<div align="center">

LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE COUNCIL
Friday, February 20, 2015
3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Health Sciences Building
HS 311

</div>

MINUTES

AN ATTENDANCE LIST IS ATTACHED.

CALL TO ORDER of the February 20, 2015, College Council Meeting – Chad Marley, Co-chair

College Council Co-chair Chad Marley called to order the February 20, 2015, College Council Meeting at 3:06 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Approval of the College Council January 16, 2015, Minutes** – Chad Marley, Co-chair

    Aaron Casteel moved and Melvin Hawkins seconded,

    MOTION: That the College Council approves the January 16, 2015, minutes as written.

    MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS (*Items on which College Council will make recommendations.*)

2. **Curriculum Development and Approval Policy 2.3** – Feedback Deadline 2/13/15 (Feedback Received) – José Fierro
3. **Program Development and Approval Procedure 2.3.1P** – Feedback Deadline 2/13/15 (Feedback Received) – José Fierro

    Melvin Hawkins moved and Judy Hay seconded,

    MOTION: That the College Council recommends President Schaffer advances *Curriculum Development and Approval Policy 2.3* to the Board of Trustees for approval and signature, and the College Council recommends approval of *Program Development and Approval Procedure* 2.3.1P for President Schaffer's signature.

    DISCUSSION: In response to Mary Ludwig's question concerning MCORs (Master Course Outline of Record), President Schaffer responded the *Program Development and Approval Procedure* 2.3.1P deals with new programs, and MCORS will be developed with new program development.

    MOTION CARRIED unanimously with a proxy vote to approve from Jodi Weppner.

4. **Student Discipline Adjudication Policy 3.16 Revised** – Feedback Deadline 2/13/15 (No Feedback Received) – Judy Hay
5. **Student Discipline Adjudication Procedure 3.16P Revised** – Feedback Deadline 2/13/15 (Feedback Received) – Judy Hay

    Terry Harper moved and Melvin Hawkins seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council recommends President Schaffer advances *Student Discipline Adjudication Policy 3.16* as revised to the Board of Trustees for approval and signature, and the College Council recommends approval of *Student Discipline Adjudication Procedure 3.16P* as revised for President Schaffer's signature.

DISCUSSION: Judy Hay noted *Student Adjudication Procedure 3.16P* has to do with student conduct issues not grades and that a chart included with the procedure helps navigate the process.

From Jodi Weppner's proxy: Subsection 5.0 B. 1) [of the procedure] states, "All student conduct cases will be triaged in one of the following four areas:"
a. There are five areas listed under this sentence rather than four, so "four" should be changed to "five". College Council agreed to the change.
b. The term "triaged" in the language is, in my opinion, not the best choice of wording. "Triaged" typically brings ideas of war or emergency room issues. I would suggest that "triaged" be changed to "designated". College Council agreed to the change.
c. Other than the suggestions, I vote yes on procedure 3.16P.

Terry Harper stated the procedure now includes recognition of program handbooks and that she appreciates the time Student Services staff spent with her and others to clarify the procedure and how it impacts those in the School of Health Sciences and Wellness.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously with proxy vote changes from Jodi Weppner.

6. **Naming of College Spaces Policy 5.5** – Feedback Deadline 2/13/15 (No Feedback Received) – Lisa Murphy
7. **Naming of College Spaces Procedure 5.5P** – Feedback Deadline 2/13/15 (No Feedback Received) – Lisa Murphy

Lisa Murphy stated the Foundation Board has reviewed the policy and procedure and they are in agreement with the language in both as is President Schaffer.

Terry Harper moved and Melvin Hawkins seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council recommends President Schaffer advances *Naming of College Spaces Policy 5.5* to the Board of Trustees for approval and signature, and the College Council recommends approval of *Naming of College Spaces Procedure 5.5P* for President Schaffer's signature.

DISCUSSION: From Jodi Weppner's proxy:

a. Subsection A of the policy reads: "Shall be done with careful diligence to assess the contributions to the College raise to the level of significance worthy of a naming tribute." I would suggest changing "raise" to "rise". College Council agreed to the change.
b. Other than the suggestion, I vote yes on policy and procedure 5.5 and 5.5P.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously with proxy vote changes from Jodi Weppner.

DISCUSSION ITEMS (*Items needing discussion by College Council.*)

8. **Budget Trend Data** – Jayne Myrick
   A. FY 2016 Master Trend Data
   B. Master One-time Requests FY16
   C. Funds Available – Proposed Distribution

   Budget Director Jayne Myrick presented the FY 2016 budget information, which she stressed is still in the developmental stages, and therefore, the amounts are preliminary estimates. The FY 2016 budget will be

basically a flat budget unless other monies are found or reallocated. She reviewed the Estimated Funds Available from the Operating and One Mill funds. The Operating Funds include New Funds, Internal Funds Available, and One-time Funds Available. A decrease is anticipated in State Aid, tuition, course and miscellaneous fees, and High Tech and Athletic fees. She pointed out estimated tuition and fees are less because of declining enrollments. Offsetting the estimated reductions in funding are the Internal Funds Available (vacancies/replacements, adjunct retirement budget) and the One-time Funds Available (State Aid for Enrollment Growth Funding). The vacancies/replacements savings estimate is based on historical amounts over the last ten years and what is believed to be reasonable according to the natural cycle in the workforce. The calculation equaled 1.4%, which is the percentage of funds unutilized from vacancies/replacements over a ten-year period. Carol Hoglund stated including the estimated vacancies/replacements savings in the budget will help mitigate the funds the College is allowed to carry over into the reserve, which is set by statute at 8%. At this point, however, an Operating Reserve is not included in the budget estimations. President Schaffer drew attention to the $1,539,458 in enrollment growth funding from the State, noting the $1.5 million is one-time only money and could go away in FY 2017. Total Estimated Operating funds available for FY 2016 is $1,378,038. Total Estimated One Mill funds and Motor Vehicle Fees revenue is $1,386,369.

The proposed distributions from the Operating Fund and the One Mill Fund were also reviewed. Distribution of the Operating funds will go to the employee Compensation Package, Continuation of Services, Construction Expense, and the On-going Expenses Budget in FY 2015. Total distribution amount from the Operating Fund is $1,332,712. Distribution of One Mill funds and Motor Vehicle Fees revenue will go to Eastern Laramie County, Innovative Funds, Professional Development, Facilities Planning, Small Maintenance Projects, One-time Requests, and Equipment Repair and Replacement. Total distribution amount from the One Mill Fund and Vehicle Fees revenue is $1,386,369.

Comments and Clarifications
- President Schaffer – The Student Activity Expenses that were previously funded by the Student Fee Allocation Committee (now called the Student Activity Fee Allocation Committee or SAFAC) are included in the College's FY 2016 operating budget at the request of the SAFAC. SAFAC members rationalized these monies were being allocated for co-curricular (i.e., programs that are connected to the curriculum) instead of extra-curricular programs. If necessary, the total amount of $140,000 could be phased into the College's operating budget over a two-year period.
- Jayne Myrick – Only the employer contribution (61.59% of a .75% increase) to retirement is increasing this year. The employee contribution amount will stay the same. President Schaffer added the employee contribution is expected to go up in FY 2017.
- Jayne Myrick – One-time Requests funds are estimated at $443,831; one-time requests submitted for consideration total $1.1 million.
- President Schaffer – After much discussion the Innovation Funds amount was reduced from $200,000 to $100,000. The total funds allocated the last couple of years have not been spent. Also, the management of innovation funds projects has created an additional burden on faculty and staff, who are already managing changes taking place on campus. The reduction will allow the Innovations Funds program to be preserved. The $100,000 not allocated was added to the One-time Requests budget. The Facilities Planning monies were reduced from $275,000 to $75,000. The reduced amount of $75,000 is expected to cover the architectural fees associated with a Level I update for the Fine and Performing Arts Building and an early analysis of another residence hall. The Learning Commons and PE Building renovations are working their way through the legislature for an anticipated authorization.
- President Schaffer – One Mill monies cannot fund Albany County Campus requests. These funds must be spent in the district in which One Mill monies are collected.

Speaking to the trend data, Jayne stated the proposed College budgets for FY 2016 show a trend data increase of 2.9%. President Schaffer stated the current requests do not show reductions in variable expenditures. His philosophical approach is that revenues need to be requested based on actual

anticipated expenditures as opposed to budgeting high and spending low. This philosophy will be the basis for his review of the proposed budgets.

President Schaffer asked BRAC to consider the use of the other funding sources for the larger Health Sciences and Physical Plant requests, but noted further he would encourage BRAC not to deplete these funding sources. For the larger Health Sciences requests, approximately $300,000 is available in the Equipment Repairs and Replacement budget that is generated through student fees along with approximately $35,000 in the Foundation's budget. The One Mill Fund may be used to fund the Physical Plant one-time requests for small maintenance projects. President Schaffer explained a shift in how State maintenance funds may be used by community colleges required the College to set aside additional funds for small maintenance projects. Perkins funds are another possible funding source. The BRAC will begin meeting next week to review of the one-time requests. The goal is to have the BRAC's work completed by March 13th.

9. **Noel-Levitz Survey Analysis** (The executive summary is attached to these minutes.) – Ann Murray

   A. [Attachment 2 NL CESS Results Analysis Report]
   B. [Attachment 3 NL CESS Results Analysis Report]
   C. [NL Results Analysis Report]

Ann stated a huge commendation goes to the Noel-Levitz Survey Analysis Team of Aaron Casteel, Mohamed Chakhad, Melvin Hawkins, Meghan Kelly, Caroline Ross, and Jennifer Thompson, who did exceptional work in thoughtfully and thoroughly analyzing the survey results in a very short time frame and did so with the highest regard for collaboration. Simply stated, the survey's analysis would not have been possible without them.

The analysis team had three charges: 1) determined how to analyze the quantitative data, so that the priorities concluded from the results are presented in an easy-to-understand format, 2) determine how to organize the qualitative or open-ended data, so that those results provide some context and direction for those who will be tasked with developing strategies for improvement, and 3) determine recommendations for improving the process for future surveys, so that it is more streamlined and puts process steps in the right order.

Based on the team's analysis, the College should focus on developing strategies for improvement on the following eight categories that are listed by priority.

   1) Planning and Decision-making
   2) Culture and Values
   3) Communication
   4) Professional Development
   5) Engagement
   6) Employee Appreciation
   7) Budget and Resources
   8) Image

Regarding the open-ended survey items, the team recommended the College Council and other campus groups consider these a resource when developing strategies for improvement.

Finally, the team recommended an analysis team be established before the next survey is administered. The team should use the methodology established to provide a consistent framework for using survey results, which will improve the employee survey process.

Following Ann's in depth explanation of the survey analysis methodology and the resulting recommendations, the College Council members provided the following input and observations:

- The analysis team considered comparing this survey's data with the data from the same questions asked on past surveys. However, time did not allow for this type of analysis. The methodology used focused on a high-level, institutional, "where-we-are-now" analysis and used strictly LCCC data.
- The analysis team should analyze the survey results and produce a similar report before releasing the results.
- Next year the analysis may incorporate national comparison data as well as historical data from this year's survey analysis.
- Concerning further analysis, the team was willing to continue their work with further direction from College Council.
- Each school is different and will likely take a different approach to implementing strategies in response to the survey results. One size does not fit all. What is being done in response to the survey results needs to be shared college-wide.
- The names in the open-ended comments were not redacted before they were published in the *Wingspan*. Anonymous quotes were also included in the *Wingspan*.
- The Noel-Levitz guidelines stated the comments should not be made public.
- The Wyoming Press Association guidelines state employee titles cannot be redacted but names can and should be.

Additional discussion was held about when the next survey should be scheduled (fall or spring semester) and whether or not open-ended comments, which allow incivility and personal attacks and are not measurable, should be allowed. President Schaffer stated the Council's conversation has been fantastic, even if not comfortable. He pointed out the data shows the level of satisfaction is slightly positive but that was lost in the focus on the comments. He concluded that no one is dissenting from assessing employee morale and that the timeframe for administering the surveys needs to be evaluated.

Based on the survey analysis and the College Council members' input and observations, the analysis team was asked to bring back a recommendation for how often the survey should be administered. Ann will create a place on EaglesEye under the Institutional Research for publishing the survey's quantitative pieces. (POSTSCRIPT TO MINUTES: The survey information may be found on EaglesEye at: My Communities>Institutional Research>Shared Files>Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey)

INFORMATION ITEMS *(Items not needing large discussion, but are important for College Council's awareness.)*

10. **New Position Request Process (HR Priority Plan) – Completed Scoring Forms are due Friday, March 13, to HR@lccc.wy.edu** – President Joe Schaffer

    President Schaffer went through the step-by-step process for accessing the 14 position requests and stated all College Council members are to score the position requests. He explained the prioritization exercise is a good planning process even though the budget is not finalized. The 14 positions will be budgeted in the general fund; auxiliary positions will be supported by grant monies.

11. **Enrollment Reports** – Ann Murray

    Ann stated the "the super summary" is the official enrollment report and will be provided more publicly. President Schaffer observed the College had more new students last fall than previous semesters, but in contrast, retention is down. More recent enrollment information just received this afternoon indicates spring enrollment is up. Ann will email this enrollment information to College Council.

12. **Human Resource Recruitment (Position Vacancy Status) Report** – President Schaffer

    No questions

13. **Next Meetings –** All meetings are on the third Friday of each month from 3 to 5 p.m. in HS 311. E-vites for these meetings were sent 12/9/14.
    - March 27 (Moved from March 20)
    - April 17
    - May 15

14. **Constituent Feedback**

    None

ADJOURNMENT of the February 20, 2015, College Council Meeting – Chad Marley, Co-chair

College Council Co-chair Chad Marley adjourned the February 20, 2015, College Council Meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Boreing
Recorder

COLLEGE COUNCIL 2/20/15 ATTENDANCE RECORD				
P E UE*	**Member** **22 Voting Members**	**Representative Areas**	**Term Start Date**	**Term End Date**
P	President Joe Schaffer	ex officio	N/A	N/A
P	Aaron Casteel	Classified Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Dawn Williams	Classified Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
P	Amy Ehlman	Classified Staff – Appointed	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Stacy Maestas	Professional Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
P	Caroline Ross	Professional Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
E	Jodi Weppner	Professional Staff – Appointed	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Mary Ludwig	Faculty – Appointed by Faculty Senate	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Mohamed Chakhad	Faculty – Elected at Large	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Jeff Shmidl	Faculty – Elected at Large	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
P	Terry Harper	Mid-level Manager	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
P	Melvin "Hawk" Hawkins	Mid-level Manager	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Chad Marley	Mid-level Manager	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
E	Ali Briggs	SGA (Student Government Association)	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
E	Bill Dalles	SGA (Student Government Association)	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
E	Hailie Pragnell	SGA (Student Government Association)	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
P	Kim Bender	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
P	José Fierro	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
P	Carol Hoglund	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
P	Judy Hay	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
E	Peggie Kresl-Hotz	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
E	James Malm	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
P	Lisa Murphy	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
P	Jayne Myrick	Budget Director – ex officio	N/A	N/A
P	Ann Murray	Institution Research Manager – ex officio	N/A	N/A
P	Vicki Boreing	Recorder (non-voting)	N/A	N/A
GUESTS None				

Memo

To:	LCCC College Council
From:	Aaron Casteel, Mohamed Chakhad, Melvin Hawkins, Meghan Kelly, Caroline Ross, Jennifer Thompson, and Ann Murray
Date:	February 20, 2015
Subject:	Fall 2014 Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey Results Analysis and Recommendations

Executive Summary

At its January 16, 2015 meeting LCCC College Council (CC) established a cross-functional team to analyze the results of the Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey (NL CESS) in which LCCC participated during November 2014. The team, comprised of four CC members representing all employee constituencies and an additional representative from each of Faculty Senate and Staff Senate, was charged with analyzing the quantitative results and recommending priorities for systematic, institutional improvement strategies to College Council, as well as making recommendations on how to consider the qualitative (open-ended) responses in the development of those strategies. The team also developed recommendations to improve the process of analyzing and using the results from this survey next year.

It is evident from the survey results (quantitative and qualitative) that there are many opportunities for improvement. If the College recognizes this and there is strong will and consistent, systematic effort to transform LCCC, we shall succeed.

Recommendations

Based on the team's analysis, described below, the team recommends that the College focus on developing strategies for improvement in this order, based on the weighted average gap for items associated with these categories (described in more detail below).

Category
1.   Planning & Decision-making
2.   Culture and Values
3.   Communication
4.   Professional Development
5.   Engagement
6.   Employee Appreciation
7.   Budget and Resources
8.   Image

The team further recommends that efforts be focused on the first three categories.

Regarding the open-ended survey items, the team recommends that these be used as a resource for College Council and other campus groups as they develop strategies for improvement. For example, one strategy to address some communication concerns is to provide regular updates to the College community on changes being implemented, including how these changes support the strategic plan. Another strategy is to have agendas and minutes of all standing committees available online and to provide regular reminders of how to access these documents. While neither of these strategies address larger issues, they would address concerns about availability of information, a common theme among the comments.

Finally, to improve the employee survey process, the team recommends that an analysis team be established before the next survey administration and use the methodology that has been established to provide a consistent framework for using results. More detailed recommendations are found later in this report.

Methodology

Quantitative Data Overview

The quantitative survey results were separated into four sections, mirroring the survey instrument. These were
1. Campus culture and policies
2. Institutional goals
3. Involvement in planning and decision-making
4. Work environment

After reviewing the survey items in each of the four sections, the team determined that the information in Section 2, Institutional goals, would be most useful to the Board of Trustees in the development of LCCC's next strategic plan. The information in Section 3, Involvement in planning and decision-making, could be used to monitor the effectiveness of strategies for improvement in these areas but does not offer useful information for developing priorities for improvement. A next step in the analysis would be to examine these results to determine if there are differences among the employee groups in terms of their perceptions of employee involvement in decision-making (see Attachment 1).

For the first and fourth sections, respondents were asked to rate the importance of and their satisfaction with several statements. Results also included a gap score, the difference between the average importance and satisfaction ratings. These results provided the richest source of information to the team.

Analysis of Sections 1 & 4 Results

Before analyzing the results in these areas, the team reviewed the statements in these sections and developed categories for analysis purposes.

Category	Description/Key Words
Budget and Resources	Resources include personnel, technology, infrastructure, etc. Items related to professional development were excluded from this category.
Communication	Sharing information, opportunities for input or feedback, professional dialog

Category	Description/Key Words
Culture and Values	Mission, vision, values, policies, procedures, strategic plan, goals – are these consistently followed (i.e. does LCCC walk its talk?)? Also items providing historical context
Employee Appreciation	Recognition, benefits, excluding salary/wages
Engagement	How an employee is engaged in his/her work and the organization, relationships with others, including both favorable and unfavorable types of engagement
Image	Perceptions of LCCC (internal or external), engagement with our external community
Planning and Decision-making	How input is gathered or used in decision-making, planning processes and timelines
Professional Development	Professional development, orientation, training

Each statement was assigned a primary category; some statements were also assigned a secondary category. (See Attachment 2 for categorized statements.) The gap scores were then used to develop a priority ranking for the categories. (Recall that the gap score for a statement is the difference between the mean importance score and the mean satisfaction score.) For each category, a weighted average gap score was calculated. A statement's gap was weighted by 2 if the category was the primary category for that statement; otherwise, the gap was weighted by 1. This methodology produced the following prioritized order:

Category	Average Gap (weighted)
1. Planning and Decision-making	1.63
2. Culture and Values	1.56
3. Communication	1.52
4. Professional Development	1.34
5. Engagement	1.25
6. Employee Appreciation	1.15
7. Budget and Resources	1.11
8. Image	1.10

Analysis of Qualitative (Open-ended Question) Results

The team reviewed the open-ended results and categorized them using the same categories. Many comments addressed concerns in more than one category. (See Attachment 3 for a listing of the categorized items.) The number of comments associated with each identified category is shown in the table below.

Category	# of comments	% of all comments
1. Planning and Decision-making	149	53.6%
2. Culture and Values	181	65.1%
3. Communication	137	49.3%
4. Professional Development	13	4.7%
5. Engagement	163	58.6%
6. Employee Appreciation	66	23.7%

Category	# of comments	% of all comments
7. Budget and Resources	32	11.5%
8. Image	25	9.0%

Process Improvement Recommendations

The NL CESS Analysis Team recommends several strategies for improving the process of analyzing the results for next year.

1. College Council should establish a cross-functional analysis team, similar to this team, before employees are invited to participate in the NL CESS. The analysis team should receive the results and conduct its analysis before results are released to the college community. This will provide context for broader discussions about improvement strategies based on the results.
2. For continuity, as well as monitoring for improvement, future analysis teams should use the same methodology for analyzing the results as the current team.
3. The next analysis team should develop a rubric for analyzing the open-ended responses after they have been categorized. Examples of rubric criteria might include whether or not a comment offers a specific suggestion and how a comment might be used for systematic, institutional improvement.
4. The next team could also make recommendations on the use of disaggregation and historical comparisons for improvement and accountability.