TEACHING TEAM
Teacher of Record
Cecilia M. Orphan, Ph.D.
Pronouns: She, Her, Hers
Assistant Professor, Higher Education
Morgridge College of Education
University of Denver
cecilia.orphan@du.edu
303-871-3619
Office Hours: Mondays 3:30 – 5:30 pm and by appointment

Teaching Intern
Steve Jenks, M.S.
Pronouns: He, Him, His
Ph.D. Student, Higher Education
Morgridge College of Education
University of Denver
steve.jenks@du.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION
Each year, department chairs, deans, boards of trustees, and college presidents hold their collective breath in anticipation for the release of college, university, and program rankings. Will their academic unit/campus be given a more prominent place in the rankings? Will their efforts to reshape campus life in the image of a prestigious institution pay off? Or will they be assigned a lower rank and, by default, lower status within the postsecondary field? Called by scholars and academic leaders a "positional arms race" and a "zero sum game," rankings systems in higher education fill the hearts and minds of many with hope, despair, pride and shame.

This seminar examines how ranking systems such as *U.S. News and World Report* shape higher education structures and cultures. We explore the history of rankings while unpacking and critiquing the metrics used within these systems. We debate whether rankings disadvantage or benefit particular individuals or institutions, and if they reify systems of oppression or improve the quality of higher education and its ability to improve equity and society.

Credit where credit is due. The design of this seminar borrows heavily from one taught by Dr. KerryAnn O'Meara, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Maryland.

OFFICIAL COURSE CATALOG DESCRIPTION
Advanced seminar to examine timely topics, issues, and problems. The course description is developed each time the course is offered to describe the topics to be investigated.

SIGNIFICANT LEARNING OBJECTIVES (SLOs)
   i.   Describe the history, purpose, evolution, and influence of rankings systems.
   ii.   Describe and critique criteria used in rankings systems.
   iii.   Analyze the effects of rankings systems on individuals and postsecondary institutions, with particular attention to how rankings systems affect marginalized individuals and the access institutions that serve them.
   iv.   Interrogate how rankings systems perpetuate power, privilege, and oppression.
   v.   Examine how rankings systems support or impede the ability of postsecondary institutions to promote Inclusive Excellence, dismantle systemic oppression, and embody their public purposes.
   vi.   Design an alternative rankings/ratings system.
   vii.   Co-construct knowledge with seminar participants.

STATEMENT OF TEACHING
As a teacher, I teach from a place of love for students. I seek to co-create with students a classroom space that honors the principles of Inclusive Excellence in which all participants feel inclined to bring their expertise, identities, learning, and experience to bear on the topics we are considering in class. I care deeply about student learning and development. I have been influenced by Paulo Friere's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and bell hooks's *Teaching to Transgress*, and I have a desire to co-create with students a classroom space that is liberatory, challenging, and inclusive of the diverse experiences, identities, and expertise students and the teaching team hold. I am interested in helping students cultivate the skills, efficacies, and expertise necessary for engaging in research and leadership within higher education so that they may enact their roles effectively while dismantling disrupting power, privilege and oppression, and promoting the public purposes of higher education.

I do not think of myself as the sole expert in the seminar or as a sage on the stage. Instead, I view myself as a guide on the side helping facilitate the learning of seminar participants. I firmly believe that I have as much to learn from students as I have to teach them, and that students have much to teach and learn from one another. In these ways, I view our seminar as a co-owned and co-created learning experience. I seek and welcome student feedback about the course and incorporate this feedback into the course. To that end, I will make available an anonymous survey link for students to provide feedback about the course during Week 4

READINGS
All readings are available on Canvas or via weblinks provided in the syllabus. Remember to check both Canvas and the syllabus to ensure you have completed each week's readings.

COURSE TIMELINE
The following table describes each week's topic, readings, activities, agenda, assessments, and assignments, and the corresponding learning outcomes pursued (Eg., SLOI corresponds with Significant Learning Outcome I listed above).

Week's Theme	Agenda and Activities	Readings	Assessments	Assignments
Week 1: Rankings Systems in Society	• Land Acknowledgment • Co-construct Seminar Ground Rules [SLOVII] • Introduction to Rankings Systems in Higher Education [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII] • Seminar and syllabus overview • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**Rivera, L. A.** (2011). Ivies, extracurriculars, and exclusion: Elite employers' use of educational credentials. *Research in social stratification and mobility, 29*(1), 71-90. [SLOI, SLOIV, SLOV] **Espeland, W.N. & Sauder, M.** (2016). Rankings everywhere. Chapter in *Engines of anxiety: Academic rankings, reputation, and accountability.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation. [SLOI, SLOII] **Fuller, R. W.** (2009, August 2009). Somebodies and nobodies: Understanding rankism. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from: https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/someb odies-and-nobodies/200908/somebodies-and-nobodies-understanding-rankism. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII, SLOIV] **Robert Morse's** blog on the *U.S. News and World Report* ranking system: http://www.usnews.com/blogs/college-rankings-blog. [SLOI, SLOII]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII]	• Work Group Contract and Accountability Structure [SLOVI, SLOVII]
Week 2: Introducing Rankings Systems in Higher Education	• **Guest Speakers: Ally Garcia**, Ed.D., Director, TRIO Support Services, Metropolitan State University of Denver, and **Julie Wienski,** Ed.D., Adjunct Faculty Member, Higher Education, University of Denver [SLOVI]	**Winston, G.** (2000). *The positional arms race in higher education*. New York, NY: Andrew W. Melon Foundation. **Gladwell, M.** (2011, February 14) The order of things: What college rankings really tell us. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/02/14/the-order-of-things. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII] **Amsler, S. S., & Bolsmann, C.** (2012). University ranking as social exclusion. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 33*(2), 283-301. [SLOI, SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Bastedo, M.N. & Bowman, N.A.** (2011). College rankings as interorganizational dependency:	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII]	

3

		Establishing the foundation for strategic and institutional accounts. *Research in Higher Education*, *52*, 2-23. **Wilson, R.** (2011, October 2). Syracuse's Slide. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* [online]. Retrieved October 5, 2011, from http://chronicle.com/article/Syracuses-Slide/129238/. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV]		
Week 3: Theories that Explain the Influence and Appeal of Rankings Systems	• Theory Gallery Walk [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] • Mini lecture on theories [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**Davies, B. & Bansel, P.** (2010). Governmentality and academic work: Shaping the hearts and minds of academic workers. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, (26)*3, 5-20. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Meyer, J. & Rowan, B.** (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structures as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340-363. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Acker, J.** (2006). Inequality regimes gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society, 20*(4), 441-464. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Sauder, M., Lynn, F., & Podolny, J. M.** (2012). Status: Insights from organizational sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 38*, 267-283. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Saunders, D. & Blanco-Ramírez, G.** (2016). Resisting the neoliberalization of higher education: A challenge to commonsensical understandings of commodities and consumption. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1-8. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIV, SLOV]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII]	
Week 4: History and Evolution of Rankings Systems	• Discussion of Readings [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOVI, SLOVII] • Debating the Rankings [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV]	**Dichev, I.** (2001). News or noise? Estimating the noise in the *U.S. News* university rankings. *Research in Higher Education, 42*, 237-266. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII] **Hazelkorn, E.** (2015). What rankings measure. In *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education* (pp. 26-90). London: Palgrave Macmillan. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII]	• Alternative Rankings/ Ratings System Proposal [SLOVI, SLOVII]

	• Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**O'Meara, K. & Meekins, M.** (2012). *Inside rankings: Limitations and possibilities.* Working Paper: Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOVI] **Gnolek, S.L., Falciano, V.T, & Kuncl, R.W.** (2014). Modeling change and variation in U.S. News & World Report college rankings: What would it really take to be in the top 20?. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(8), 761-779. [SLOI, SLOII, SLOIII]		
Week 5: Rankings Systems and Prestige-Seeking	• Pair-Led Reflective Class Discussion [SLOVII] • **Guest Speaker: KerryAnn O'Meara,** PhD, Professor, Higher Education, University of Maryland [SLOI, SLOIII, SLOV] • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time (Dr. Orphan will meet with each group to go over their proposals) [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**Oravec, J. (2019).** The 'dark side' of academics? Emerging issues in gaming and manipulation of metrics in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 42*(3), 859-877. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Doran, E.** (2015). Negotiating access and tier one aspirations: The historical evolution of a striving Hispanic-serving institution. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 14*(4), 343-354. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Morphew, C. C. & Baker, B. D**. (2004). The cost of prestige: Do new research one universities incur increased administrative costs? *Review of Higher Education, 27*(3), 365-384. [SLOIII] **O'Meara, K.** (2007). Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige. J.C. Smart (ed.). *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. XXII, (121-179.) [SLOI, SLOIII, SLOV]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII] • Pair-led reflective discussion rubric [SLOVII]	• Pair-led reflective discussion [SLOVII]
Week 6: Rankings Systems, Admissions, and College Choice	• Peer Review of Alternative Ranking/Rating Systems [SLOVI, SLOVII] • **Guest Speaker: Christopher Pena,** Director, Data Management,	**McDonough, P., Antonio, A. L., Walpole, M. & Pérez, L. X.** (1998). College rankings: Democratized college knowledge for whom?. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(5), 513-537. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Bowman, N. A. & Bastedo, M. N.** (2009). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation, status signals, and the impact of *US News and World Report* rankings on student decisions. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, p. 415-436. [SLOIII]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII]	• Preliminary discussion/presentation of rankings/ratings system [SLOVI, SLOVII]

	University of Denver [SLOIII, SLOIV] • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**Foley, N.F.** (2018, January 30). A radical plan to combat inequality in college admissions. *Pacific Standard*. Retrieved from: https://psmag.com/education/a-radical-plan-to-combat-inequality-in-college-admissions.[SLOIV, SLOV, SLOVI] **Campbell, C.M., Jimenez, M., & Arrozal, C.A.N.** (2019). Prestige or education: College teaching and rigor of courses in prestigious and non-prestigious institutions in the U.S. Higher Education, *77*(7), 717-738. [SLOIII]		
Week 7: Rankings Systems and Faculty Life	• Pair-Led Reflective Discussion [SLOVII] • **Guest Speaker: Leslie Gonzales,** Ph.D., Associate Professor, Educational Administration, Michigan State University [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**Gonzales, L. & Núñez, A.** (2014). The Ranking regime and the production of knowledge: Implications for academia. *Education Policy Analysis*, *22*(31), 1-24. [SLOIII, SLOIV] **Gonzales, L. D., Martinez, E., & Ordu, E.** (2014). Exploring faculty experiences in a striving university through the lens of academic capitalism. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(7), 1097-1115. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Gardner, S.** (2013). Women faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*(3), 349-370. [SLOIII, SLOIV] **O'Meara, K., & Bloomgarden, A.** (2010). The pursuit of prestige: Examining the consequences of striving for faculty work-life, reward systems, and satisfaction. *Journal of the Professoriate, 4*(1). 40-74. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII] • Pair-led reflective discussion Evaluation[SLOVII]	• Pair-led reflective discussion [SLOVII]
Week 8: Rankings Systems and Institutional Diversity	• Pair-Led Reflective Discussion [SLOVII] • **Guest Speaker: Robert Kelchen,** PhD, Associate Professor, Higher Education, Seton	**Morphew, C.** (2009). Conceptualizing change in the institutional diversity of U.S. colleges and universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(3), 243-269. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Morphew, C. C. & Huisman, J.** (2002). Using institutional theory to reframe research on academic	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII] • Pair-led reflective discussion	• Pair-led reflective discussion [SLOVII]

	Hall University [SLOIII, SLOVI] • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVII]	drift. *Higher Education in Europe, 27*(4), 491-506. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Birnbaum, R.** (1983). *Maintaining diversity in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (Chapters 1 & 2). [SLOIII, SLOV] **Pusser, B. & Marginson, S.** (2013). University rankings in critical perspective, *Journal of Higher Education, 84*(4), 544-568. [SLOIII, SLOV]	Evaluation [SLOVII]	
Week 9: Rankings Systems Across the Globe	• Pair-Led Reflective Discussion [SLOVII] • **Guest Speaker: Gerardo Blanco Ramírez,** PhD, Assistant Professor, Higher Education & Student Affairs, University of Connecticut [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] • Rankings/Ratings Group Meeting Time [SLOVI, SLOVII]	**Safón, V.** (2013). What do global university rankings really measure? The search for the x factor and the x entity. *Scientometrics*, *97*, 223-244.) [SLOI, SLOII] **Lo, W. Y. W.** (2011). Soft power, university rankings and knowledge production: Distinctions between hegemony and self-determination in higher education. *Comparative Education*, *47*(2), 209-222. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Kabo, A. J.** (2012). Analyzing the Anglo-American hegemony in the *Times Higher Education* rankings. *Education Policy Analysis*, *20*(21), 1-53. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV] **Blanco-Ramírez, G. & Berger, J.** (2014). Rankings, accreditation, and the international quest for quality: Organizing an approach to value in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *22*(1), 88-104. [SLOIII, SLOIV, SLOV]	• Student Participation Rubric [SLOVII] • Pair-led reflective discussion Evaluation [SLOVII]	• Pair-led reflective discussion [SLOVII]
Week 10: Alternative Rankings and Ratings Systems	• Final Presentation of Alternative Ratings/Rankings Systems [SLOVI, SLOVII] • Seminar conclusions	**Shahjahan, R., Blanco Ramírez, G. & de Olivera Andreotti, V. D.** (2017). Attempting to imagine the unimaginable: a decolonial reading of global university rankings. *Comparative Education*, *61*(2), 51-73. [SLOVI] **Diver, C.** (2005, November). Is there life after rankings? *Atlantic Monthly*. Retrieved December 1, from: https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2005/11/is-there-life-after-rankings/304308/. [SLOVI]	• Final Rankings/ Ratings Presentation Rubric [SLOVI, SLOVII]	• Final Rankings/ Ratings Presentation [SLOVI, SLOVII]

SEMINAR EXPECTATIONS

This is a doctoral-level seminar. As such, you are invited to embody the highest standards of scholarly excellence. The Teaching Team expects that you will be critical and creative in how you present your work and expertise. All class sessions will involve discussion of assigned readings; we invite students to co-construct knowledge by sharing in this discussion and completing readings in advance. You will be evaluated on the scholarly excellence you bring to discussions with seminar participants and experts we host as guest speakers. We will use readings, activities, discussions, and group activities to achieve the course's significant learning outcomes. The goal of each session is to strengthen your ability to understand and critique rankings systems in higher education.

A doctoral seminar holds high expectations for written work, communication, and professional conduct. The expectation of this seminar is that students will be present and fully engaged during class exercises and discussions, which means being free of technological distractions. Not only do these distractions contribute to a student's inattentiveness, research demonstrates that they make it difficult for others to focus. Therefore, the following expectations are in effect during the seminar. Students should familiarize themselves with these expectations and understand that when they are not actively engaged, their learning and their fellow students' learning will be affected, as will their participation grades.

- Seminar attendance is required. Missing more than two class meetings will result in the deduction of an entire letter grade from final student grades (e.g., a A- will become a B-).
- All assignments must be completed on time and submitted via Canvas or presented in person during class. Late papers will receive a maximum of 70% and are only accepted up until three days after the assignment due date unless the teacher of record and student make alternative arrangements.
- Arrive to class on time and return promptly from class breaks.
- Turn off all mobiles devices or switch them to silent mode during in-class meetings. The use of electronic devices is restricted to notetaking and accessing seminar-related content and when the teacher has granted permission for their use during an exercise.
- Text messaging or sending email during in-person class are inappropriate.
- If you have an emergency that requires being accessible by phone during an in-class meeting, notify the Teacher of Record before class.
- Be respectful of your classmates and minimize distractions.
- Your participation grade will be evaluated based on your adherence to seminar expectations.

The Teacher of Record is available to meet as needed to assist students in meeting the expectations described.

SEMINAR ASSIGNMENTS

Doctoral seminars are intended to expose students to an array of scholarly topics while encouraging their participation in scholarly debates and co-facilitation of learning among all seminar participants including the Teaching Team and students. Seminar assignments are designed with these goals in mind.

1. Participation (20 points – grading rubric available on Canvas)

Because this seminar relies heavily on discussion and in-class participation, 20% of student grades will be assessed by their participation. Each class period, 2 participation points are possible; students will evaluate their own participation using the participation rubric (up to 1 point per class) and the Teaching Team will evaluate student participation (up to 1 point per class). Participation will be evaluated based on student co-construction of knowledge and expertise among seminar participants through engagement with the readings, guest speakers, pair-led reflective discussions, and activities. Student participation will also be evaluated by

how well students embody the principles of Inclusive Excellence in their interactions with seminar participants and guest speakers (the Teaching Team and students).

2. Pair-Led Reflective Discussion (30 points)
Students will work in pairs to lead a 45-minute reflective discussion of their assigned week's readings. Students are expected to pose questions, insights, and observations about the readings with the goal of co-constructing knowledge and expertise with seminar participants. Students will be evaluated on their ability to create a thoughtful, creative and informative discussion that pushes the thinking of seminar participants and advances our understanding of rankings systems in higher education. Students will also be evaluated on their efforts to encourage a variety of viewpoints and contributions to the discussion. In the past, students have led a variety of exercises including design thinking exercises, simulations, role plays, and jeopardy games. While not required, students are also welcome to incorporate media coverage of rankings systems within their reflective discussions.

3. Rankings/Ratings System for Higher Education (50 points)
The culminating assignment for the seminar is the creation of an original rankings/ratings system using criteria designed by each group. Each group will use the rankings system to do the following within a final paper and presentation:

- Rank 10 postsecondary institutions using publicly available data.
- Clearly identify criteria, weights, and methods of ranking/ratings system.
- Use class readings and other research to substantiate the importance of criteria and appropriateness of methods.
- Use theory to design rankings/ratings system.
- Provide rationale for this rankings/ratings system.
- Anticipate the striving and organizational behavior this ranking/rating system might catalyze: What kinds of institutional, faculty, or student behavior is it likely to catalyze? What kind of reputation is the ranking system intended to imbue?
- Differentiate characteristics of the rankings/ratings system from those of other rankings systems and explain the implications of these differences.
- Argue persuasively as to why rankings/ratings system is superior. Which stakeholders will it serve and how? How will it promote or impede educational opportunity and equity? How will it dismantle systemic oppression? How will it strengthen the public purposes of higher education?
- Discuss limitations of the rankings/ratings system.
- Papers should use APA, be 20-25 double spaced pages (exclusive of references or appendices), have normal margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman.
- 20-minute final presentation of rankings/ratings system.

Final group projects will comprise five parts:
1. DUE: Wednesday, September 11, 11:59 pm - Work Group Contract and Accountability Structure.
2. DUE: In class on Tuesday, October 1. 3-page double-spaced proposal for rankings/ratings system. Each group will receive written and verbal feedback from the Teaching Team on proposals in-class on Tuesday, October 8. The feedback will focus on the key ideas, criteria, data sources, and system proposed. As such, the proposal should escribe these elements.
3. DUE: In class on Tuesday, October 15: Brief (5-7 minute) discussion/preliminary presentation about rankings/ratings system to which seminar participants will provide feedback that will aid in the final design of rankings/ratings systems.

4. DUE: In class on Tuesday, November 12: Final presentation.
5. DUE: Monday, November 18, 11:59 pm: Final paper.

Note: the final presentation is due before the final paper. Each group is urged to consider feedback and questions offered by seminar participants in the formulation of final papers.

Examples of Alternative Rankings Systems are included below. Students are encouraged to carefully consider alternative systems and discuss with group members the affordances and limitations of each. The rankings/ratings systems that student groups create must be wholly unique and distinct from these examples, although they may be informed by elements of one or more of these alternative systems.

Examples of Alternative Rankings Systems [SLOVI]
- Sykes, T. (2006). 50 Top Colleges for African Americans. *Black Enterprise for Wealth and Life.* (SoC): http://www.blackenterprise.com/be-lists/50-top-colleges-for-african-americans/
- Essence's 50 Best Colleges for African Americans: http://www.essence.com/2016/04/11/50-best-colleges-african-americans (SoC)
- Department of Education College Scorecard: https://collegescorecard.ed.gov/
- A Fighter for Colleges That Have Everything but Status http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/28/education/28face.html
- de Alva, J.K. (2019). *Is the college next door the way to upward mobility?* Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute. http://www.aei.org/publication/is-the-university-next-door-the-way-to-upward-mobility/.
- *Washington Monthly* rankings: https://washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/september-october-2019/a-different-kind-of-college-ranking/ [SLOVI]
- Meekins, M. & O'Meara, K. (2011). Ranking contributions to place: Developing an alternative model for competition in higher education. *Public Purpose, Winter 2011*, 7-9. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/52aa1677e4b069d1317f42d0/t/5a01021dec212d85ddeb2d2e/1510015517951/Meekins+OMeara+%282011%29+Ranking+contributions.pdf
- Usher, A. (2019, April 3). A new set of international rankings. Higher Education Strategy Associates. Retrieved from: http://higheredstrategy.com/a-new-set-of-international-rankings-ii/.
- Hurst, A.L. (2019). College rankings: Creating an equitable model of transformation and institutional effectiveness. *Journal of Working-Class Studies*. *4*(1), 79-97. https://workingclassstudiesjournal.files.wordpress.com/2019/06/jwcs-vol-4-issue-1-june-2019-hurst.pdf.
- Garcia, A., Wienski, J., Cote, N., Silva, C. (n.d.). A rating spectrum for sexual assault education and prevention at Ten Ivy Plus Institutions. [Note: This publication was the result of a ratings system developed in the Rankings Systems in Higher Education Seminar taught in 2017]
- Smith, A.A. (2019, May 2014). Finalists names for best Hispanic-Serving colleges. *InsideHigherEd*. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/05/24/finalists-named-best-hispanic-serving-colleges. [SLOVI]
- Block, D. (2019). America's best colleges for student voting 2019: : the schools doing the most to turn students into citizens. *Washington Monthly.* Retrieved from: https://washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/september-october-2019/americas-best-colleges-for-student-voting-2019/
- McCann, A. (2019.) 2019's Best & Worst Community Colleges. Retrieved from https://wallethub.com/edu/best-worst-community-colleges/15076/?utm_source=One+Dupont+West&utm_campaign=daa72c714e-

EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2019_08_20_04_58&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_0977590b85-daa72c714e-414275943#rankings-by-state

- O'Reilly, K. (2019). The top 20 coolest schools 2019: Here's how the greenest colleges of the year earned an A+. Retrieved from https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/2019-5-september-october/cool-schools-2019/top-20-coolest-schools-2019

GRADING POLICY

Grades are based on the following criteria:

Grading Criteria for Final Papers	Possible Points
• Organization, structure, and clarity of writing.	5 points
• Employment of higher education research and theories to justify criteria, methods and system.	5 points
• Quality of critical analysis and reasoning for chosen criteria.	7.5 points
• Effectiveness of comparison and contrast with extant ranking systems.	
• Evidence of effective use of seminar participant feedback to improve the final product.	2.5 points
• Creativity, innovation, and significance to Inclusive Excellence and the public purposes of higher education.	5 points
TOTAL possible points	**25 points**

Grading Criteria for Final Grade	Percentages/Points
Participation	20% (20 points)
Facilitation of Reflective Class Discussion	30% (30 points)
Rankings/Ratings System for Higher Education • Work Group Contract and Accountability Structure (2 points) • Proposal (3 points) • Discussion/preliminary presentation of system (5 points) • Final paper (25 points) • 20-minute final presentation (15 points – rubric available on Canvas)	50% (50 points)
TOTAL possible points	**100% (100 points)**

GRADING SCALE
A: 4.0 = 93-100
A-: 3.7 = 90-92
B+: 3.3 = 87-89
B: 3.0 =   83-86
B-: 2.7 = 80-82
C+: 2.3 = 77-79
C: 2.0   = 73-76
C-: 1.7 = 70-72
D+: 1.3: = 67-69
D: 1.0: = 63-66
D-: 0.7 = 60-62
F: 0.0 = 59 & below

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is important to recognize that the University of Denver resides on lands that are held in stewardship by the Cheyenne and Arapaho tribes. It is with much gratitude that we recognize the descendant communities of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana, the Northern Arapahoe Tribe of Wyoming, and the Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma and remember that it is through their sacrifices that we are able to engage in learning and collaboration to further the study of higher education. To learn more about DU's recognition and reconciliation of their involvement in the Sand Creek Massacre, please review the John Evan's report by visiting this website: https://portfolio.du.edu/evcomm/page/52699.

FOOD AND HOUSING SECURITY

As a student, I often had to choose between eating or buying textbooks and paying rent. I urge any student who faces challenges securing food or housing to visit the University of Denver food pantry, located in the Center for Sustainability, Towers North, on the 1st floor. The food pantry is open to everyone with a DU ID. To learn the hours of the food pantry, please email: sustainability@du.edu. Short term emergency loans are available to students who are experiencing temporary financial hardship. To learn more about these loans, visit this website: https://www.du.edu/bursar/debt/emergency.html. Any student who faces challenges securing their food or housing and believes this may affect their performance in the course should contact the Office of Student Outreach & Support in the Division of Campus Life & Inclusive Excellence to get connected to the appropriate resources. Furthermore, please notify me if you are comfortable doing so. This will enable me to provide any resources that I may possess.

MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING

Fifty percent (50%) of graduate students experience anxiety or clinical depression, and 10% have contemplated suicide at some point during their studies (Jaschik, 2015). If you are experiencing mental health challenges, you are not alone and it is of the utmost importance that you seek professional support. There is no shame or stigma in getting the support you need. As a student, I benefited from the support of mental health professionals. Fortunately, the University of Denver offers robust supports for the mental health of graduate students. Please see below for additional information.

Counseling Services is here to support your transition to DU and through other transitions in your life, as well as to support your development and growth. Our services are all confidential and no information is released to anyone without your written consent except in the case of a life-threatening emergency, or when it is otherwise required by law. Please browse through this section of the HCC website to learn about the counseling services we offer. If you would like to initiate counseling services, you may drop in to our same-day access services (without any scheduled appointment) between 2-4 pm, M-F; call us at 303-871-2205; or schedule a brief screen online at MyHealth: https://myhealth.du.edu/login_directory.aspx. Students can benefit from different types of therapy, ranging from individual counseling to group counseling with licensed professionals. Graduate and doctoral students can also gain valuable experience by working closely with staff members through training and professional development programs.

Jaschick, S. (2015, April 22). The other mental health crisis. *InsideHigherEd*. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/04/22/berkeley-study-finds-high-levels-depression-among-graduate-students.

RESEARCH SUPPORT

The University Libraries Research Center (https://library.du.edu/services/index.html) answers research questions seven days a week by phone, email, in-person, chat/IM or text. One-on-one research consultations in the Anderson Academic Commons are also available on a drop-in basis or by appointment. Consultations

help students at any stage of the research process, from refining a topic, to finding books and articles, to creating a bibliography. The Research Center can also assist students with finding images, audio recordings, and videos for course projects. Telephone and Zoom video consultations are also available by request for distance students. Ask a question or make an appointment by calling 303-871-2905 or visiting http://libraryhelp.du.edu. Over 99% of the students who have visited the Research Center report they would recommend the Research Center to a friend or classmate.

STUDENTS WITH (DIS)ABILITIES/MEDICAL ISSUES

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 protects anyone with a (dis)ability from being excluded or discriminated against in the classroom. If you have a documented disability, please let me know as soon as possible so that we can set up the best learning environment for you. By law I cannot ask you if you have a disability. If you qualify for academic accommodations because of a disability or medical issue please submit a Faculty Letter to me from Disability Services Program (DSP) in a timely manner so that your needs may be addressed. DSP is located on the 4th floor of Ruffatto Hall; 1999 E. Evans Ave.303.871. / 2372 / 2278/ 7432. Information is also available on line at http://www.du.edu/disability/dsp; see the Handbook for Students with Disabilities.

TURNITIN

Students agree that by taking this course all required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin.com for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers will be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of such papers.

UNIVERSITY WRITING CENTER

The University Writing Center provides online writing support for any student who is enrolled in an online course, traveling on DU business, or studying abroad. To make an appointment, call 303-871-7456, or go to MyWeb / Student / Writing Center.

Like our face-to-face consultations, these free, 40-minute online sessions are collaborative and non-evaluative, meaning that the consultants' goals are to work with you to see your writing clearly and develop new strategies and habits for improving as a writer in light of your specific assignments, goals, and needs. These sessions are synchronous: you and the consultant will work in an online Google Doc, using the highlighting, commenting, and chat features to communicate. Please note that online consultants do not pre-read papers, proofread, or correct citations for you.

Online appointments are available during our regular hours (Sunday-Monday, including evening hours on many days, from the first day of classes through the second day of finals). Please visit our website at www.du.edu/writing/writingcenter/ for hours and additional information.

INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

In this class, we will work together to develop a learning community that is inclusive and respectful. Our diversity may be reflected by differences in race, culture, age, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, and myriad other social identities and life experiences. The goal of inclusiveness, in a diverse community, encourages and appreciates expressions of different ideas, opinions, and beliefs, so that conversations and interactions that could potentially be divisive turn instead into opportunities for intellectual and personal enrichment.

A dedication to inclusiveness requires respecting what others say, their right to say it, and the thoughtful consideration of others' communication. Both speaking up and listening are valuable tools for furthering thoughtful, enlightening dialogue. Respecting one another's individual differences is critical in transforming a collection of diverse individuals into an inclusive, collaborative and excellent learning community. Our core commitment shapes our core expectation for behavior inside and outside of the classroom

This course supports self-identification of gender pronouns. As the course includes group work and in-class facilitation, it is vitally important to us to create an educational environment of inclusion and mutual respect.

TITLE IX
Gender violence can happen to anyone regardless of race, class, age, appearance, gender identity, or sexual orientation. The University of Denver is committed to providing an environment free of discrimination on the basis of sex (gender), including sexual misconduct, sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking. The Center for Advocacy, Prevention and Empowerment (CAPE) provides programs and resources to help promote healthy relationships, teach non-violence and equality, and foster a respectful and safe environment for all members of the University of Denver community. All services are confidential and free of charge.

For assistance during business hours, call 303-871-3853 and ask to speak to the Director of CAPE. After hours, please call the Emergency & Crisis Dispatch Line at 303-871-3000and ask to speak to the CAPE advocate on call.

HONOR CODE/ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
All work submitted in this course must be your own and produced exclusively for this course. The use of sources (ideas, quotations, paraphrases) must be properly acknowledged and documented. For the consequences of violating the Academic Misconduct policy, refer to the University of Denver website on the Honor Code (www.du.edu/honorcode). See also http://www.du.edu/studentconduct for general information about conduct expectations from the Office of Student Conduct.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS ACCOMODATION
University policy grants students excused absences from class or other organized activities or observance of religious holy days, unless the accommodation would create an undue hardship. You must notify me by the end of the first week of classes if you have any conflicts that may require an absence. It is your responsibility to make arrangements with me in advance to make up any missed work or in-class material.

ONLINE AND WEB-SUPPORTED CLASS
It is your responsibility to procure reliable, readily-accessible Internet service and technology in order to fulfill course expectations. I am under no obligation to accept late assignments or waive required tasks (e.g., discussion participation) due to lack of online access or malfunctioning computer hardware. Please consider identifying an alternative Internet source in case of technical problems. Look here for a list of computer labs on the DU campus . Computer support is available from the University Technology Support (UTS) Help Center.