**STATE FACULTY
ADVISORY COUNCIL**

MEETING MINUTES
Friday, October 4, 2019
Colorado Community Colleges System Office
9101 E Lowry Blvd, Denver, CO 80238
Foundation Room – 2ND floor
9:00am- 3:00pm

I.   **CALL TO ORDER (9:05AM)**

   A.   Roll Call

   B.   Members Present: Thomas Williams (CCD) Chair, Lisa Gallegos (OJC) Vice Chair, Jenai Rutledge (ACC), Kelly O'Dell (CCA), Joe Shields (LCC), Kent Ross (NJC), Mary Nicks (PCC), Cathy Henrichs (PPCC), Amy Braziller (RRCC), Kathryn Carpenter (TSJC), Daniel Grafton (MCC), Nicholas Swails (FRCC), Andy DeRoche (FRCC) Absent: CNCC

II.   **GENERAL BUSINESS**

   A.   Minutes reviewed and edited. Motion to accept minutes made by Thomas Williams; Seconded by Kelly O'Dell. (2:33PM)

   B.   Travel Documents Procedure update (Lisa Gallegos)

      i.   A map is now required for re-imbursement every time the forms are submitted. Email updated maps to Lisa Gallegos (lisa.gallegos@ojc.edu)

      ii.   Individuals staying overnight can be reimbursed up to 75% of dinner the night before the meeting and the night after the meeting.

   C.   SFAC Recorder/Secretary open position. Jenai Rutledge (ACC) volunteered to serve in this capacity.

III.   **GUESTS**

   A.   **Dr. Landon Pirius** - Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

      i.   Discussion about the 2:2 Meeting held in Pueblo Sept. 27, 2019 –

      ii.   New shorter format of introductory remarks was well-received

      iii.   Remote participation in the meeting needs improvement - not all discipline meetings had WebEx. A request for WebEx in all discipline meetings was made by an SFAC representative to allow all faculty, especially those located at more remote locations, the opportunity to participate in discipline discussions.

      iv.   WebEx in the overflow room onsite also did not work as planned – it was reported that microphones of participants calling into the WebEx for the opening statements were not muted making it difficult to hear the opening comments and shared content.

      v.   SFAC Representative requested clarification about underlying motives regarding the 2:2 discipline meeting action item to review pre-requisites within the discipline. Dr. Pirius indicated that intention was to encourage disciplines to

evaluate if/what pre-requisites are necessary, and to discuss whether existing/recommended pre-requisites are fulfilling their intended purpose(s). It was also reiterated that, per revisions to SP9-17 (Common Course Numbering System), the requirement for pre-requisites to be standardized across the system has been revised. The new expectation is that pre-requisite standardization occurs at the level of the individual college and that pre-requisites should be the same within an institution.

B. Q&A about revisions to SP9-71 (CCNS SP) regarding pre-requisite standardization
   i. **Question**: How do discrepancies between pre-requisites between institutions affect transferability if some schools remove credits from a pathway/program and others do not? **Answer**: Dr. Pirius indicated that current trends in GT is that schools tend to be less focused on pre-requisites and more on the core coursework. It is not anticipated that differences in credit numbers due to variance in pre-req's will cause problems for students.
   ii. **Question**: Per the changes to SP9-71, how are colleges expected to handle/determine prerequisites if they are college/discipline specific? **Answer**: It was reiterated/clarified that if pre-requisites are added to courses there should be a clear motive for having them and reasons should not be related to keeping enrollment lower in different courses.
   iii. **Question:** Based on the new version of SP9-71, which now allows each college to decide on pre-requisites for each course, what is the recommended procedure each college should follow to determine whether recommended pre-requisites should be modified/removed/added within a college? **Answer**: Decisions about modifying or removing pre-requisites in a way that conflicts with discipline recommendations should be faculty-driven and collaborative. Process should include chief academic officer and may include the college curriculum committee.

C. 2:4 DWD (Degrees with Designation)– statewide transfer statements reviews. What is the purpose?
   i. Revisions are aimed at improving the process by which students are able to obtain these degrees. Some are working well, but others, like those in biology and chemistry work less well – and in certain cases current requirements for the degrees can mean students can't actually obtain the DWD without going to a 4-year, taking courses, and getting the DWD in retroactively. Also, some courses offered at CC's that are 200-level but that are 300-level courses at 4-years are not transferring in as the equivalent course, requiring students to retake them at the 4-years.
   ii. Concerns were voiced about consequences of the initiative to revise required coursework within degrees: Dr. Pirius indicated that the intention is not to remove courses currently taught, but rather to improve alignment with the 4 years so that they transfer as intended.

iii. There is a move by CDHE to have the DWD's reviewed on a scheduled cycle. Currently there is no pre-set schedule for revision work.

D. Faculty evaluation committee

i. Doodle poll was sent out to determine a meeting time for representatives from each college. Purpose is to re-open last year's SFAC discussion about faculty evaluation process. Intention is to improve consistency and training in policy and practice. Goal is to have final determination of revisions to procedures/policies/practices in spring – revised policy/procedures will not impact current year (AY2020) review cycle.

E. Teaching and Learning Grant – follow-up from last meeting

i. Grant proposes to pull $5 million out of reserves to focus on initiatives that will improve teaching across the system over 3 years. The intention is to improve variable approaches to teaching and not to advocate for a single methodology.

ii. Grant proposal was presented to the college presidents since the last SFAC meeting.

iii. Grant proposal received mixed reactions. Two objections raised by presidents were:

- Current solutions for utilizing money are preferred (e.g., spending money on advising, improving guided pathways, etc.),

- It was perceived that the proposal focused too much on strengthening a single pedagogical approach (related to a single company) where development of more varied methods/resources would be preferred.

- Revisions to the proposal are being made to correct this misperception. If approved, target date for funding is spring at the earliest. Landon follows-up in Nov. with the board.

iv. **SFAC question**: Who will set criteria for priorities? And what will they be? **Answer**: Board is interested in closing equity gaps (broadly defined to include and extend beyond race and ethnicity). More broadly, initiative will also focus on improving teaching excellence. It is envisioned that funds will be accessible to individuals, departments and specific colleges.

v. Related SFAC Request/Discussion: system needs to clearly define 'diversity' for institutions. Suggestion was made to consult Ryan Ross Assoc. Vice chancellor of student affairs, equity and inclusion. Ross has visited and presented to a number of colleges in an effort to clarify equity and diversity. May be beneficial to have him present at all colleges in the system.

F. Opened to Faculty questions:

i. Will a group to review policies be formed? Answer: Angie Gramse & Landon Pirius were working to develop a 'policy on policies' – intention was to cultivate a policy that describes how policies and procedures should be developed. Two documents were drafted – but the initiatives were tabled because of objections by other upper divisions about having to go through those defined processes to

modify policies and procedures. Dr. Pirius plans to continue to spear-head an effort to create a policy about developing policies and procedures regarding academic and student affairs at the system level.

ii. CCC-Online updates? Now reports to Dr. Pirius's office. Tina Parscal of CCConline also reports to Dr. Pirius's office.

- Review of the strategy used to offer CCConline courses is ongoing. Dr. Pirius indicated he hopes to create a model used to offer courses through CCC-Online that is "internally collaborative and complimentary but externally competitive." Current model requires colleges to show all courses offered within CCC-Online forcing them to compete with college courses.

- Three options were identified that may be considered as a means to address criticisms about the manner in which CCConline courses are currently offered: (1) to remove CCC-Online courses completely, (2) separate CCC-Online from the other colleges and make it its own accredited college, or (3) modify the manner in which courses are offered so that schools have control over which courses are listed in their catalogs. Goal of the third option would be to better ensure that CCConline is used to meet needs for courses that are not already being met by coursework offered within or by the individual college. It will remain 'as-is' for the moment, but a conversation is on-going with an intention to revise. CCC-Online revenue supports infrastructure of CCC-Online, system office, and then a portion goes into reserves. Reorganization of funding will be required if significant revisions are made to how CCC-Online is structured.

- Dr. Pirius noted that justification of current model has focused on the revenue generated by CCC-Online and has typically not considered how much the courses cost individual colleges.

  (a) It was indicated that the current goal is to shift CCC-Online course so that those courses "complement what is going on at the colleges not…duplicate what is going on at the colleges." Colleges will hopefully have some 'say' about whether CCC-Online classes are offered or not – currently there is no option.

- Observation made that LOR OER course resources are not freely available to OER coordinators

  (a) CDHE Grant requires that institutions create a repository, but the OER resources are not currently open to coordinators. LOR's to OER and D2L course shells at CCC-Online should be open to colleges.

  (b) Time frame: strategic direction by spring 2020. Conversation, including updates, with SFAC should be ongoing.

IV. **National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships -** [Brandon Protas](#)
   A. Presentation focused on describing what CE is, how it is offered and introduced NACEP as a possible method for ensuring the courses are offered in an accreditable manner.
   B. Students who take some college but do not complete a degree can be worse off than students who take no college. Future goals of CE center on ensuring that taking CE courses helps lead students to completion of a college degree.
   C. There are accrediting body for CE: NACEP (National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships) – Colorado does not require accreditation. CCD is the only college in the system that is accredited. Current System "Standards" mirror NACEP standards
   D. CCD offers specific onboarding criteria and topics for new CE instructors. Searchable on ccd.edu "onboarding". Orientation sessions are organized and offered by individual departments.
   E. Advocates for NACEP accreditation and use of standards to ensure quality of CE.

V. **LUNCH- with Chancellor Joe Garcia CCCS**
   A. Discussed different tuition models for Community Colleges including the model that would make enrollment free to all CC students – currently a method to financially offset the costs of the 'free model' has not been found.
   B. System Board unanimously voted to support Proposition CC to retain tax revenue that exceeds revenue cap. If passed, the additional retained revenue would in part be used supplement higher education funding. This proposition does not involve a tax increase.
   C. Discussed enrollment trends at different colleges and how our system is working to support the needs of more rural colleges as enrollment declines and/or the cope with changes in the local economies.

VI. **Counter Educational Learning Lab** - Jordan Clark (Assistant Director of Counterterrorism Education learning Lab [(CELL)](#)
   A. CELL has 3 "Pillars" used to educate and train the public and professionals on recognizing and responding to threats in their environment – specifically related to terrorism.
   B. Exhibit: by Denver art museum – introduces threats of terrorism, national and global threats in a non-partisan method. School groups are invited to that exhibit (exhibit will be closing and upgraded at end of the year).
   C. Speaker Series: National security events – brings in national experts to Denver to discuss current issues and training for (Have current workshops planned this year at CCA, CCD, Columbine H.S.);
   D. Training: CAP (Community Awareness Program) trains the public about evolving criminal and terrorist threats, identifying and reporting on suspicious activity – offered to community members and students.
       i. Programming can be provided on campuses. There is a cost associated with the programs.

      ii.   Offer career internships.

E.   Oct. 21 CCD at Auraria Campus – CELL presentation open to the public. Flier will be forthcoming.

F.   Junior Crime Stoppers – partner with college-age students interested in getting involved in their community. Students who are interested can contact: Jordan Clark at: jclark@thecell.org

VII.   NEW BUSINESS- SFAC Open Discussions

B.   12-month contracts for faculty – how many days are in contracts? Determined it varies but most faculty contracts are 9-10 months.

C.   Retention of faculty email – Question: Can it be longer than 6 months? Are faculty emails subject to Freedom of Information Act – yes. Emails are not actually permanently gone. Requests can be made to recover emails from IT – will need to go to system IT

D.   Workload Information Request

    B. How is release time and workload calculated at different colleges?

    C. Is it allowable to "load bank" – what is the cut-off?

    D. Discussed what constitutes "service"? How is the 70/30 calculated? Optimistic that the system evaluation committee will strike the 70/30 language from the SP related to evaluation because it is quantitative language used to describe a qualitative division of labor and time.

    E. Are sabbaticals being used? Not so far – money to cover the opening may be a hinderance

VIII.   COLLEGE REPORTS – combined with discussion of new business

IX.   Adjourn at 2:34PM

Minutes recorded by Jenai Rutledge (ACC)