



MEETING MINUTES

Friday, May 7th, 2021

WebEx

9:00am-3:00 pm

I. SFAC Business/Discussion

A. Attendance

1. Members Present: Amy Braziller (RRCC) Chair, Daniel Grafton (MCC) Vice Chair, Jenai Rutledge (ACC) Recorder; Deidre Schoolcraft (PPCC), Kelly O'Dell (CCA), Kent Ross (NJC), Travis Parkhurst (PCC), Andy DeRoche (FRCC), Rhonda Schoenecker (TSJC), Shirley Smith (CCD), Nicholas Swails (CNCC), Becky Sporer (OJC),
2. Absent: Joe Shields (LCC)

B. Approve April 2nd Minutes – Minutes approved unanimously

C. SFAC Bylaws—Review and approval of added revision regarding compensation to SFAC bylaws (Article VI revised). Voted on reimbursement and compensation; approved unanimously.

II. CHANCELLOR JOE GARCIA, CCCS

A. Adult learners served by the system is down 12% over the past 5 years – working to analyze underlying factors contributing to this trend

B. 5 new college presidents have been hired. A new search for president at Northeastern Junior College (NJC) will begin shortly.

C. Vaccination mandates – larger higher education institutions in the state of Colorado including CSU, CU, MSU, DU, Fort Lewis, have issued vaccination mandates. Governor's office & Department of Higher Education office have encouraged colleges to consider adopting policies that support vaccination. Public health authorities have not provided advice specific to Higher Ed and vaccination mandates.

1. Individual colleges have been encouraged to work with local public health authorities for support and advice regarding policies.

2. SFAC Representative Reports about faculty responses to the system's public announcement about vaccination policies. Reactions are mixed – there is a concern that enrollment, especially at rural colleges, could be negatively impacted if vaccinations are required. Summary response to feedback: in the absence of a health authority-based mandate, decisions will be left to be made by individual colleges.

D. SFAC question: are there policies being developed to address faculty workload for those who will continue to work remotely. Answer: Yes*, for system employees and CCCOnline personnel. Related consideration includes whether amount of space dedicated to individual offices in system buildings and/or on campuses should change if a large portion of the employees/faculty will be working remotely more of the time.

E. AAUP – System leadership has been working with this group, but is considering shifting from looking to AAUP for part-time instructor advocacy more towards the Instructor Council for



these conversations so that actual employees of the system have more of a voice.

III. DR. LANDON PIRIUS – Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

- A. New faculty evaluation process – begins AY 2022
 - 1. SFAC question: what training will be offered? Answer: at least one training will occur in the fall in September for ALL current and new supervisors. There will be some expectation that supervisors will participate in on-going training with some regularity.
 - 2. SFAC question: Could faculty be involved in the supervisor trainings? Answer: Possibly. Requires further consideration.
- B. SFAC Question: Per Chancellor Garcia’s statement that policy related to workload calculations/expectations and working remotely - Can faculty be involved in development of system policy regarding workload and remote instruction? Answer: No current revisions of system policy/procedures as they relate to faculty workloads have been proposed. Additional conversation about whether system will be needed to determine whether there will be a system-level review and development of existing system policies and procedures that relate to faculty workload and remote work. Currently most of these policies and procedures are set and defined by individual colleges.
- C. Classified employees are being unionized – there is interest from this union group in introducing a 5-level evaluation ranking system for classified employees.
- D. Bill to unionize other groups of state employees is being drafted.
- E. Concurrent Enrollment:
 - 1. SFAC led discussion:
 - a) SFAC Concern: Instructor Qualifications: CE liaisons feel pressure to approve instructors even when instructors may not be well-qualified.
 - (1) Response
 - (a) HLC and system expectations are that methods used to credential and approve/hire instructors at the college should mirror the methods used to credential high school instructors.
 - (b) Credentialing requirements by discipline vary immensely between colleges which poses a challenge for school districts – especially those served by multiple colleges.
 - b) SFAC Concern: Scheduling issues – CE liaisons are learning, sometimes after the academic term has started about CE courses and instructors being offered at high schools. This leaves instructor qualifications to be completed after the fact and verification that course resources and curriculum align with college expectations after the class has begun. Response: Timelines for high schools to communicate about CE courses they wish to offer in an upcoming academic term may already exist in CE agreements at the system-level. Further research will be conducted and a follow-up will be provided at a SFAC future meeting.
- F. Colorado Online Updates



1. Program Committee updates: Positions held by SFAC representatives, Daniel Grafton, Nicholas Swails and Kent Ross, are being vacated as these SFAC representatives leave the council. Travis Parkhurst and Rhonda Schoenecker have volunteered to join as representatives over the summer. Faculty representatives will be compensated for participation in summer meetings. Kelly O'Dell and Deidre Schoolcraft will continue serving on the committee.
2. Updates:
 - a) Student Experience: Consultant has been hired to assist with mapping and designing the student experience.
 - b) Tammy Vercauteren hired to serve as the Colorado Online Project Director. This is a 3-year position that will lead the coordination of the logistics related to this transition from CCCOnline to Colorado Online. Recommended that SFAC invite Tammy Vercauteren to a meeting in the fall.
 - c) Project team is finalizing subcommittees and their representatives. Subcommittees will be assembled this summer and likely will convene starting in the fall.
 - d) Faculty representatives from each college are being identified to serve on faculty/instructor advisory board that will support all subcommittees.
3. Instructional Design (ID) subcommittee representative report: current direction and main objectives are unclear. Response: Work to collect student and faculty feedback and mapping of the student experience is underway. Future directives of the committee will likely develop from the data collected from these efforts. Committee work may be paused in the short-term to allow for data collection to complete.

IV. MARK SUPERKA – Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

- A. Long Bill Updates:
 1. 169% operating budget increase over current year – this restores the \$110million cut out of budgets from previous year and replaces \$100 million from CARES act funds.
 2. First time a funding formula was used – focused on low income, first gen, and BIPOC students. Beneficial to CCCS.
 3. JBC Updates
 - a) Approved a classified salary increase of 3%
 - b) Capital construction – IT and infrastructure – CCCS was awarded money for multiple projects.
 - c) Allowed up to 3% increase in resident and non-resident tuition increase.
 - d) General fund has bounced back, along with good economic growth making for a favorable budget. Need still exists to recover losses from declines in enrollment. 2/3 of CCCS generated revenue now comes from student tuition.
- B. Federal & State-level stimulus
 1. Three types – CARES, CRRSAA, ARP – waiting for dispersal of some of these funds, have been helpful to shore up losses due to declines in enrollment.



2. State Governor's office has given \$100 million of these funds, there are additional funds anticipated. Much will go to behavior/mental health & housing initiatives. Third set of projects are likely related to social justice initiatives.
- C. Extended session has delayed major projects – updates will be forthcoming in fall
- D. SFAC Question: Tuition – is there anything that is set to be done to address disparity between online tuition and face-to-face tuition costs. Answer: Likely here to stay in at least the short-term. Ongoing conversation about current online rates going forward. Revising the rate structure would be costly.

V. CCCS Scholarship Equity Taskforce

- A. Key functions of the CCCS Foundation, Presenter: Adam Cermak (Executive Director, CCCS Foundation):
 1. CCCS foundations helps to manage donations from donors who wish to give money broadly to community colleges and their students.
 2. Coaches presidents in managing donations and scholarships
- B. Description of current CCCS foundation initiatives, Presenter: Sophie Greenfield (Manager of Foundation Programs and Operations, CCCS Foundation)
 1. Introduced the Foundation Board Members: Zaneta Kelsey, Mike Beasley, Christinne Johnson (in attendance), and John Trefny (in attendance)
 2. Examining issues of equity in current scholarship process.
 - a) 150 scholarships awarded on average annually. (For more information about foundation scholarships visit: <https://www.cccs.edu/cccs-foundation/scholarships/>)
 - b) Scholarship awards by demographics appear to closely reflect system-wide demographics.
 - c) Student surveys/focus groups indicate that awareness of scholarship opportunities is one of the biggest challenges they face.
 3. SFAC question: How do students know to apply for a CCCS scholarship? Answer: publicized through college foundations and posts opportunities on social media feeds. Information is also available through many of the college offices on individual campuses. Currently marketing strategies appear to be effective as number of applications have increased over the past two years. But, it is unclear if there is equal access to this information across all student types.
- C. Taskforce Questions for SFAC:
 1. Are faculty made aware of scholarship opportunities? If so, how are faculty made aware of these? SFAC indicated they are generally unaware of these opportunities.
 2. What information do you share with students about scholarships when you are made aware of them? SFAC feedback: through guest lectures, research assignments, D2L announcements and emails.
 3. What are good vehicles for spreading the word about scholarships in addition to D2L? SFAC feedback: pizza and pancake parties, link on homepages to scholarships,



4. What role do faculty play in communicating with students about scholarships?
SFAC feedback: Information could be communicated via SFAC representatives; provide a YouTube video with instructions/information for faculty/staff/students.
5. What thoughts do you have about the scholarship application processes? SFAC feedback: First gen students need more support perhaps in understanding the what and how of scholarship applications and communication about these opportunities.

VI. SFAC Discussion

- A. Resuming in-person meetings – what considerations are there to convene in-person again? And to what extent should remote options for attendance continue? Should meetings be hy-flex? Representatives who travel from a distance were asked for input.
- B. SFAC goals – brainstorming for AY2022:
 1. Faculty-led message / initiative regarding CE policies and standards
 2. Colorado Online – on-going monitoring
 3. Ryan Ross – Academic integrity standardization
 4. Faculty evaluation process – check-in on faculty experience.
 5. Course renumbering process – unintended consequences
 6. Math co-requisite initiatives – updates from Danen Jobe
 7. Remote procedures related to faculty workload
 8. Advising and student accountability processes for remote learning – both ongoing and contingency planning

VII. Adjourn (2:30pm)