

COLLEGE COUNCIL

Friday, March 27, 2015
3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Health Sciences Building
HS 311

MINUTES

AN ATTENDANCE LIST IS ATTACHED.

CALL TO ORDER of the March 27, 2015, College Council Meeting – Chad Marley, Co-chair

College Council Co-chair Chad Marley called to order the March 27, 2015, College Council Meeting at 3:02 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Approval of the College Council [February 20, 2015, Minutes](#)** – Chad Marley, Co-chair

Terry Harper moved and Aaron Casteel-Hatfield seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council approves the February 20, 2015, Minutes as written.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

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

2. **[Board Committees Policy No. 1.2.6 Revised](#)** (No feedback) – President Schaffer

Terry Harper moved and Bill Dalles seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council recommends President Schaffer advances *Board Committees Policy 1.2.6* as revised to the Board of Trustees for approval and signature with the suggested revisions.

DISCUSSION: None

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

3. **[Student Account Automatic Payment Plan Policy No. 4.11](#)** (No feedback) – Sabrina Lane
4. **[Student Account Automatic Payment Plan Procedure No. 4.11P](#)** (No feedback) – Sabrina Lane

Terry Harper moved and Judy Hay seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council recommends President Schaffer advances *Student Account Automatic Payment Plan Policy No. 4.11* to the Board of Trustees for approval and signature, and that the College Council recommends *Student Account Automatic Payment Plan Procedure No. 4.11P* be ratified for President Schaffer's signature.

DISCUSSION: Ann suggested removing “for a consecutive semester” from the procedure in section 5.0 B.3)c. The removal of the language was considered a friendly amendment to which Terry Harper and Judy Hay agreed.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously with acceptance of the procedure's language changes.

5. **Student Fees** – President Schaffer, Chad Marley

A. Math Course Fees

President Schaffer removed the “Math Course Fees” item from the agenda and stated no increases to math course fees will be proposed this year. José added the fee may be reduced. Class materials will be handled through the bookstore.

B. Technology Infrastructure Fee

C. Student Technology Fee

President Schaffer shared the background of the proposed Technology Infrastructure Fee and Student Technology Fee. If the new fee structure is implemented, the online course fee and the high tech fee will be eliminated.

Two new fees are being proposed—a Technology Infrastructure Fee (\$9/credit hour; capped, not assessed for credits above 12) and a Student Technology Fee (\$14/credit hour; capped, not assessed for credits above 12). The Technology Infrastructure Fee will be assessed to students to cover the cost of installations, upgrades or improvements, and maintenance of core technology systems that directly ensure the College has a high tech environment desired by students and required for efficient and effective operations. The Student Technology Fee will be assessed to those students who are directly touched by the technology; i.e., to cover the costs of various technologies that directly support the educational processes of Laramie County Community College. An example is the Smarthinking online service that offers tutoring in many subjects, including math, accounting, chemistry, and more. President Schaffer has been hesitant to propose a new fee structure because the data hasn't been adequate until now to ascertain whether too much or too little fees are being assessed. He now has the confidence to say, based on the services, technologies, and associated expenditures that the data supports the proposed new fee structure.

Comments and Clarifications

- *Review and Approval of Student Fees Procedure* No. 4.10.1P states “...all proposed fees are advanced through the LCCC Student Government Association and the College Council for recommendations. Recommendations are advanced to the President's Cabinet for final approval.” In compliance with the procedure, President Schaffer met with SGA yesterday, March 26th.
- Under the current fee structure students taking 12 credit hours on campus pay a High Tech Fee of \$120; under the new structure the student would pay a Technology Infrastructure Fee of \$108 and a Student Technology Fee of \$168. The difference is an increase of \$156.00. For a student taking 12 credit hours in online courses, the current fee cost is \$240 (High Tech Fee of \$120 and Online Course Fee of \$120). Under the new structure the cost would be the same as that for a student taking 12 credits on campus—\$276, the difference being an increase of \$34. If approved, the new fee structure will be implemented for fall 2016. The goal is to have the new fee structure approved by April 6th.
 - o The Technology Infrastructure Fee and Student Technology Fee will be built into the biller; Pam DeMartin inputs this information.
 - o No batch process exists for implementing the new fee structure. Amy Ehlman will input the student fee changes; administrative assistants will input course fees.
 - o SGA President Bill Dalles stated students taking more than 12 credit hours will save money under the proposed fee structure.
- LCCC's mandatory fee costs rank in the middle of those of the other community colleges. However, mandatory fees are assessed differently among the institutions. The College ranked the highest three years ago.
- Course fees will be evaluated on an annual basis. Procedure No. 4.10.1P created a structure and an expectation that the College will have a formalized process for inventorying and examining fees and for faculty and deans to recommend changes. Each year the expenditures associated with fees and the

revenue generated by the fees will be analyzed during the budget process and adjustments will be made as necessary. A comprehensive inventory of fees will be updated in the fall prior to the beginning of the budget process. Course fee adjustments will be effective for fall 2017.

President Schaffer commended those who will be responsible for inputting course fees and the changes in student fees. He added that from a budget and technology perspective, the new student fee structure is the right approach. The fact that online fees will no longer be tied to each course, and that non-technology will be associated with mandatory fees that are centrally assigned, will make future management much easier.

Terry Harper moved and Judy Hay seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council approves the new fee structure for a Technology Infrastructure Fee and a Student Technology Fee for implementation fall 2016.

DISCUSSION: None

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

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

6. FY 2016 Budget – President Schaffer, Jayne Myrick

A. [FY2016 Budget Assumptions](#)

Jayne reviewed the estimated funds available, the proposed distributions, and the changes made since the presentation at the February 20, 2015, College Council meeting.

Highlights

- August 2014 Recapture/Redistribution – The College reports an estimate of the expected local appropriations in July of each year to the Wyoming Community College Commission. Those estimates are added into the formula and then the State appropriation is re-distributed to the community colleges. The College is expecting \$473,625 more from local appropriations and \$505,304 less from State appropriations.
- Course Completions – The College’s course completions are increasing, and therefore, so is the revenue by \$364,000 from this calculation. Ann stated a test of the data showed a statistically significant improvement. Carol explained that had the course completions not increased, the College would have a much smaller base budget.
- Employer Retirement Contribution – The contribution is increasing .75% as of July 1st. The State is reimbursing the College at \$82,682 (61.59%), which is the approximate percentage of the State appropriations compared to the total revenue that includes tuition and fees and the local appropriation.
- Tuition – Estimated to be down by \$906,000 (11.47% decrease) based on declining enrollment.
- Miscellaneous Fees – Estimated to be down \$49,000 based on declining enrollment.
- Athletic Fees – Estimated to be down \$33,400 based on declining enrollment.
- Total decrease in Estimated New Funds is \$573,092.
- Internal Funds Available – These funds total \$1,501,866 and will come from vacancies/replacements, estimated vacancy replacement savings (based on a 10-year average), the Technology Infrastructure Fee and Student Technology Fee structure, and the adjunct retirement budget (adjunct faculty are no longer eligible for retirement).
- One-Time Funds Available – One-time funds total \$1,449,775 and come from the State aid for enrollment growth.
- Total Estimated Funds Available – \$2,378,549

B. [FY2016 Trend Data](#)

Jayne reviewed the proposed distributions for FY 2016 that were supported by each area’s trend data. The difference between the estimated revenue and proposed distribution was \$553,094. The trend data compared last year’s budget amounts to this year’s.

Terry observed from the proposed distribution amounts that some areas have significant cuts and others increases. President Schaffer stated the BRAC recommendations provide the rationale for the increases.

7. **Budget Resource Allocation Committee (BRAC) and Recommendations** – Jayne Myrick, Kim Bender, Cindy Henning BRAC members: Deborah Ambroso, Kim Bender, Monica Benes, Kari Brown-Herbst, Bill Dalles, Nycole Courtney, Cindy Henning, Sabrina Lane, Chad Marley, Jayne Myrick, Jason Ostrowski, Caroline Ross, and Bill Zink

A. [Recommendations for One-Time Requests and Operating Expense Requests](#)

Jayne recognized the BRAC members for their hard work during the last five weeks. From lengthy discussions, the BRAC made the following recommendations:

- 1) Allocate 47.58% of the funding to non-infrastructure requests and 52.42% to infrastructure requests. The budget available for one-time requests is \$495,786. Cindy explained this year’s funding determinations were based on weighted measures; the infrastructure (Trait 10) weight was doubled in the Resource Decision-Making Rubric. She shared the rationale behind each purchase that was recommended for funding and also shared what communication took place to gain clarification of a request. The breakdown is as follows:

Non-infrastructure	\$235,881
Infrastructure	\$259,905
Unfunded Requests	\$708,592

A list of the items recommended for purchase was attached to the recommendation.

- 2) If one-time funds become available during FY 2016 (e.g., funding by Perkins, lower expenditures than budgeted), the unfunded requests will be funded in priority order as funds become available.

In additional discussion, Jayne clarified for President Schaffer that the reduction of contracted services in the Math and Sciences is reflected in the updated trend data. In visiting with Kathy Hathaway, the amount of the Math and Sciences’ contracts for services may be reduced further.

B. [BRAC FY2017 Process Improvements](#)

Kim recounted the main purpose of College Council is to strengthen continuous improvement. College Council uses BRAC to evaluate performance and effectiveness of the College, which is one of the five purposes established in procedure for College Council. Therefore, the BRAC’s close analysis of the data is an evaluative resource for College Council that is important and necessary. He summarized that the BRAC is the linkage between the budget process and College Council. That linkage provides an evaluation method for College Council that’s contingent on data that produces improvements, and those improvements enhance the budget process. Kim explained the process improvement recommendations made by BRAC for one-time funding items and trends report items for FY 2017. Those recommendations are linked to these minutes. During the spring kick-off week in January formal training was provided on developing a good rationale for funding requests. President Schaffer stated in response to Terry’s question about attendance at the training that he believed a good portion of faculty and staff who make one-time requests attended the training.

Comments and Clarifications

- The decrease of 11.75% in adjunct faculty salaries was more of a directive from President Schaffer. The directive was based on the tuition and fee revenues varying downwards as a result of enrollment decreases. As enrollment declines a decrease in high tech fees, athletic fees, and tuition revenue has to be estimated. The only truly linked variable expenditure are adjunct faculty salaries. Whereas, full-time faculty salaries are a fixed expenditure. The \$900,000 decrease in tuition revenue is matched up with only about a \$270,000 overall reduction in adjunct faculty expenditures. So, the reduction is not 1:1, which indicates some flex still exists in the adjunct faculty budget. The unused adjunct faculty expense cannot be reallocated because the revenue associated with it has been lost; i.e., the College does not have the revenue to replace the loss, and some budget units were doing this. The assumption used for determining the FY 2016 adjunct faculty budget will be included at the onset of the budget process for FY 2017.
- What are the steps taken to get to a decreased amount? An email was sent to budget managers at the higher level (above the deans) asking that rationale be provided for any line item that had a budget increase greater than the three-year average plus 20% or cut the budget amount for that line item.
- The information BRAC uses to justify their allocation decisions includes a “rationale” column. The rationale is a vital component to their decision-making process. The BRAC members hold extensive conversations about the monies being requested, their purpose, and their justification. Because the BRAC has a tight five-week timeframe in which to make those decisions, the additional time needed to seek justification for any rationale that is not provided with the initial budget request reduces time needed for the overall process. The BPAC and BRAC have been in effect for three years, and great effort has been made to inform those who are responsible for submitting the budget requests.
- President Schaffer stated BRAC members look at three different areas:
 - o Is the request flat?
 - o Is the budget request a substantial increase? If so, has a rationale been provided to justify the increase?
 - o Is the budget request the same but has not been historically spent at that level? Does the rationale justify sustaining the budget request as submitted?

He noted the process has an understandable learning curve. José suggested any requests, that support frontline student services should be given extra attention, even though they are not supported by the rationale requested of all budget submissions. Terry believed a teaching component with some background and examples would benefit those who are charged with submitting budget requests. Kim pointed out the decision-making rubric includes an example of a strong rationale. He also shared that this year’s practice of using a three-year average plus 20% was intended to drive the surplus out of the budget. Consideration will be given to including this practice as a third budget assumption for the next FY 2017 budget process. Carol followed that the BPAC is open to recommendations for improving the budget allocation process. The BPAC members evaluate the process prior to the beginning of each budget-building cycle. José concluded further tweaks of the process combined with additional education will help those, whose budget requests are not recommended, understand why; they will still not be happy, but at least they will have the satisfaction of understanding the justification behind the non-funding recommendation.

President Schaffer observed the Council’s time to address the remaining agenda items was waning and asked Chad to request a motion be made on the one-time expenditures. He also stated the Board will hear the first reading of the budget on April 15th and suggested a follow-up conversation be held at the next College Council meeting on April 17th. He noted that what is presented to the Board may be a little different from what was presented at today’s College Council meeting.

Terry Harper moved and Stacy Maestas seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council accepts the Budget Resource and Allocation Committee’s recommendations for one-time expenditures.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

8. Human Resources Priority Plan Scoring – Amy Stinson

Human Resources Assistant Director Amy Stinson explained the “Full-Time Position Request, Review, and Ranking Process Workflow” and the College Council’s participation in that process. Of the 22 College Council voting members asked to participate in the ranking of the 14 positions requested, only 13 completed the scoring for the positions. Amy clarified that the position’s funding estimate includes salary and benefits. Funding for a faculty position was based on 162-day duty days. Judy advised the One-stop Navigator position has \$29,000 in existing funds attached to it.

Chad asked that a motion be made to move the recommendations forward to President's Cabinet. President Schaffer stated the priority plan process is intended to help apply objective criteria tied to the College’s performance indicators and strategic plan to justify the requests. Other unique circumstances and funding also play into the decision-making process for determining which positions will be recommended for FY 2016 budget funding.

Melvin Hawkins moved and Terry Harper seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council recommends the Human Resources Priority Plan scorings be moved forward to President's Cabinet for further consideration for inclusion in the FY 2016 budget.

DISCUSSION: Jeff said he submitted comments along with his scorings because he was concerned that the rubric does not provide opportunity for the whole story to be shared about the position requests. In doing so, he hoped the President's Cabinet would consider his comments as they make their final determinations. Chad also pointed out that with only a little over half of the Council members submitting responses, the scorings could not be qualified as a true representation of the Council. José observed, however, the interest of Council members in scoring the position requests is growing and that he has asked for additional information to support the requests from his managers. Ann followed that if the comments were shared with the hiring manager, future requests could possibly be more strongly documented. Terry stated the opportunity for all College Council members to participate should not be discounted. If a College Council member chose not exercise that opportunity, then that’s their choice. Amy stated an additional email was sent, reminding Council member the scorings were needed, hoping to get greater participation, and some additional scorings were received. Judy observed the submissions were much more complete and competitive this year. President Schaffer stated the budget and priority plan processes work in tandem and both validate the complexity of the decision-making process and how the criteria is used to evaluate the requests. In addition, both processes provide opportunity for engagement across campus. The process will continue to improve as more and more of the campus becomes involved and their comments and concerns are shared.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

9. Timing of Future Surveys – Ann Murray

Ann stated the recommendations (below) for future employee survey cycles were brought to College Council by the team that analyzed the Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey.

- 1) The survey should be conducted in the fourth or fifth week of the spring semester. This would allow for employees who are new in the fall to participate. By doing it relatively early in the spring semester, results should be available for analysis that semester.
- 2) The survey should be done every year to develop data trends and monitor improvement.

Although the team's directive did not include a recommendation for whether or not to include the open-ended comments, the team brought forward for consideration a recommendation that "strongly encourages" inclusion of the open-ended items. Guidelines for improving the "usefulness of the information" was also submitted to the Council. Those guidelines are below.

- 1) Responses that are the most useful:
 - Are specific and related to the survey question.
 - Provide suggestions for systematic, institutional improvement.
 - Are about department programs or service areas, not individuals.
- 2) The College will follow the recommendations of Noel-Levitz for analyzing and distributing the results from the open-ended survey items.
 - The survey analysis team appointed by College Council will analyze the results.
 - Responses that name individuals will not be released.

Ann suggested a team be appointed in the early fall who will work on the communication points and determine exactly what the guidelines are. Some of the current team members are willing to serve on the committee formed in the fall, which will provide some continuity. Lisa asked that any information containing names that will be released to the public be sent to her as the Public Records Custodian so that names can be redacted. Position titles cannot be redacted, but names can and should be redacted.

Lisa Murphy moved and Terry Harper seconded,

MOTION: That the College Council accepts the recommendations of the team that analyzed the Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey and asks that any information released to the public be sent to Public Records Custodian Lisa Murphy for the redacting of names.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

10. Adopt-A-Highway Clean-up – Lisa Murphy

Lisa asked that consideration be given to combining the Spring Clean Fling and BBQ with the Adopt-A-Highway Clean-up. As many as 110 and as few as 30 people have participated in these events. The events take about 20 hours to organize.

Comments

- The event could be connected with Earth Day.
- Student participation in the summer is difficult to coordinate.
- Rotating the responsibility might generate a better response.
- The time investment in organizing and participating in these and other events may be too much and may also be splitting the interest.
- Maybe fewer events need to be held.

Lisa asked that emails with suggestions be sent to her. She encouraged brainstorming with the College Council's representative groups.

11. Academic Standards Committee Program Modification Status Report – Terry Harper (handout)

Referring to the status report, Terry stated much work has been accomplished and work is still occurring on getting schedules completed and catalogued. The purpose of her report was to show how much work is involved.

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

12. Next Enrollment Reports – Ann Murray

- Spring – After End-of-Term – May 18, 2015 – final one in June
- Summer and Fall – After First Day of Registration – April 22, 2015

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

Recruitments are in process for 16 positions.

14. Constituent Feedback

Terry shared constituent feedback from the School Health Sciences and Wellness strongly recommends the College not launch any new big projects.

15. Next Meetings

- April 17 – HS 311
- May 15 – Moved to CCI 129

Question from Stacy Maestas: Because commencement, HSEC graduation, and nurses' pinning are May 16, and much planning will be taking place on May 15, could this meeting be moved (or perhaps cancelled)?

The College Council will consider moving or cancelling the May 15th meeting after their April 17th meeting. (POSTSCRIPT TO MINUTES: The April 17th and May 15th meetings were cancelled because no action, issues, or follow-up necessitated holding the meetings.)

ADJOURNMENT of the March 27, 2015, College Council Meeting – Chad Marley, Co-chair

College Council Co-chair Chad Marley adjourned the March 27, 2015, College Council Meeting at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Boreing
Recorder

**COLLEGE COUNCIL 3/27/15
ATTENDANCE RECORD**

PE 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
E	Caroline Ross	Professional Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
P	Jodi Weppner	Professional Staff – Appointed	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
E	Mary Ludwig	Faculty – Appointed by Faculty Senate	Fall 2014	Spring 2016
E	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
P	Ali Briggs	SGA (Student Government Association)	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
P	Bill Dalles	SGA (Student Government Association)	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
P	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 Hوجلund	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
P	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 BRAC Members: Deborah Ambroso, Herry Andrews, Kari Brown-Herbst, Cindy Henning, Sabrina Lane, Amy Stinson for Peggie Kresl-Hotz, and Bill Zink