

BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, STATE OF WYOMING, HELD WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2015, PETERSEN BOARD ROOM, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Board Present: Board Chairman Ed Mosher, Vice Chairman Bill Dubois, Treasurer Don Erickson, Secretary Christine Lummis, Trustees Brenda Lyttle and Carol Merrell, and ACC Advisory Board Ex Officio Trustee Butch Keadle and Student Ex Officio Trustee Noah Cheshier

Board Excused: Trustee Bradley S. Barker, III

Staff Present: President Joe Schaffer; Vice Presidents Judy Hay and Rick Johnson, Interim Vice President Terry Harper, Associate Vice President Kim Bender, and Executive Director Tammy Maas; Faculty and Staff Members Candy Ferrall, Jeri Griego, Ann Murray, and Leah Noonan; and Legal Counsel Tara Nethercott

Visitors: Kristine Galloway (*Wyoming Tribune-Eagle*), Shari Johnson and Amber Munjar (*Wingspan* Online Editors), and Daniel Martinez (*Wingspan* Editor)

1. CALL TO ORDER of the December 2, 2015, Board Meeting of the Laramie County Community College District Board of Trustees – Board Chairman Ed Mosher

Board Chairman Ed Mosher called to order the December 2, 2015, Board Meeting of the Laramie County Community College District Board of Trustees at 7:06 p.m.

2. MINUTES – Approval of the [November 18, 2015, Board Minutes](#) – Board Chairman Ed Mosher

Trustee Merrell moved and Trustee Lyttle seconded,

MOTION: That the Board of Trustees approves the November 18, 2015, Board Minutes as written.

DISCUSSION: None

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. Report from the Nominating Committee on Each Nomination – Trustee Lummis

Board Chairman Mosher complimented Trustee Lummis's organization of the election process, stating she has been working with the trustees in preparation for the Board's officer elections. Trustee Lummis read the list of officer positions and the nominees for each position as follows and Trustee Erickson seconded the nominations:

- 1) Chairman – Trustee Mosher
- 2) Vice Chairman – Trustee Dubois
- 3) Secretary – Trustee Lummis
- 4) Treasurer – Trustee Erickson

Trustee Mosher asked for any other nominations and hearing none called for the vote.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

1) WACCT Representatives (one voting member and one non-voting member)

Trustee Lummis stated Trustees Don Erickson and Bradley Barker have been nominated. Trustee Lyttle seconded their nomination.

Trustee Erickson commended Board Chairman Mosher for his service on the Wyoming Association of Community College Trustees Board as past president and treasurer and stated he will be missed.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

2) Foundation Board Representatives (three non-voting members)

Trustee Lummis stated Trustees Bill Dubois, Brenda Lyttle, and Carol Merrell have been nominated. Trustee Erickson seconded their nomination.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

Board Chairman Mosher commended Trustee Lyttle for sharing the report she gave during the November 12th Foundation Board meeting; Trustee Lyttle shared that report with the LCCC Board during their November 18th meeting. Trustee Erickson also offered his appreciation for the Foundation Board reports, as well as those from committees and other activities in which the trustees participate. Trustee Lyttle stated the reports will continue following each of the Foundation Board's quarterly meetings. Board Chairman Mosher reminded the trustees of the holiday gathering at Sloan and Anna Marie Hales' home on December 9th.

3) Finance and Facilities Committee (chairman and representative)

Trustee Lummis stated Trustees Carol Merrell and Don Erickson have been nominated. Trustee Lyttle seconded their nomination.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

Board Chairman Mosher noted the exciting building projects and other accomplishments that are underway on campus, thanked the trustees for their participation and support, and stated he looks forward to working with them during the coming year.

4. REPORTS TO THE BOARD

A. LCCC Reports

1) SGA (Student Government Association) – Danielle Kienzle, President; Sawyer Burkett, Vice President

Student Ex Officio Trustee Noah Cheshier stated he will report on behalf of SGA during his report as ex officio later in the meeting.

2) Staff Senate – Candy Ferrall, President; Amy Ehlman, Vice President-Classified Staff; Kevin Yarbrough, Vice President-Professional Staff; Jennifer Thompson, Secretary; Sarah Smith, Treasurer

Staff Senate President Ferrall reported on the following:

- The next group of unsung heroes has been selected.
- A door decorating contest will be held again this year.

- Plans are underway to welcome new employees beginning in January that will include a welcome packet with information about Staff Senate. The welcome packet is part of the Staff Senate's new marketing plan to actively distribute information that promotes Staff Senate.
- 3) Faculty Senate – Leah Noonan, President; Mohamed Chakhad, Vice President; Mary Ludwig, Secretary

Faculty Senate President Noonan stated the Faculty Senate has not met since the last Board meeting. She offered a clarification on her comments given during the November 18th Board meeting, stating the items she brings forward during the Board meeting are at the request of the Faculty Senate. Board Chairman Mosher stated the Board looks forward to hearing from Faculty Senate.
- 4) LCCCEA (LCCC Education Association) – Meghan Kelly, President; Les Balsiger, Vice President; Maggie Swanger, Secretary; Jim Streelman, Treasurer

An LCCCEA representative was not available to give a report this evening.

5. WORK ITEMS

A. [Data Byte – KPI Measure D.5 Licensure/Certification Rates](#) – Institutional Research Director Ann Murray

The Licensure/Certification Rates President Schaffer stated this KPI focuses on workforce development, which is at the heart of the College's mission to prepare people for successful entry into the workforce and career advancement. He reviewed the "current" 2013-2014 grades for each of the measures, noting the decrease in total enrollment in credit programs that leads to jobs where students are most apt to be employed; i.e., those that are designed for occupational entry. He observed the decrease is the same as being experienced in other credit programs across the institution. The good news is the total enrollment in non-credit workforce programs is increasing, as are the degrees being awarded and the in-field job placement rate. Additionally, 50% of the FTE enrolled in Workforce Development programs are graduating on an annual basis, which results in A Grade. These are the programs for which the College offers certification for completed coursework through the School of Outreach and Workforce Development. Predominately because of the College's A.C.T Now! program and grant, students are receiving certifications in areas such as Pharmacy Tech, Dental Assistant, and Certified Nursing Assistant and are aligned with jobs that are available. The number of AAS degrees and occupational-related certificates being awarded is on track. An employer satisfaction survey is being developed and so no data are yet available.

This KPI provides data for the College to consider as it considers:

- Enrollment
- Student Success in Terms of Completing
- Is the credential relevant? Are students getting jobs?
- Are the employers happy? Did the College's coursework prepare the student for occupational entry employment?

President Schaffer explained for Trustee Erickson how the grades are calculated. The grading scale model includes five data inputs for a five-year period. Two of the data inputs are consistent for all calculations and are an external benchmark and an improvement goal. LCCC has been nationally recognized for the grading scale model. Director Murray created the model with input from many others and has presented it at national conferences. The KPI system provides a strong framework for data comparisons that shows how well the College is doing on a specific measure. The improvement goal was determined by Director Murray and committee members. From the five data inputs, an average and a standard deviation (SD) are calculated. The "A min" grade (minimum A grade) is then calculated by

adding the SD to the “B min” grade (the average that was calculated); the C grade, by subtracting the SD from the “B min” grade; and the D grade, by subtracting the SD from “C min” grade.

Institutional Research Director Ann Murray chose the licensure/certification pass rate data byte, because the College has collected data for a long time for the programs that require licensure/certification. The data comes from the reports received from each program’s licensing agency. However, the quantity of data collected is small and shows the limitations of the College’s system when only a small amount of data exists. A benchmark is not available for this data byte, so this data byte has only four data points. A bit of a time lag also exists, because the KPI system calculates the data comparisons in August, and all spring graduates may not have sat for their licensure/certification examinations yet. The graph shows a downturn from 96% to 90%, which was primarily due to a drop in nursing licensure. Because the nursing licensures are the greatest in number, these pass rate percentages will affect the overall pass rate for the licensure/certification data byte. Nursing Program Director Jennifer Anderson has indicated the downturn in nursing licensure rates is a national trend. However, LCCC’s passing licensure rates are still above the national average. From an accreditation point of view, the Nursing Program pass rates are where they need to be.

Director Murray pointed out that the Surgical Technology Program 2013-2014 class was very small. Small classes mean small denominators, and small denominators mean volatile pass rates. The program was put on hold after the 2013-2014 academic year, so that the curriculum could be revised. A needs assessment conducted several years ago after another community college closed its program indicated a need existed for this program at that time. When LCCC began offering the program, it did so with the understanding that a surgical technologist would have to be certified. However, the required certification was not implemented. President Schaffer stated the College has a new Surgical Technology Program director and the current number of students would suggest a need exists locally. Extending the program offering for certified scrub technicians into rural areas is being considered and doing so by partnering with other community colleges is also being considered because a need is apparent across the state. Trustee Erickson asked about the schedule of offerings remembering some problems existed with the previous schedule. Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs Terry Harper added the new program director has introduced a more flexible hybrid program because many students are working full-time. The program also includes on-the-job training. So far, the hybrid program has been very successful. The Surgical Technology Program can take up to 12 students and currently has 9 students enrolled.

Director Murray observed some of the College’s programs (e.g., Radiography) already have high ratings so in those cases, the measures are used for monitoring. Programs receive reports by exam section, so curriculum changes can be made to help students where they are not doing well, which in turn will improve the licensure rate. Director Murray also observed that linear assumptions will need to be changed because there is a definite ceiling with this measuring that does not allow for results to improve if they are already at 100%.

Trustee Merrell stated that she believed a student could take licensure test again. Director Murray stated the data report is specifically based on a student’s first attempt and is the same for state reporting.

Board Chairman Mosher inquired about licensure result for programs other than healthcare; e.g., Automotive Technology. Director Murray stated her plan is to recruit faculty next semester to assist with obtaining exam scores in a more systematic manner than just anecdotally. President Schaffer added numerous other certifications exist but two issues exist in gathering that data. The first is no method exists for acquiring that information at the student records level. The second is the exam results are confidential. However, there may be some way for the faculty to work with certifying agencies to receive either aggregated or individualized data.

B. Program Review Report – Associate Vice President Kim Bender

- 1) [Board of Trustees Annual Report – Program Review Executive Summary](#)
- 2) [Board of Trustees Annual Report Program Review Appendices](#)

President Schaffer introduced the presentation of the program review annual report stating the Board learned about the comprehensive program review structure during their November 18th dinner meeting's learning agenda presentation by Dr. Bender. President Schaffer introduced Dr. Bender who then presented the first annual program review report, the structure of which is outlined in Procedure 10.2P Academic Program Review.

Dr. Bender's report introduction stated:

“This is the first LCCC Program Review Annual Report that procedure 10.2P directs be generated annually by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness. It is comprehensive, especially in this first rendering, as to establish a foundational record of beginning for the College to scale up a systematic approach for continuous improvement. It forms multiple baseline measures and program performance descriptions that will inform future report analysis. Included is an overall description of program reviews for 2014-2015 that appear in Appendix B. Normally this report is to be submitted to the Board in the fall. However, the first cycle of program review coincided with the institution's roll out of the curriculum redesign project. The added campus activity delayed the development of self-studies, extending the program review process into fall 2015 (November) and necessarily delaying this annual report until December 2015.”

The annual report included ten program review self-studies for the following programs.

- Art (AA)
- Automotive Technology (AAS) (Certificate)
- Computer Science (AS)
- Diagnostic Medical Technology (AAS)
- Emergency Medical Services – Paramedics (AAS) (Certificate)
- History (AA)
- HVAC–R (AAS (Certificate)
- Music (AA)
- Paralegal (AAS) (Certificate)
- Welding Technology (AAS) (Certificate)

Dr. Bender explained the main sections that make up his report, stating they may appear in subsequent reports if they have value. Those sections and their explanations were:

- Alignment of the Program Review Process with Board Policy 10.2 Academic Program Review

The College's current program review process aligns with the Board's program review objectives below:

- Generate meaningful knowledge about how well academic programs are contributing to the attainment of the College's mission.
- Provide for regular evaluation of each academic program with enough frequency to establish a cycle of planning and assessment for continuous improvement.
- Incorporate objective input, process, and outcomes components to provide a holistic perspective of programs' current efficacy and guide planning and improvement.
- Lead to the development of actionable and appropriate plans for program improvement.

Baseline measures established from these program reviews will be used over the next two to four years to make future comparisons. The program review timeline is as follows:

- September thru January – Program self-studies are developed.
 - February – Academic Standards Program Review Sub-Committee reviews the self-studies and submits feedback online for those self-studies.
 - Early March – Program leaders respond online to the feedback.
 - Late March or Early April – Program leaders and the Academic Standards Program Review Sub-committee members meet to discuss the self-studies.
 - April – Academic Standards Program Review Sub-committee members review the program leaders’ responses submitted in follow-up to their joint meeting. Scores are then adjusted as Sub-committee members believe appropriate.
 - Late April and May – Academic Standards Program Review Sub-committee members determine programs that need follow-up reports if sections are under development.
 - September – An annual report on program reviews is presented to the Board.
- Program Review’s Role in the College’s Participation in AQIP (Academic Quality Improvement Program)

The College’s February 2015 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report gave the College’s program review process a lower level rating of “reacting” in contrast to the “systematic” rating for most of the College’s other operational process descriptions. The program review process used for the programs included in this annual report was developed in response to the feedback report’s discovery that the College needs to develop a process supported by data-driven decision making that shows the performance of its programs. The program reviews included in this annual report underwent a systematic review process and will be included in the College’s 2018 system’s portfolio as will future program reviews. The next Higher Learning Commission visit by peer-reviewers will take place in 2019-2020.

As evidence the College’s program review process is being looked upon favorably by HLC through AQIP, the College has been asked to submit a proposal to present its non-academic program review process so that it can be presented to a wider audience. The non-academic program review process, which is similar to the academic program review process, was submitted to HLC as an action project.

- Faculty and Staff Participation in the 2014-2015 Program Review Process

The participation and interaction of program review leaders (14 faculty) and program reviewers (30 faculty) on the program reviews through their feedback demonstrates the high level at which the faculty are working to solve problems (635 feedback comments; 230 program review responses) with respect to achieving quality, developing organizational learning, and advancing the culture of continuous improvement. Dr. Bender believed that this extensive dialogue and participation is evidence the assumed practices (what a program should do) are being shared among faculty. He added the knowledge of assumed practices is part of developing institutional learning.

- Impact of Integrating KPIs into the Program Review Process

Program review action plan goals for the next five years are tied to the College’s KPIs, which is evidence programs are improving based on KPIs. In addition, program reviews should reference KPIs.

If they do not, the program reviewers will ask the program leaders to do so. If no response is received, the program review is likely to be scored low.

A summary of KPI scores shows a clustering of nine programs across the four KPI sections that reveals an even performance on participation, a stronger performance on student success and learning environment, and an overall weaker program performance on efficiency. The four KPI sections referenced above are:

- A. Participation
- B. Success
- C. Learning Environment
- D. Efficiency

Program review self-studies are also scored on data that is input to rubrics and calculated in the three areas (below) using a Likert scale with 1 being the lowest value. Scores below 3 signify underdeveloped. Scoring consistency was pretty good for the first year. The need for scoring consistency will be emphasized at the beginning of each review cycle during the orientation for program reviewers.

- Knowledge Distribution
- Organizational Effectiveness
- Program Planning

Responses in the above areas attempt to highlight the output patterns among the ten programs.

“Knowledge Distribution” did a little better than the other two. This may be attributed to the work the Academic Standards Program Review Sub-committee did during 2014-2015 with respect to the MCOR’s (Master Course Outline of Record) process and the development of degree plans.

“Knowledge Distribution” questions regarding the alignment of course competencies with program-level competencies were answered based on the MCOR work already accomplished. Areas needing improvement, such as the development of rigor and complexity in student learning over time, will be addressed with the development of best practices. The annual assessment planning peer review process assists with identifying areas needing improvement as well.

The mitigation of weakness and strengthening of performance will take place through the Academic Standards’ process and follow-up reporting that will be developed into action plans and continuous improvement planning. Action plan goals of which the College has 21 are an HLC expectation in part of their criteria for institutional performance. The inability to effectively plan has been determined through program review to be one of the central weaknesses of the College’s programs. The College’s new institutional project coordinator will serve as a resource for program leaders who need to develop projects in order to attain the goals they want to achieve. Planning is a place to work harder and is the first step to strengthening data development.

Program Review Resources

Workshops, inservice training, and online resources are being offered to assist with program improvement. A day-long training on the development of data was also offered on the faculty connection day in November. A table of data resources was developed and presented by Institutional Research Director Ann Murray during that November training. Another resource is the annual peer review on assessment planning that explains how to improve planning. Last spring, planning was critiqued as part of the assessment planning. This spring the data will be critiqued. In addition, a “best practices” locator is now available on EaglesEye and is included in the annual report’s Appendix D. The focus is on identifying,

developing, containing, and organizing program data in tabular forms, analyzing the data, and identifying program strengths and weaknesses.

Program Review Process Improvements

Dr. Bender stated the program review process is not perfect. One discovery was that the data and results and the improvements that are data driven were requested under the three areas of Organizational Effectiveness, Knowledge and Distribution, and Program Planning. Most program leaders copied the information into successive areas. This process has been clarified for the next program review cycle. Additionally, clarity has been added to assumed practices. The program review timeline was revised, recognizing the second review performed by reviewers in order to adjust scoring in rubric calculations. More KPI, SENSE (Survey of Entering Student Engagement), and CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) data were added along with course detail. An emphasis on curriculum mapping was also added. A blank curriculum map was uploaded in Aquila and EaglesEye (Institutional Effectiveness> Program Review) for program leader use to complete their own curriculum map design. The map is also included as a best practice. Inter-related liability will be strengthened for reviewers before they begin their review process in the spring.

The next step will be for Academic Standards to notify program leaders their program review is being accepted as submitted or is being accepted contingent upon follow-up reports on areas needing improvement.

A one-page aggregation (score card) of the rubric scorings for ten programs (roughly one-fifth of the College's programs) was included with the annual report. The green-shaded areas indicate the programs that are performing at a score of 3 or above, which means these programs are meeting assumed practices in the self-study areas receiving these scores. Programs receiving scores of 3 or above in all categories are not scored a second time. Dr. Bender stressed the amount of work done by the program leader and the Academic Standards Program Review Sub-committee. Programs were reviewed two times—the first to obtain an initial scoring, the second to adjust scores. Dr. Bender also gave a special thank you to Executive Administrative Assistant Jennifer Thompson who collected, compiled, and aggregated the rubric scorings. Scorings were received for 10 programs from 30 program reviewers during two review cycles. Over time, more and more programs will be reviewed and their scores will be folded into the score card.

In conclusion, the program review rubric scorings show the ten programs overall performed strongest on “Knowledge Distribution,” less strong on “Organizational Effectiveness,” and the least strong on “Program Planning.” The summary score card provides scoring specific to self-evaluation and data-driven improvements of processes because AQIP expects the institution to show improvements in these areas. Over time, the scorings will become a baseline for improvement and will be a valuable piece of evidence that will show the processes are working as intended.

Comments and Clarifications

Trustee Erickson thanked Dr. Bender for his in-depth explanation, stating he now has a better understanding of the program review process. He also stated that he was “struck” by the fullness of the well thought-out program review system. In response to Dr. Bender's request for trustee comments on what to include in the reports, Trustee Erickson asked that an intermittent follow-up report be provided along with next year's annual report that includes the progress made on identified weaknesses or concerns; e.g., declining enrollment. In response to Trustee Erickson's question regarding follow-up reports, Dr. Bender stated Academic Standards will be requesting follow-up reports on program weaknesses that are to contain action plans for improvement. The follow-up reports are due in the spring and will be submitted as supplemental material into the program reviews. The follow-up reports will be scrutinized again five years from now.

Board Chairman Mosher asked President Schaffer to provide some guidance on how to identify areas of concern that would be of the most interest to trustees. He also asked who would be responsible for assimilating that information. President Schaffer stated the program reviews assess how programs can improve and are complex. He reiterated the program review system requires programs receiving a score below a 3 to have a follow-up report submitted to Academic Standards, which is where compliance is assured. In addition, the program review system makes the academic affairs vice president, academic school deans, and program faculty aware of the program review information, and where appropriate, action plans have been put into place. From the Board's perspective, the Board approves programs and therefore wants to know if a program is successful. The summary information included in the program review is a germane way to validate the College is going through that process. Knowing this, President Schaffer asked the Board to consider the format for a follow-up report and the intent for requesting that level of detail. Trustee Erickson stated from a Board Treasurer's point of view resource allocations are "a big deal." If enrollments continue to go down, there is a big question about whether or not the program should be continued. President Schaffer stated a lot of the College's staff think at that level. The program review process was implemented knowing the College has committed to the program and its improvement where necessary. The program review system is not intended to be a threatening process, and a threshold has not been determined for pulling the resources that support a program. Trustee Erickson continued the Board needs data or feedback on which to make decisions. In the case of program reviews that data or feedback is needed on what is being done to reduce program weaknesses and to mollify concerns. Trustee Merrell stated the trustees want to know which programs are doing well, which ones are needing improvement, and which ones are making good economic sense. She added that she believed the College is doing a good job of keeping the trustees apprised of those results. President Schaffer stated the chart on page 18 of the executive summary gives a pretty good indication of the "programmatically health" of the ten programs included in the annual report. He noted further the College is finally implementing a plan for program improvement and he would like to see that process play out. He added the annual report may not give the trustees the information they need to determine the College is being financially savvy. An annual report could be produced from a more limited perspective on just outcomes. Trustee Lytle stated the Board's responsibility is to assure the community has a successful community college where the students have the training and education they need to be successful as they pursue a career. Therefore, she would like to know what the program reviews mean for LCCC's students and the community; what is the College doing to produce a better product; and what can the trustees do to make a difference. President Schaffer responded the biggest thing the trustees can do is continue to focus on the work they have already done. The trustees should also continue to push the College to be objective and goal-oriented with regard to resource allocation and to look at the evidence of the College's overall effectiveness. The Board wants programs that respond to the needs of the students in the community and that help students become successful, and that is the Board's appropriate role. President Schaffer stated at this juncture he would not bring recommendations to close programs. He reiterated a process is now in place that is designed to guide and focus faculty efforts on the improvement of their programs. Among the resources in place to assist with program improvement are action planning and assessment planning and support from Institutional Research Office and the Institutional Projects Coordinator. The Board's focus should be on the institutional KPIs that address whether more students graduating, being retained, and transferring. Dr. Bender added that good processes make good learning. The College wants to develop its thinking where the focus is on processes and gathering results on the effectiveness of the processes. The curriculum design and instructional approaches included in program reviews are processes, and faculty are beginning to think of them as processes. The accumulation of faculty thinking and sharing of information that comes out of the program review process will aid in the improvement of scores such as those for completion rates.

President Schaffer stated he appreciates the feedback and asked if a follow-up report that identifies information meaningful to the Board would be useful. For example, Are there jobs? Are there students? On what are program improvements focused? Board Chairman Mosher observed the annual report

program review information is very helpful and that he needs to spend more time studying that information. The intent of the program reviews is to find ways to improve programs. He believes the Board needs a salient, short report to accompany the in-depth program reviews that would help the trustees grasp the meaning of the information supplied in the report. Board Chairman Mosher also commented on the amount of work the program review system requires and stated the work required by the faculty should be recognized. He thanked the faculty and those who assist the faculty in their program review work. President Schaffer added that this level of comprehensive, objective review will not be found at most community college or four-year institutions. The work is difficult and that's why it is not commonplace. If LCCC wants to rise to a higher level of excellence then faculty and staff must have the discipline to do the work, have the hard conversations, and understand the value of the work in which they are engaged. Then the College can say to its students and the community that everything is being done to assure students are afforded the best education when they step through the LCCC doors. President Schaffer also recognized Dr. Bender for his able, thoughtful, and patient facilitation of a new program review system.

Trustee Merrell stated when President Schaffer hired Dr. Bender, she wondered what he was going to be doing and now she knows and finds the work pretty amazing.

Board Chairman Mosher asked the trustees to consider further what changes or suggestions they might have that would help them better understand how the program review process benefits the trustees in serving the institution and its students.

6. APPROVAL ITEMS – None

7. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – President Joe Schaffer

A. Governor's Budget Consideration

Governor Mead released his budget recommendation for the coming biennium. Given the State's financial circumstances, the budget is very state- and community-focused and will allow the State to progress and to benefit from the prudent planning and saving the State has done. From the community college perspective, the Governor recommended over \$12 million for community college funding based on the recalibration of the model. The community college's recommendations was to formulate a method to recalibrate based on current enrollment thresholds and provide appropriate funding for the enrollments community colleges are serving. The community colleges' request was for \$16 million but was for a higher enrollment threshold, so \$12 million recommendation is appropriate.

The Governor's recommendations for capital construction funding (planning or construction) did not include the College's Fine and Performing Arts Building. He did recommend authority for the projects that would be funded entirely by the College. Those projects are the Residence Hall and Children's Discovery Center. The capital construction projects receiving recommendation for construction funding included one for Sheridan and two for Central Wyoming College—one in Riverton and one in Jackson. Funding for the educational longitudinal data system at the Wyoming Community College Commission was pulled from the Commission's budget because monies were found in the current biennium allocations for ETS (Enterprise Technology Services), and those monies were shifted to the Commission.

B. Pending Legislative Meetings

The Commission will present the community college budget to the Joint Appropriations Committee next week on December 11th. The State's Administration and Information division will present capital construction projects that will include the community college's projects. Senator Tony Ross is chair of the

Joint Appropriations Committee and Representatives Bob Nicholas, Glenn Moniz and Cathy Connolly are also members of the Joint Appropriations Committee.

President Schaffer clarified that authority to proceed and not funding are being sought for the Residence Hall and the Children's Discovery Center.

President Schaffer also reported on how the HLC's changes are impacting faculty qualifications. The HLC is clarifying and re-enforcing their standards and assumed practices that have been on the books but have not been real clear. The HLC wants to ensure institutions have qualified faculty by credentialing or experience for the delivery of education. More specifically, a faculty member must possess an academic degree relevant to what they teach and at least one level above what they teach. The HLC specifies a faculty member teaching general education (non-occupational) courses must have a master's degree or higher in the discipline or subfield. The conversation about subfield is confusing because the HLC also states if a faculty member has a master's degree but not in the discipline or a subfield, that faculty member must have 18 graduate credit hours in a discipline or a subfield. However, if the College says an MBA qualifies a faculty member to teach, for example, a Principles of Marketing class, then the College must have a policy and procedure in place that demonstrates how the College made that determination, and that policy and procedure has to predominately originate from the faculty who are the subject matter experts. An exception exists for faculty teaching terminal programs (career and technical areas). Institutions can define by policy and procedure how it provides testing for experience to create equivalencies for these faculty members. The HLC's standards and assumed practices will be tested as to how they are applied at LCCC when the HLC peer reviewers visit the campus in 2019-2020 and the determinations are contingent upon the evaluators' interpretations.

President Schaffer explained for Trustee Dubois the HLC is a regional accrediting body that sits above the state jurisdiction and is comprised of members of higher education institutions within the region that are nominated and elected. The HLC must comply with federal regulations and structure but the intent is that accreditation status is determined by peer evaluators from regional institutions.

C. [Construction Update](#) (*Standing Agenda Item*)

President Schaffer observed the structural steel is going up on the University/Student Center. Vice President Rick Johnson stated the cranes have been periodically shut down due to high winds, which has caused some delays.

Chairman Mosher asked about a plan for naming the new buildings. President Schaffer stated a priority has been set for the Foundation Board to identify naming opportunities for University/Student Center and Flex-Tech Building buildings. A couple of options are in the works. Naming conventions for some of the other buildings will need to be discussed in advance of the onset of the wayfinding project.

8. BOARD REPORTS

A. Board Member Updates – Board Chairman (*Standing Agenda Item*)

Trustee Erickson reported the WACCT (Wyoming Association of Community College Trustees) is working with ACCT (Association of Community College Trustees) to schedule participation by each of Wyoming's community colleges in the GISS (Governance Institute for Student Success). The Institute cost for LCCC will be \$3,000 and will be paid out of the Board's professional development funds if the Board agrees. Board Chairman Mosher asked if any trustee was opposed to expending the \$3,000 from the Board's professional development funds, and hearing no objection, stated the Board supports participation in the Institute and payment of the Institute's cost as suggested.

The Institute focuses on the following, which are explained in full at <http://www.governance-institute.org/>:

- Data Collection and Review (Board Self-Assessment and College Data) (<http://www.governance-institute.org/giss-model/board-self-assessment>)
- Convenings <http://www.governance-institute.org/giss-model/convening>
- Ongoing Engagement <http://www.governance-institute.org/giss-model/components-of-giss>

Trustee Dubois inquired if the ACCT still offered trustee training via teleconferences to which Trustee Erickson replied they have a number of webinars, adding follow-up on the conference activities will be held via tele-video.

Trustee Erickson will provide Board Secretary Boreing a link to the Nebraska GISS Site for her to forward to the trustees. (POSTSCRIPT TO MINUTES: The following link was emailed to the trustees on Thursday, December 3rd. <http://www.governance-institute.org/member-states-colleges/nebraska>)

President Schaffer noted a Governance Leadership Institute will be held in Grand Island, Nebraska. The Institute is a good primer to trustee governance and would cost each trustee \$400 to attend. He offered to provide the information for that Institute to interested trustees.

9. EX OFFICIO TRUSTEE UPDATES (*Standing Agenda Item*)

A. ACC Advisory Board Ex Officio Trustee – Mr. Butch Keadle

Ex Officio Trustee Keadle thanked Trustee Lummis for taking the time to have lunch and tour the Albany County Campus. He was proud to have her tour the campus, noting the building shows well. He also stated the program review presentation was very helpful. President Schaffer shared conversation has developed about converting the art lab to a wet lab for science courses. Tobin and Associates are working on a mock-up of a design for an addition to the ACC. Some intermediary planning may need to be done.

B. LCCC Student Ex Officio Trustee – Mr. Noah Cheshier

Ex Officio Trustee Cheshier reported a memo to be sent to President Schaffer has been composed of all the responses collected during the SGA's meet and greet. Receiving the most comments were:

- WiFi in the dorms
- Unavailability of some adjunct instructors
- Concerns about the implementation of new technologies and the heavy reliance on just the technology to facilitate the learning in math classes
- More dances in the student lounge

Students were also surveyed on whether they would use a locker. Over half of the students surveyed said they would not use the lockers. Those students who would use a locker suggested the lockers be placed in the Student Lounge, Health Sciences Building, near the Library, and in the Welding area for students to store their welding equipment. Lockers for adjunct faculty were another consideration.

10. NEW BUSINESS – Board Chairman

Board Chairman Mosher clarified the Finance and Facilities Committee meeting will be held next Wednesday, December 9th, at 10 a.m. Trustee Merrell said she will not be in attendance.

Trustee Lyttle noted the LCCC Music Holiday Concert will be held next Monday at 7 p.m. at the St. Mark's Episcopal Church.

11. ADDITIONAL ITEMS – Information Only

A. [Historical List of Board Motions](#)

12. NEXT MEETINGS/EVENTS

- **January 20 (Wednesday)** – Board Meeting and Dinner: Dinner – 5:30 p.m. – CCC 178/179; Meeting – 7 p.m. – Petersen Board Room

13. PUBLIC COMMENT (Public comment may be made on anything not on the agenda. Comments will be limited to five minutes.) – Board Chairman

No one asked to give public comment.

14. ADJOURNMENT of the December 2, 2015, Board Meeting of the Laramie County Community College District Board of Trustees – Board Chairman

Board Chairman Ed Mosher adjourned the December 2, 2015, Board Meeting of the Laramie County Community College District Board of Trustees at 9:49 p.m.

15. EXECUTIVE SESSION – *An executive session was not held.*

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Boreing
Board Recording Secretary