Minutes 5/4/22

CoCD meeting

1. First year tenure track reduced workload program

Loats, Lechuga, Jay, guests

Opportunity to create a campus-wide program, not only for the reduced teaching, but also robust engagement.

Not trying to make happen this fall—setting for Fall 2023

They think of this as separate from the workload reduction, but there are some accreditation issues in small programs, this may not be possible.

We have the budget, can make the money happen

So want to put together the right programming

This is essentially a course for new faculty, what do we want them to learn, not what do we want to tell them

Beyond attending to DEI, we’d like to see the curriculum rooted in equity. Want it to serve as a retention program

Want to slow down and have a conversation about what people want in this program

Comments: Jacob in Theatre shared about new faculty coming in without any experience with canvas, or with university teaching. So canvas training would be good at base level. Also need info about CARE reports.

Greg-do you find there is a need for new faculty to be on 2/2 load, since we are moving to a 3/3? Jeff answered that new faculty in the voluntary institute shows that it is really clear, the haves and the have-nots. If all faculty need reduction to 3, the new faculty need more. Can’t layer responsibility beyond a support group.

Also-there is a 2 day training week before classes start for canvas

But if 3/3 has been determined to be sufficient, should we wait to see if 2/2 is needed?

Jacob-if we are reducing load because of being overwhelmed, and if new faculty are especially overwhelmed, there is justification for the additional reduction. But agree it warrants further conversation.

Chalane—is the workload about a reduction or more manageable workload—depends on where you lie in that assumption. The first year program that is being proposed, will take more time. So replacing what they could be doing (teaching a course) so that they can be more engaged.

Adriana-I think it would help a lot, with recruiting especially.

Sam—this is also about cohort-building. Faculty retention is better with cohorts.

1. Internship procedures

Pam Ansburg-prof in psych, last two years as interim director and co-leader with experiential learning for all

Cassie Mullin—new exp learning Program Manager—came from social work dept. new in this role. Also joining ELFA

Asked to talk a little bit about procedures and

One-page paper about who can answer questions

Used to have Applied Learning Center, with Internship advisors

Instead, when students are at the beginning, ask them to go to C2Hub and meet with Career Advisor to prep for applying. If specific industry questions, we get them in touch with the industry partnership team, and internship navigators (help locate internships)

The Program manager will help with paperwork

If student or faculty have questions, the email to the C2 hub is the best resource. Goes to central desk, and routes question to right person.

For students, we have a robust website presence that describes the internships. Including Earn and Learn, supported by MSU Denver that will pay students

50 students at $16/hour. Application process is up now. Program manager is Derek Bowers dbowers9@msudenver.edu he was hired 3 weeks ago, and has it up and running.

Cassie is on the ground, and will talk procedures

Application for academic credit—located inside career link. Students list the tasks out, etc., then routes to employer, and then the faculty advisor. Or send them to cmullin@msudenver.edu

Question: if already have the internship—send them to Cassie. She also includes her contact info in career link if they already started the process.

Question on technical side. Is there a way to have career link send the chairs the notifications of available internships?

Students can sign up for notifications for certain industries, and if they like it they will get reminders.

Not sure if faculty can get those reminders. Faculty can get an account in career link, but they would have to go in and look. (Pam later sent us information that this is possible) Can also send the opportunity to those students.

In CJC, wondering if we could create a directory for who to contact in each department. They are getting lost. Where can we fix some of the leaks?

Will look into it—good idea. They have lists to make sure the application is routed correctly. Also have department program info. Cassie will look at this for CJC.

Each department is so different—helpful for Cassie to know the nuances.

1. Handbook changes

Section II about the changes to PiP and reconciliation meetings

Vote: Yes, 6 in person, 21 online

No, 1 in person

Abstention, 1 in person

1. Section II regarding Department guidelines

Jess presented. Originally said Chair with input would revise guidelines. Group that created this proposal said that was not specific enough about how input was gathered. Now, the paragraphs have been modified to

Our CoCD feedback was that the new proposal said every single change needed to be reviewed by a committee and voted. I.E. if department name change is made, or something that is not related to performance. They did respond and change to this really is about performance areas. I.E. there are some cat II faculty in Jess’s dept. don’t need to have all faculty input. The committee did say that all full-time faculty should vote on all.

Buffy brought up complications about knowing at the start who needs to be consulted.

Layton-appreciate the changes, want to understand change from needing to consider mission statement and at least meet mission, accreditation,

One of the dean’s said

Why a reconciliation meeting with the Dean and not the Chair? Assumed the chair was already in the process, so if the department can’t agree, it would go above the chair.

Elizabeth—point out the chair’s responsibility is to coordinate the committee. Unnecessarily complicates. Questions about who would monitor. Answer—the chair could also be on the committee.

Greg—who determines whether someone is impacted or not?

Jess says she thinks that would be the chair’s decision. Example, our cat II faculty do not have to do scholarship, so why would they have to take part in decisions impacting this?

Liz—in terms of the inconsistency—the chair is responsible for creating a committee to help them develop the guidelines.

The reason we had everyone voting, in some departments there is only 1 cat ii, so it would be awkward to have only one person voting.

Matt Makely suggested having all full-time faculty voting, so not all chairs agree.

Jess pointed out that this is trying to be prescriptive, when the reality is this is complex and that departments are different.

Sheryl-finds the changes confusing. “impacted” is a bit vague, changing committees, doesn’t clarify, it just makes it more complicated.

Layton-does this improve the guidelines process, and are there unintended consequences. Provost also said in our last meeting with EC, he brought up need for by-laws.

Adriana—under 7, about the mission statements, doesn’t see the connection between standards and mission—seems impossible

Liz-there are options about what the handbook committee

Suggested pause, but Liz said that defeats the purpose.

There is fear.

Elizabeth said that the President has said that the workload will increase. It’s not the chairs.

Liz-the Provost says the guidelines belong to the faculty.

Jess-back to the topic, it is up to the departments. 99% of the time the chairs are the departments’ best advocates. There are trust issues, maybe not everyone is well meaning, but the vast majority do

Majority do not have a problem with faculty voting, but the majority of the problems are because of clarity, and to account for differentiated workload.

Ford-agrees, this is confusing. If the goal is to make sure faculty get a vote, and if there is disagreement, then the deans can reconcile. I see my role to be an advocate for my department. Trust issues should be addressed elsewhere.

Vote on Version 2

For 0 in person, 2 online (2)

No: 5 in person, 17 online (23)

Abstain: 3 in person, 5 online (8)

Jess is one vote out of 6 on the Handbook committee

1. General Studies updates

Liz and Todd Laugen

Launching General Studies policy changes document—

This has already been presented to professional advisors

This is not really for student eyes—too confusing

Big change-general studies courses can double-dip

The one-credit deviation was intended to help transfer students, but they were using it even as residential to get out of a second course in AH, so made it really only partial credit.

Lauri Ann Garcia is working on the coding, but it is not yet done, expect an email from her to help test it. She will get in touch with Chairs. Then you will be able to do a what-if report to see if changing catalogs will help.

This was designed to help facilitate transfer students in their transition.

Jacob-still have same question that I had when this first came up—if we are working to ensure that all degrees are not negatively impacted, why the extra hoop of doing the 33 hours outside of the major? Liz—the idea was to ensure the students still have a broad experience, but also work within the general studies state rule.

1. BRC updates-Layton

Estimated funds after mandatory—2.8 million

Assumes -6% enrollment decrease, and 2% tuition increase

We had an agreement that we are going to push for 3% compensation increase as a priority. This would mean that other priorities would not be addressed. We’d be asking the BRC to tighten belts in other areas so that this could be implemented.

Layton is serving through the summer, so if interested put your name out when the call for vote happens.

1. Elizabeth made another announcement-badging policy

We didn’t review and didn’t really have a say in it. So consider this an information item.

Election will happen in summer—need to revisit the whole structure of EC