CMU Academic Affairs Council
Agenda May 15, 2017

ADH Working Session
10:00 am to 12:30 pm
LLH 302

Announcements/Updates/Reminders/Air-time & Action Issues

Summer Fun:
-Course rotation matrix update (update instructions via email from Erin Rooks, **updates due by 5/22/2017**)
-Catalog updates - ADHs responsible for the programs of study sections – distributed in hardcopy today, **return to Erin Rooks not later than 5/22/2017.** Yes, do it the old-fashioned way in hardcopy (just one more time folks, hang in there with us).

Program Reviews: fyi
        Minor format revisions coming this summer – goal = consistency
        Read, review, edit – goal = quality document
        Dr. Haas role = gatekeeper, not pass through…

Official Functions Policy Docs: link to the AP page: http://www.coloradomesa.edu/accounting-financial-services/accounts-payable.html The Official Function Policy can be found on the AP page. Please note and adhere to.

Low Enrollment Courses – interpretive guidance reviewed and ok'd by President Foster 5/4/2017
Course Caps – interpretive guidance reviewed and ok'd by President Foster 5/4/2017

Scheduling & space utilization (accurate usage is increasingly important as we begin to map-out a roadmap to 15,000!
-include prep time for labs?
-2-5 pm, Fri and Sat classes…we need to look to scheduling in these "off" times…

FYI: Handbook changes will be reviewed by BOT during the May 2017 meeting.

?Question/Clarification - Tenure Timeline text in Handbook: Interpretation and application (see bold text – next pg)
?Apply in Year 6 and award for 7 is normal?
?Apply in Year 7 and award is normal? By end of 7th year = awarded.

Performance Ratings. The following Performance Ratings will be used for evaluations (p. VI-5 to VI-6).

a.   Excellent. Evidence convincingly demonstrates that the Faculty member has made **exceptional contributions** in the General Evaluation Criteria area under consideration, contributions that clearly **would be recognized as outstanding by professional colleagues at comparable institutions.**

b.   Highly Proficient. Evidence clearly demonstrates that the Faculty member has made **significant contributions i**n the area under consideration and is **considered highly skilled** in that area.

c.   Proficient. Evidence demonstrates that the Faculty member meets minimum expectations and has made modest contributions in the area under consideration.

d.   Below Standard. Evidence demonstrates that the Faculty member's contributions are below accepted standards in the area under consideration. A need for improvement is clearly indicated. The level of contribution does not justify any salary increase and may jeopardize continued employment with the University.

Tenure-track Period. **The Tenure-track period at the University shall be up to seven (7) consecutive Academic Years as Full-time, Tenure-track Faculty under annual assignments** (emphasis added). Academic Years during which Tenure-track Faculty members are on sabbatical leaves, professional development leaves, leaves without pay, or administrative leaves of one or more semesters' duration or are employed as Administrators for one or more semesters shall not be included in the Tenure-track period. However, exclusion of such Academic Years from the Tenure-track Period shall not make the preceding and succeeding annual assignments nonconsecutive. (Handbook p. VI-14).

Immediate or Early Tenure. Candidates for both immediate and early Tenure must document excellent or highly proficient Performance Ratings in the General Evaluation Criteria areas. (Handbook p. VI-15)

Early Tenure. Tenure-track Faculty members who are rated highly proficient or excellent for all General Evaluation Criteria may apply for early Tenure beginning their second Academic Year as Tenure-track Faculty.

Denials of immediate or early Tenure applications shall be final, unappealable and non-grievable. Unsuccessful early candidates may not reapply for early Tenure, but may reapply for Tenure during the seventh Tenure-track contract.

Nothing in this Handbook shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise limit the discretionary nonrenewal of Tenure-track Faculty members who apply for early Tenure, the same as any other Tenure-track Faculty. (Handbook p. VI-16)

ADH Working Session Faculty Qual Review and Matrix Alignment Verification
-Review all files and verify all recs
-Fill in overall/summary worksheet
-Note instances of changed rec (sticky tags)
-New Hire reminder – ALL new hires need qual forms, vitae and transcripts!!!!

Good of the Order/Kudos & TQs!

Congratulations to Ms. Heather McKim. Ms. McKim developed an admissions recruitment model using Hierarchical Linear Modeling software that overlays high likelihood of student enrollment with recruiter travel and marketing activity. She will be presenting the model developed at the May 30 – June 2, 2017 Association for Institutional Research meeting in Washington, DC. Her presentation is titled: Where Should We Go: Predictive Modeling for Admissions Recruiting. Great work Heather!

> In the current economic environment, many public higher education institutions face decreasing funding from state governments and consequently become more financially dependent on tuition. Recruitment via advertising and contact from admissions personnel is crucial to attract students and bring in needed tuition dollars, but requires careful enrollment management to balance the costs of the recruitment endeavors with the yield of new students. This presentation will discuss how the IR office at Colorado Mesa University has supported enrollment management decisions, with a particular focus on which geographic regions to target for recruiting. The session may be of interest to institutional researchers or admissions officers who have a role in determining how their institutions' recruiting efforts and budget are directed and to anyone interested in learning more about specific statistical methods (regression and hierarchical linear modeling) or software (Tableau maps).

Dates & Deadlines/2017-2018 Meetings: 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of the month, UC 213, 3:00-5:00 pm

August Launch Meeting/Retreat: 10 am to 4:00 pm Thursday August 10, location TBA

Academic Department Head Guidelines Regarding Low Enrollment Courses and Overload Pay, including Summer Pay

Low Enrollment Classes: As a general rule, low enrollment classes are defined as those with fewer than 10 students at the 100-400 level and fewer than 6 students at the 500+ level.

In determining whether to run a low-enrollment class, ADH's should consider whether the courses are:

- Essential to degree program requirements

and

- Required for timely completion of the degree; i.e., not offering the course would require student(s) to delay completion of studies and graduation

Assumed within these two points is that students worked with their academic advisors to plan a course of study that integrated the course in question into their program of study for the semester in which the course would normally be offered.

ADH's need to evaluate low enrollment courses relative to these two conditions, as well as potential opportunities to substitute other courses that meet students' program of study needs. For licensure considerations and some degree plans, this may not be possible. However, in cases where there is an option, it should be explored, and where feasible implemented.

The current lecturer and overload pay scale is maintained in the Office of Academic Affairs. Exceptions to the pay structure (see in particular summer and online pay) appear on page 2. Note: The list of exceptions on page 2 is not intended to be exhaustive. Other "exceptions" may be granted with approval of the VPAA.

Overload Payment: ADH's need to adhere to CMU policy (see the Professional Personnel Employee Handbook, Section VIII.C) and be judicious when assigning overload pay. It is the responsibility of the ADH to maximize the institution's resource use while still fairly compensating faculty.
- Faculty members should not be paid overloads for low-enrolled courses unless both of the above conditions for running low-enrollment courses are met.
- When a faculty member has two or more online courses, the course with the lowest enrollment will be used as the overload course.

Online Course Enrollments: Since 2012, CMU's policy has been that online sections should have the same course caps as face-to-face courses. Over time, however, increasing enrollments have often led to increases in online course caps. At the point at which online course caps can, in aggregate, support another section of the course, another section should be added. In this case, an additional instructor would be needed. (NOTE: An online lecturer would not have to be located on campus.)

CMU institutional directives regarding course comparability and online instruction derive from the Course Comparability Manual and communications from Academic Affairs and the Office of the President originating in 2013. These communications instructed that face-to-face course capacities and online course capacities should be congruent. In fall 2016 (Academic Council Meeting: 11/17/2016) the following reaffirmation guidance was shared with Academic Department Heads as part of a broader discussion relating to low enrollment courses, summer, January term and online instruction:

> Online Course Enrollments: Since 2012, CMU's policy has been that online sections should have the same course caps as face-to-face courses. Over time, however, increasing enrollments have often led to increases in online course caps. At the point at which online course caps can, in aggregate, support another section of the course, another section should be added. In this case, an additional instructor would be needed.

Grounded in a review of relevant literature, this document serves to provide course comparability guidance as CMU instructional needs continue to evolve.

Relevant Literature

Research on constructivist approaches to online learning (constructivist being a traditional faculty-led presence in a course) supports a requisite for increased engagement in order to promote teaching and learning comparability to F2F courses. This engagement is evidenced through use of discussion questions, instructor-posted videos, active learning activities, and small group assignments. For constructivist courses, research supports a class size of 25-30 students for maximum effectiveness (Aragon,2003; Rovai, 2002).

Non-constructivist classes (those that do not rely on instructor-student interaction, such as MOOCs or online courses heavily reliant on gaming content) may have significantly higher caps. These course types are not consistent with CMU's emphasis on teacher-student interaction.

- Variables impacting decisions about optimal class size include: (a) nature of the discipline, course objectives and outcomes, (b) instructors' prior experience teaching online, (c) student class level (undergraduate, graduate), and (d) overall institutional support for online instruction (e.g., faculty workload, technology staff assistance, etc.). With these variables in mind, research by Artz (2011) noted 12-22 students per class as desirable.

- Rovai (2000) recommended a class size of 30 students, noting that greater than 30 diminished the amount of social presence that can be established between student and instructor.

- According to Rao (2000) courses designed to teach technical laboratory skills should be limited to 12-15 students. Boettcher (1998) recommended 25 to 65 students for courses focusing on training, certification and/or professional degrees.

- Roach (2002) recommended course caps for online undergraduate course work of 25 students. Colwell and Jenks (2006) recommended caps of 20 undergraduate students.

- MacKinnon (2002) suggested that class size should be limited to 20 students, while Larson (2002) found "…although greater student–faculty interaction had a positive impact on learning, class size per se had no significant effect" (http://www.professionalnursing.org/article/S8755-7223(08)00095-1/fulltext#back-bib1).

- Palloff and Pratt (2003) found a class size of 20 to 25 students facilitated a sense of connectedness and that large class sizes were associated with less satisfaction and less learning.

- Orellana (2006) reported online instructor perceptions of optimal class size ranging from 15 to 22 undergraduate students.

- "…for online classes that range from 16-40 students, increasing class size as much as 25 percent does not significantly affect student grades, credits earned…or enrollment… (Bettinger, Doss, Loeb, & Taylor, 2014).

CMU Course Comparability Guidance

CMU realizes there may be instances where course cap incongruency between F2F and online sections can be permissible based on:
-Course structure
-Pedagogical best practices of the discipline
-Co-requisite courses
-Artificially low enrollment caps in face-to-face courses due to facility or instructor limitations

Departments wishing to apply for a one-time or ongoing exception to expected course cap congruency should provide evidence and rationale, including a review of best practices, to the Director of Distance Education during the semester prior to the requested exception. Requests for exceptions beyond the areas listed above may be considered upon recommendation of the Director of Distance Education to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

References

Aragon, S. (2003). Creating social presence in online environments. *New Directors for Adult and Continuing Education, 100*, 57-68.

Artz, J. (2011). Online courses and optimal class size: A complex formula. ERIC.

Bettinger, E., Doss, C., Loeb, S. & Taylor, S. (November, 2014). Panel Paper: Virtually large: The effects of class size in online college courses. In The 2014 APPAM Fall Research Conference. Albuquerque, NM

Colwell, J.L. & Jenks, C.F. (2004). The upper limit: The issues for faculty in setting class size in online courses. Retrieved: https://web.archive.org/web/20100607051111/http://www.ipfw.edu/tohe/Papers/Nov%2010/015__the%20upper%20limit.pdf

MacKinnon, G. (2002). Practical advice for first time online instructors: A qualitative study. *Journal of Instruction Delivery Systems*, 16. 21–25.

Rao, L. (2000). Can technical laboratory skills be taught at a distance? An analysis of a semiconductor course taught at a distance via interactive technologies. Unpublished Dissertation, The University of New Mexico.

Palloff, R.M. & Pratt, K. (2003). *The virtual student: A profile and guide to working with online learners*. SF: Jossey-Bass.

Rovai, A. (2000). Building and sustaining community in asynchronous learning networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*. 3, 285–297

Roach, R. (2002). Staying connected: Getting retention right is high priority for online degree programs—special report: Recruitment & retention. Retrieved: http://www.findarticles.com

Rovai, A. (2002). Building sense of community at a distance. International Review of research in *Open and Distances Learning, 3*(1), 1-16.

Orellan, A. (2006). Class size and interaction in online courses. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 7*(3), 229–248.