



# CENTRAL CHRISTIAN COLLEGE OF KANSAS

## COLLEGE COUNCIL – MINUTES

---

Wednesday, February 8, 2023 @ 12:08 p.m., RBC-AC-20

**Present:** Lenny Favara, LeAnn Moore, David Ferrell, Matt Malone, Katy Potter, Doug Vanderhoof, Kyle Moody, Enrique Barreiro, Cathy Brown, Lyndsi Romero, Lara Vanderhoof and Hannah Litwiller (recorder)

**Not Present:** SGA Representative

I. Call to Order

II. Devotion & Prayer

The Chair shared perspectives from the Joseph narrative and how they intersect with our day-to-day functioning of the institution. Prayer followed.

III. Consent Agenda

A. The January 11, 2023 minutes with corrections were approved by unanimous consent.

B. The Constituent Reports were received by unanimous consent.

IV. Tabled Items

A. SIS Recommendation [SIS Review Committee] – **Pending**

V. Old Business/Action Items

**A. Window & Door Policy [President/HR] – Pending**

1. The Chief of Staff did some research and submitted to the President. The President has not had a chance to talk with HR. The policy remains in process.

**B. Post Season Play Drug Testing Proposal [Student Affairs] – Pending**

**C. General Drug Test Policy [Student Affairs] - Pending**

**D. Tuition Proposal [President/CFO] – Progressing**

1. The BAC had submitted four tuition proposals to the Council.

a) The first was to raise the cost of SPE tuition. After careful consideration, the President has declined this proposal. Evidence suggests that a cost increase at this time is unwise, as we are in the midst of a transition from Keypath to CCK management. In addition, CCK remains at the higher end of tuition costs.

(1) The Chair of the BAC informed the Council that the BAC supports this decision, as data confirms the wisdom of at least keeping tuition stable for the time being.

b) The other three proposals were all focused on residential tuition. However, the College Council could not reach consensus based on the proposals by the BAC. The issue was referred to the President for action. Since that meeting, the President has met with multiple key players. He has expressed appreciation to the FA Director, CFO, and AD for working with him as they investigated and debated possibilities.

(1) The President provided the Council with an overview of some findings that were uncovered as he investigated possibilities.

(a) The primary considerations underlying the possibility of adjusting curriculum were:

- (i) *The need to generate \$3.5M in net tuition – balancing the effects of inflation.*
  - (ii) *The desire to invest into specific programs.*
  - (iii) *Realization of the assumed break point of \$18-20K out-of-pocket.*
  - (iv) *There are underlying assumptions, held over from past administrations, which have influenced the way members of the institution have perceived our approach to tuition and scholarship development.*
- (2) To help inform the process, the President worked with the NAIA Research Office (ROA) to gather data and test assumptions. Through that interaction, he was able to derive data concerning average scholarships, Discount Rates, and out-of-pocket expenses for athletes associated with the NAIA. This included the ability to specifically derive data on the KCAC and the SAC. The President summarized some of the findings.
- (a) We are lagging on the amount we invest into the overall athletic experience when we look strictly at sport expenses/player, which is partially explained by the deficit we experience in net tuition income.
  - (b) Athletic scholarships are larger than the averages across the NAIA and SAC, and in alignment with the KCAC.

	CCCK	NAIA	KCAC	SAC
FA Per Student Athlete	\$16,700	\$14,210	\$16,470	\$12,550

- (c) From a purely out-of-pocket perspective, CCCK significantly outpaces KCAC and SAC institutions. This out-of-pocket comparison includes all costs (Tuition, Fees, Room, and Board) and ALL institutional aid (i.e. athletic, academic, early bird, etc.)

### KCAC Comparisons

Institution	AVG Out of Pocket (Full Cost)
Institution 6	\$14,582.50
Institution 15	\$21,276.98
Central Christian College of Kansas	\$21,497.22
Institution 18	\$22,497.05
Institution 9	\$22,614.67
Institution 13	\$22,642.17
Institution 5	\$23,344.51
Institution 14	\$24,488.53
Institution 4	\$25,263.25
Institution 19	\$25,861.52
Institution 1	\$26,131.03
Institution 20	\$27,665.37
Institution 17	\$28,387.12

### SAC Comparisons

Institution	AVG Out of Pocket (Full Cost)
-------------	-------------------------------

Institution 7	\$20,989.15
Central Christian College of Kansas	\$21,497.22
Institution 10	\$21,632.71
Institution 2	\$22,003.24
Institution 16	\$22,623.18
Institution 12	\$23,037.47
Institution 3	\$24,502.12
Institution 11	\$24,870.93
Institution 8	\$27,802.24

(3) Based in part of from these findings and other analysis, the President is proposing:

- (a) An increase in Room & Board, in response to inflation. This is estimated at about 2.5% [\$1,000].
- (b) A freeze on tuition.
- (c) The inclusion of an athletic fee (with the caveat of adding secondary insurance for all athletes).
- (d) Investment in singular programs so they can compete in the SAC conference.
- (e) The establishment of a KS Scholarship to attract Kansas residents (Pell Eligible, Comp Eligible, SEOG Eligible).
- (f) Realignment of our scholarship structure to a *stackable* model, using GPA and Talent Based criteria for awarding. This would not erase, but perhaps modify comprehensive scholarships such as Legacy.

(i) *The College Council articulated general consensus of the increase of overall price by 2.5% minimum, consideration of an athletic fee to be added to underwrite Athletic funding, and support for pursuing a KS Scholarship.*

(ii) *The FA Director shared concerns that this move might not help the coaches as much as they think. However, they do need to stop overfunding their scholarships. With stacking scholarships, there would be less abuse of the scholarships. This would allow the coaches, FA Director and Admissions to work together. Question – what about non-athletes?*

**(a) The College Council supported the modifications.**

**E. Increase of Lost Key Fees [President/COO] – Pending**

- 1. COO is waiting for feedback from the Operations Committee.

**F. Work Week [COO] – Pending**

- 1. Looking at the week after graduation, May 8-11, 2023. No objection from the Operations Committee. However, the, President's Reception is scheduled on that week, Wednesday, May 10.
- 2. President would like to discuss among the President's leadership team next week.

**VI. New Business**

**A. Lifestyle Covenant**

## 1. Feedback

- a) Suggestion to add a scripture to back-up some of the expectations.
  - (1) Discussion: That definitely could be considered. The struggle is that some aspects of the covenant are not necessarily derived from a purely Scriptural perspective. Some elements are more indicative of preference, or perhaps are informed by Scripture, History, Tradition, and Experience. Since much of the new language is more reflective of the Free Methodist Discipline, the logic of the first draft was to allow the Discipline (and the Scriptures it references) to serve as the primary source document. However, including Scripture will be considered.
- b) In the section about excessive consumption of food – question of obesity or lack of food consumption.
  - (1) Discussion: Yes – there are a number of other nuisances that need to be considered here. The next draft will attempt to flesh some of this out.
- c) There was a concern that the DAC Appeal process is only being 24 hours seemed unwise and didn't allow students/parents enough time to cool down and find help from staff. The suggestion is 48-72 hours.
  - (1) Discussion: Student Engagement will investigate modification.
- d) Where do staff and faculty fall? Is it a double standard?
  - (1) Discussion: This process is a multi-phase response to the denomination's request to align standards. This phase is focused on residential students, as we develop this, we will begin addressing other groups (online, graduate, non-residential, and staff). At this time it seemed prudent to address the largest population first.

## 2. Keep asking for feedback, it is appreciated.

### B. Long Range Planning Calendar

- 1. Overlapping terminology when talking about the calendar. Academic calendar is under the faculty purview. The institutional calendar is under the authority of the College Council and managed by the Chief of Staff.
- 2. The Council needs to take aspects of the modified academic calendar (as approved by the Faculty Senate) and finalize the overall institutional calendar. In the course of discussion a number of factors were discussed.
  - a) For athletics, it would behoove us to have a 5 year calendar.
  - b) KICA schools have asked the CAO to meet with other institution CAO's and to get the calendars aligned to cross share classes/instructors.
  - c) We are not in alignment with KICA schools. Our misalignment is that we start too early and end too early.
  - d) The President has been asked about having a December term (short term 2-3 hour class to be offered to other KICA schools). That would fall within the "term" and would end when the online class ends. It would be a unique thing.
  - e) The AD wants to be sure we align with the SAC calendar.
  - f) Academic Calendar is set for 2023-2024.
  - g) We need dates for the 5 year institutional calendar, ex) Homecoming, move-in dates, business drive, volunteer recognition luncheon, etc. Discussion about MLK Day or maybe celebrate Freedom Day in February.

3. After discussion, members were asked to send date changes to the Chief of Staff to update the calendar to send back out to College Council.

#### VII. President's Report

- A. MOU: The Foundation Board approved the updates to the MOU between the College and the Foundation. This put the Advancement Office back under the umbrella of the institution. This office will become more involved in campus committees and governance (see below for more information).

#### VIII. Integrated Planning Matrix

- A. For January, the final quadrennials should be making their way to AAAC. The teams have been put together to review with a 2 week turn around. The Natural Science has not been submitted, however, Psychology, CJ and Business has been reviewed.
  1. The Chair made note that if the dates need to change through the planning matrix, then a proposal can come to the College Council.
- B. Athletics is lagging on their quadrennial. The Chair reminded members of the importance of engaging ongoing assessment. We cannot make good decisions if we lack the data needed to consider outcomes.
- C. For February, the focus is on the P&P Manual. Chief Officers need to get modifications to the Chief of Staff by February 15<sup>th</sup>.
- D. Budget Process continues on track.

#### IX. Assurance Argument - Oversight Responsibility

- A. Thank you for engaging in the Criterion 5 read through. We will incorporate all the feedback.
- B. As we look forward the goal is to have
  1. March 6: A second preliminary read through with staff randomly assigned to different components.
  2. Spring: We will separate by interest group; Criterion 1&2 will go to the leadership team, 3 &4 go to faculty, and 5 to Business Office and Foundation.
  3. Fall: A third read through with staff randomly assigned to different components.
  4. Winter: A full read-through
    - a) Executive Director of the Foundation, Dr. David Ferrell articulated support for the current process since it has enhanced the opportunity for people to interact with Assurance Argument. He also expressed the importance of ensuring that all members of the institution continually made an effort to be present at this read-throughs.

#### X. Governance Structure

- A. As part of our responsibility as the College Council we are to review the governance structure and ensure that it is meeting its intended ends. As we have moved through this year, there have been some ideas that have emerged, which should guide our assessment:
  1. Does membership on committees reflect and support effective representation?
  2. Where is the student input and voice in each committee? Who has the primary responsibility on getting a student there or gathering student input? We may need to consider something more than just auto-assigning SGA members. Perhaps looking to allow the student body or SGA to appoint students reps, even if not on student council.
  3. What is the role of Advancement and it merges back into the work of the College?
  4. Question about student engagement with the BAC, especially about confidential issues

- a) Discussion: That is a risk of shared governance, regardless of student involvement, it is a genuine concern, perhaps we can find some creative way such as could a senior in the business department do the meetings as part of an internship?

B. Members were asked to review the governance structure, talk with constituents, and provide feedback.

XI. Adjournment @ 3:02pm