P 303.556.3595 | F 303.556.4602
Campus Box 200 | P.O. Box 173363 | Denver, CO 80217-3363