



**STATE FACULTY
ADVISORY COUNCIL**

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, November 1, 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

- A. Welcome
- B. Attendance

1. Members Present: Lisa Gallegos (OJC) Chair, Jenai Rutledge (ACC) Recorder, Joe Shields (LCC), Mary Nicks (PCC), Kathryn Carpenter (TSJC), Amy Braziller (RRCC), Andy DeRoche (FRCC), Daniel Grafton (MCC), Shirley Smith (CCD), Kent Ross (NJC), Daniel Grafton (MCC), Diedre Schoolcraft (PPCC – substitute for Cathy Henrichs), Nicolas Swails (CNCC)

2. Absent: Kelly O'Dell (CCA), Cathy Henrichs (PPCC)

II. GENERAL BUSINESS / SFAC DISCUSSIONS

- A. SFAC thanks Thomas Williams from his service as Chair and we wish him well in his new position at CCD!
- B. SFAC thanks Lisa Gallegos, former SFAC Vice Chair, for agreeing to take over the role of Chair for this meeting.
- C. October 4th meeting minutes approved.
- D. A SharePoint drive for SFAC will be created to permit document sharing and group-editing of minutes.
- E. Updates to travel document submissions shared by Lisa Gallegos.
- F. Election of SFAC Vice Chair
 - 1. Daniel Grafton self-nominated. Nomination was accepted. Vote in-favor was unanimous. Daniel Grafton will serve as the next Vice Chair.
- G. State Board Meeting Report (CFAC) - September 11, 2019
- H. Faculty Evaluation Committee Meeting Updates from October (first) meeting:
 - 1. Goals of first meeting were to collect and summarize feedback about current evaluation practices and procedures. SFAC Discussion facilitated by on the evaluation committee representatives
 - 2. Committee considering a 3-year cycle. Logistics under review.
 - 3. Request for a list of attendees of October meeting made
 - 4. Request that SFAC is allowed to provide feedback about revisions made.
 - 5. Request made to gather faculty evaluation tool for each college.
 - 6. Questions raised about current evaluation procedures and processes:
 - a. Who at each school determines compensation for each level of evaluation?
 - b. How is it determined at each school how much "exemplary" is worth?
 - c. What prevents individual colleges from allocating the 'pool' of money for awards and applying quotas.

- d. Would it be beneficial to have a single evaluation tool system-wide?
 - e. How is “service” defined? Should faculty be provided additional compensation for service they count towards their contractual service? Can we define what is compensable service?
 - f. How can the system help close loopholes and support individual colleges in their endeavors to make the process equitable system wide – but responsive to the workload of faculty within different disciplines.
- I. Discussion of Faculty Workload Documents across the system
- 1. SFAC reviewed workload documents system-wide
 - 2. Summarizing and analyzing similarities and differences across colleges in workload definitions/calculations may be a future SFAC initiative/interest project.

II. GUESTS

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

1. System Faculty evaluation group:
- a. 1st meeting in October, next meeting in November
 - b. First meeting focus: collect feedback from committee members about current process. A summary of the feedback provided was distributed to committee members to share with their individual institutions. Summary should be sent out to the college for feedback.
 - c. Procedure recommendation target date is March 2020, with implementation beginning AY2020-2021.
2. Teaching and Learning Innovation Grant Proposal – Follow-up from last meeting
- a. Revisions presented to college presidents. To better align with board priorities, focus has shifted to teaching excellence with an emphasis on addressing student success and equity.
 - b. Proposed plan would pull out \$1.5 million from system reserves over 3 years. – Board has approved this amount.
 - 1. Current stage of proposal development: identify how money will be allocated and spent. Dr. Pirius presented information about who is likely to apply and receive funds under current proposal.
 - a. Part of grant proposes Intensive Teaching and Learning Institute that would allow faculty to learn from other faculty. In October 2019, English, Math, and Dev Ed chairs piloted the intensive teaching and learning institute concept. Based on positive feedback, the concept will be built into the grant proposal.
 - 3. Request for SFAC feedback on the current draft– Submit feedback to Landon directly within the next two weeks via email.

B. Mark Superka - Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration

- 1. Budget updates
- 2. Latest economic forecasts in terms of revenue were discussed.
- 3. Budget projections and changes to projected growth if Prop CC passes.

C. Angie Gramse - General Counsel, Legal Affairs

- 1. Introduction and description of the system legal department:
 - a. Department consists of 3 attorneys, serving all 13 colleges – support students, faculty and other workforce

b. Angie primarily advises the CCCS executive team – politics, policy and procedural

c. Assistant Council: Molly Moats, Molly.Moats@cccs.edu, (Supports: ACC, CCA, CCD, NJC, PPCC, LCC)

d. Assistant Council: Mary Nero, Mary.Nero@cccs.edu, (Supports: FRCC, TCC, PCC, CCNC, OTC, MCC, RRCC)

e. This office also serves as “Special Assistant Attorney General”

2. Opened session to questions:

a. Question: How do snow day/ weather delays announced by colleges and the system impact off-site clinicals? Should clinicals be cancelled too?

Answer: Decisions-making authority about college closures or weather delays is held by college Presidents. If school is closed, clinicals do not have to be canceled. Recommended that syllabi have language to help address whether students are required to report to clinicals even in inclement weather. If a person decides to not meet obligations for work or clinicals, punitive actions taken is at the discretion of the college. All college VPI (or their equivalents) can contact Angie Gramse to get a copy of language that can be included at the front of the student handbooks. However, Ms. Gramse noted that handbooks are not contractual agreements.

b. Question: What is the difference between our current paid leave model which separately designates Personal Leave/Sick Time and how is this different for a “Paid Time Off” model?

Answer: Personal Leave/Sick Time are explained in BP3-60 Employee Benefits Policy which states that faculty may carry up to 4 personal days over years. 10hrs/contract month of sick leave are accrued. Ms. Gramse referenced the Faculty Workload BP which defines the faculty work week as 40 hours a week. This work week is defined by college presidents. Colleges define, individually, how the time on-campus and off that can count towards the 40 hour work week. How this is defined influences how sick and personal leave is claimed at each college. Paid time off (PTO) is a model that does not distinguish between personal and sick leave. Rather this model identifies a designated amount of leave time available to an employee and single amount.

c. Question: Why haven’t we switched to PTO?

Answer: There are tax implications between annual and sick leave. Annual leave has monetary value and sick leave does not. May also affect PERA benefits.

d. Question: How does the current leave benefit model allow faculty to observe holidays that are not formally recognized in the academic calendar, e.g. religious holidays?

Answer: Day recognition is set by State Statute – Religious accommodations for days that are not currently recognized and faculty who wish to observe them can be required to take their own leave to observe the holiday. Advice is to work with the college to determine what practice makes the most sense.

e. Question: How can faculty observe life events that are non-medical in nature utilize leave without dishonestly claiming sick-leave?

Answer: Because how leave requests are addressed varies between colleges, SFAC representatives will invite senior leadership from multiple

colleges to come in to discuss policies regarding workload and leave at a future meeting.

f. Question: How are “Needs Improvement” faculty supported by HR/legal? Answer: Typically addressed at college-level. SP3-31 defines steps for actions taken towards faculty. All steps outlined in the SP, including midyear meetings, must be met before further actions may be taken.

g. Question: How would support for need improvement faculty change if the evaluation cycle shifted to a 3-year cycle?

Answer: Because annual merit increases are tied to evaluations, having a 3-year evaluation cycle is not currently feasible. Shifting to a 3-year cycle would require the BP that links merit pay increases to evaluations being uncoupled.

h. Question: To what extent is a faculty member liable for issues that occur in the classroom, in which they are not personally involved?

Answer: Liability as a state employee – you have governmental immunity as described in BP3-06: Legal Protection for Employees. AG will represent you if you are sued. Student discipline procedures are currently being updated.

i. Additional information provided regarding faculty rights and social media: social media is protected speech. Adverse actions can be taken by employer if content of social media has the potential to impact the orderly actions of the college. If no clear connections can be made to inappropriate social media and the institution of the employee, there will be no legal reactions.

D. Chancellor Joe Garcia CCCS

1. Met with HR directors about supporting diversity in hiring practices.

a. Focal considerations include: (1) How do we emphasize quality teaching in our job announcements? (2) How do we recruit and hire a more diverse workforce that reflects shared values around a shared system?

b. Problem description summarized.

2. Funding formula for how CDHE distributes money is under revision at CDHE and the Governor’s office. Chancellor Garcia explained current model and described revisions proposed by CDHE.

3. Opened discussion to questions:

a. Question: Should serving on SFAC be a compensated position? Some colleges provide compensation in the form of release time for SFAC assignment, others provide no formal compensation.

Answer: More information needed. SFAC will collect data and issue will be readdressed at a later date.

b. Question: How are we staying competitive in our pay for faculty now that our system-wide initiative to bring faculty salaries up closer to national averages is complete?

Answer: No current system-initiative to evaluate where we are relative to national averages. Follow-up information about issue will be discussed at a future meeting.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. SFAC College Visits

1. SFAC will continue tradition of visiting colleges to allow SFAC members to meet with faculty from various schools and to allow programs at each college to be showcased to members of other colleges within the system.

2. Planned visits:

- a. Spring 2020 visit at CCD- coordinated by Shirley Smith

- b. Fall 2020 visit CNCC -coordinated by Nicolas Swails

B. Compensation for serving on SFAC:

1. Compensation for serving on SFAC and Faculty Senate exec committees as SFAC rep vary widely between institutions.

2. Work to revise SFAC bylaws to address compensation may be forthcoming at a future meeting.

II. COLLEGE REPORTS

III. Adjourn 3:33PM – Mary Nicks motioned, Seconded by Nicolas Swails