

**LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**COLLEGE COUNCIL**

**Friday, January 10, 2014**  
**3:00 to 5:00 p.m.**  
**Health Sciences Building**  
**HS 111-113**

**MINUTES**

**AN ATTENDANCE LIST IS ATTACHED.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**1. Call to Order** – Kari Brown-Herbst, Co-chair

Co-chair Kari Brown-Herbst called to order the January 10, 2014, College Council meeting at 3:09 p.m.

**APPROVAL ITEMS** (*Items on which College Council will take action.*)

**2. Approval of the [College Council November 22, 2013, Minutes](#)** – Kari Brown-Herbst

Terry Harper moved and Jennifer Anderson seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council approves the November 22, 2013, College Council minutes as written.

**MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

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

**3. Budget Resource Allocation Committee (BRAC) Volunteers** – Jayne Myrick

The BRAC members are Cindy Henning, Chad Marley, Caroline Ross, and Bill Zink. The BRAC will meet two to three times a week for three weeks beginning the last week of February and early March. The BRAC's main task will be to rank one-time requests, using the revised rubric that Kim Bender presented at the College Council's November 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting, and review the trend data to make sure it falls within the set level of review. Student Services, faculty, and student representatives are needed to complete the BRAC membership. Judy Hay (Student Services), Rob Van Cleave (Faculty Senate), and Katie Wells and Kylie Foster (Student Government Association) will seek a committee member from their representative areas.

**4. Campus Climate Survey – Further Analysis** (*Brought forward from the 11/22/13 College Council meeting.*) – Ann Murray

A. [2013 Survey Results CORRECTED 12-10-13](#)

The corrected results are the same as presented to College Council on December 6<sup>th</sup>. Colorized graphs have been added to illustrate the survey's content.

B. [2013 Survey Results Part II – Job Class 12-15-13](#)

This survey compared employee group responses.

C. [2013 Survey Results Part III – Historical Trends 12-17-13](#)

The significant differences, although not as numerous as expected, have been incorporated into one report. Terry Harper requested future reports be produced in gray scale so that those who have to print the report on a black and white printer can tell what the graphs are depicting.

The conceptual difference between “non-applicable” and “don’t know” were explained. Some questions might not apply to a person’s particular position and sometimes the person answering the question really doesn’t know. The point was made that survey questions should force an answer and that “non-applicable” is the usual opt out. Some survey questions such as those relating to policies and procedures are “equitable” because all employee positions are subject to policies and procedures. “Don’t know” implies a lack of knowledge or communication. To a manager, this would indicate the need for information to be shared with employees. If a survey respondent answers “non-applicable” and a “don’t know” option is available, choosing “non-applicable” implies the person has adequate knowledge to determine their answer to the question is non-applicable.

Ann asked that suggestions for refining the survey instrument be sent to her prior to the survey's distribution in the fall.

The survey comments fell into three broad categories—leadership, change management, and communication. Miscellaneous categories include comments about pay, morale, and equity and are in the minority. The survey results will be included in the next KPI report.

Few significant differences were found when comparing the results from the 2012 and 2013 surveys. Anecdotally, some were surprised that the College is not way worse while others were surprised that the College is not way better. The faculty were the biggest contributors to differences seen from year to year. In contrast to last year’s survey participation, this year’s had an over 80% response rate and very small margins of errors. Also important to note is that even though this year’s survey had many more responders, the classified staff that make up the College’s largest population, were under-represented with only 27% submitting survey responses.

How the results would be used and how the action would be prioritized were discussed. Suggestions focused on improving communication and included:

- asking employee groups to give specific strategies for improvement
- establishing one website where information could be centrally located from decision-making bodies such as the Board of Trustees, College Council, President's Cabinet, and Academic Standards Committee and could also include department quarterly summaries, division evaluation summaries, accreditations, survey results, and the AQIP systems portfolio
- producing and distributing a newsletter that would send much of the information above to employees via email and in hard copy

Other observations and suggestions:

- The above could be overkill.
- Trying several things may have no impact.
- Employees may not be seeking information from the correct resources.
- Vice Presidents José Fierro and Judy Hay have held open forums that were poorly attended.
- President Schaffer has attended division meetings.
- The multitude of information available to employees is evidence of the change the College is experiencing.
- Decisions that will affect employees, even if minimally, should be shared with them prior to any action to gain the benefit of their input and to make them aware the change is under consideration.

President Schaffer stated he would really like to reconcile the survey response “fearful to express their opinion”. He will consult with Ann Murray and Kim Bender on finding a better idea for improving the areas of concern generated by the survey responses. He asked that the survey results be shared with constituent groups, in division meetings, and with the SGA. He also asked that the feedback be compiled so that input from a group of more collective voices can be brought to a future College Council meeting.

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

**5. Innovation Fund Requests** (THE DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSAL SCORES WAS FRIDAY, JANUARY 3<sup>RD</sup>, AT 5 P.M.) – President Schaffer

A. Proposal Ranking and Totals

1) Innovation Funds Round 2 Totals (The totals were emailed to College Council members prior to the meeting.) – President Schaffer

Funding requests totaled \$245,584 for 11 projects. Innovation funds available totaled \$100,000. College Council members scored the projects. Two of the 11 projects were not funded during Round 1 and are now seeking funding during Round 2. College Council members observed the following prior to considering individual proposals for funding:

- Proposals funded during the first round did not clearly indicate additional monies would be requested during the second round.
- Proposals requesting a large block of funds could receive a portion of the monies.
- Evidence is needed that projects funded during the Round 1 have been successful before they are considered for additional funding.
- Funding is finite. No obligation exists to fund additional phases.
- Several of the projects would be more appropriately funded by one-time monies.
- All of the monies allocated do not have to be spent. Likewise, all of the monies requested do not have to be awarded.
- In the future if innovation funds are available, the rubric should be designed to give more weight to innovation.

B. Proposals Received

1) Innovation Funds Request – Collaborative Model for Online Innovation – Balsiger, Hawkins, Goyal, Bryant, Kilty, Reece, Keney, Authier, Kisinger, Holmes, Sanford, Gearhart, Carrier, Klumpp, Weppner, Shelby, Moncrief

Score 741; Funds Requested \$17,300

Comments/Clarifications

- The project is innovative and needed.
- The anticipated goals/accomplishments are not necessarily clearly laid out. A model for continuous improvement is needed.
- A detailed budget is needed.

Jodi stated that even though her letter of support was not included in the packet (a copier error), she does support the proposal as written. She will abstain from voting because she is a project team member. Project Leader Les Balsiger provided the following clarifications:

- Two instructional designers have been hired. Other monies were found to cover the cost of nine course redesigns that are currently taking place. English 1010 is one of the courses that is being given high priority and is being developed outside this funding request. Faculty contracts have

- been sent to legal counsel and one of the nine faculty is now being paid. Three or four more contracts should be completed by the end of this month.
- A 16-week process map has been developed along with a plan to gather information from students, online faculty, and other faculty. One goal is to continuously improve the quality of online offerings. Statistics will be gathered to demonstrate whether the online course was a success. The statistics will be examined before fall so any changes the statistics suggest can be incorporated.
  - Another goal is to put entire programs of courses online, which is why the proposal is for three years. Courses will go through peer, dean, and faculty review. A fully vetted course will have a template that will be given to faculty members who may make changes to it. The template will provide course continuity, and competencies and learning objectives will be tied together.
  - A Master Course Outline of Record (MCOR) will be placed into the D2L. Faculty will create their own learning objectives at the granular level. These learning objectives will be tied to the MCORs that are tied to the institutional competencies that are tied to assignments. The learning objectives may be changed by faculty and their dean.
  - Psychology faculty are voluntarily making master courses for each of their courses so there is consistency in delivery and assessment.
  - Even though only four courses were completed within a six-month time frame outside of this proposal, 18 courses can be feasibly completed within nine months due to streamlining the process.
  - The deans will evaluate all online courses using a tool developed for them. The evaluation tools will be similar but not the same for online courses and face-to-face courses.
  - Beta testing of the online course questionnaire is taking place this semester.
  - Les also addressed the project budget generalities concerning software, media, and professional development, identifying the source and purpose for each.
- 2) [Innovation Funds Request – Diesel Technology – Success After Completion](#) – LaFaso, Robbins, Van Why
- Score 566; Funds Requested \$14,606.25
- The purchases would be a one-time expense.
  - This is another example of where Perkins funds could be an alternative funding source.
- 3) [Innovation Funds Request – Development of Instructional Materials and Assessment Tools Phase 2](#) – Adachi, Chakhad, McIntire
- Score 666; Funds Requested \$20,000
- The phase one proposal *Exploring Innovative Approaches to Developmental Mathematics* was funded in Round 1. The required quarterly report and a math faculty letter addressed to College Council were emailed to College Council members.
  - The quarterly report stated steps one through ten were completed but no description was given of how those steps were completed.
  - The discourse between the math faculty should not divert attention away from the proposal but \$20,000/semester seems extreme.
  - The math faculty letter cannot be ignored.
  - Something has to be done about developmental math, but this proposal is not the right path.
  - No evidence of a completed project is provided in the quarterly report.
  - None of the \$20,000 awarded in Round 1 has been spent. Some of those funds could be redirected.
  - This is one of the few projects that are central to the strategic plan but this particular approach does not seem to be the best.

- 4) [Innovation Funds Request – HD Video Conferencing and Collaboration Solutions](#) – Bunya, Marley, Matthews

Score 636; Funds Requested \$18,998

Comments/Clarifications

- Updated equipment should be a budget item processed through equipment requests.
- The bridge piece of the request is important, so the College can have Skype capability. The State is providing this service free of charge but will discontinue that service in a year.
- The proposal is innovative because the video conferencing would provide other means for conducting interviews, meetings with students and employees at the Laramie and Cheyenne campuses, and statewide meetings.
- To clarify, previous discussion during Round 1 concerning an HD capability that would require a tower was relative to the “High Definition Student Media Broadcasting Initiative” request.
- This equipment is HD quality cameras that would replace the Ipela’s that are no longer functioning and cannot be repaired. Although not the intention, the equipment could eventually replace the equipment in the video classrooms.
- A pilot tested several different devices between the Cheyenne and Laramie campuses.
- A suggestion was made to have the equipment request considered under one-time funding.
- The equipment would provide a cost savings in the long-term.

- 5) [Innovation Funds Request – High Definition Student Media Broadcasting Initiative](#) – O’Brien, Schliske

Score 590; Funds Requested \$20,000

- The proposal was submitted in Round 1 and was not funded.
- The tower required for the HD broadcast would be a later phase of the project. A separate proposal would be submitted for the tower.
- The proposers sought funding from the grants office when the proposal was not funded during Round 1.
- The proposal would affect public perception of what the College does. The proposal could be tied to curriculum, if students are involved in creating content for Channel 11.
- The proposal adds value from how the campus is viewed.
- The proposal ties very closely to the College’s mission under collaborative relationships and engagement.
- Concern was expressed about how many students would be affected by the proposal.
- LCSD 1 high schools have broadcast programming but the College does not have a broadcast degree.
- The proposal included a recommendation that the Channel 11 operations be tied to a curriculum thus assuring student involvement.
- The individuals who submitted the proposal last time did not believe they received good feedback when their proposal was not funded.
- Almost all of the proposals are weak in providing a project evaluation tool.
- College Council could offer a workshop that showcases funded projects and demonstrates how a proposal spoke to the criteria of the application.
- Proposals need to demonstrate how they would conceptually change the way we work.
- The proposal writers discussed how the project would facilitate student interaction and would change student recruitment, but that discussion was not incorporated in the proposal’s text.
- Maybe this proposal is one that should be returned with a request that it be re-written with an emphasis on student learning and an evaluation of student learning.
- The proposers could be asked to resubmit a refined proposal.

6) [Innovation Funds Request – Modern Languages and iPad Air Tablets](#) – Bernabéu, Caldon

Score 529; Funds Requested \$12,160

- The proposal addresses only buying hardware. The proposal touches on gamification but not sure that is what the proposal is about. The learning tools are browser or web-based and do not require an iPad to use.
- Students may find an iPad will help facilitate their learning in many subject areas and therefore may wish to purchase an iPad.
- This proposal in some way relates to tool kits for jewelry because the use of an iPad increases the time on task for learning, which leads to student success.
- This proposal might be approved if it were to incorporate purposeful feedback from College Council.

7) [Innovation Funds Request – Music Dept. Wenger Practice Modules](#) – Hall, Ransom

Score 421 – Funds Requested \$100,000

Comments/Clarifications

- The project as proposed is cost prohibitive.
- A plan should be in place for the replacement of equipment.
- Remodeling costs of an instructional area may be covered by major maintenance funding. The remodeling costs may also qualify for one-time funding, although construction is not a preferred use of these funds.
- A sole source purchase may be possible because Wenger is considered the leader in this technology.
- Although sympathetic to the project, how many students would benefit from this project.

Judy Ransom offered the following clarifications:

- The funds would be for the purchase of three modules. However, the purchase of one module would be acceptable.
- A practice module would be installed in an existing space and can be moved in the future. The module creates a realistic sound environment for any instrument. The technology's innovation is in its acoustic treatment that can give a student the virtual sense of performing in a concert hall.
- Accreditation is being sought from the National Association of School of Music. Having appropriate and sufficient space for those seeking a music degree to practice is part of the accrediting criteria.
- Casper College has these state-of-the-art facilities.

8) [Innovation Funds Request – Reach Local Redirection Advertising](#) – Stockton

Score 747; Funds Requested \$14,400

- Collaboration with the faculty in the targeted areas is not addressed in the proposal.
- How the programs were selected and how many students the programs will impact are not identified.
- The proposal could be considered innovative because the College is currently not doing what is being proposed.
- More explanation is needed about how the advertising is “helping with completion.”
- If the proposal works, the cost of the advertising will be built into the Public Relations budget.
- No evaluation tool for determining the success of the advertising is identified in the proposal.

- The proposal's purpose is to identify what advertising means (print ads, radio, television, social media) generate the greatest student response.

9) [Innovation Funds Request – Recruitment for the CST Degree Completion Program](#) – Snyder

Score 570; \$3,000

Comments/Clarifications

- Public Relations to some extent promotes individual programs.
- A plan was brought to LLT by Ty Stockton and Holly Bruegman for targeted recruitment. Even though LLT did not come up with good decision-making criteria, a vehicle for targeted recruitment will probably be brought forward at some point. For the record, the CST proposal did make it to that discussion.
- This program is included in the “Reach Local Redirection Advertising” proposal to be discussed later.
- The proposed pilot can be used for recruiting current or nationwide students to complete their degrees online.
- The project proposes to reconfigure portions of a Surgical Technology degree, identify people who have a significant experience, and help them complete a degree through the College. The innovation is finding a way to help people complete degree programs.
- Support was expressed for the pilot program, because if it works for Surgical Technology, it likely could be packaged to work for others.

10) [Innovation Funds Request – School Tools – Metals Tool Kits](#) – Wilson

Score 461; Funds Requested \$5,120

Comments/Clarifications

- The purchase of equipment should come out of division budgets.
- The purchase may qualify for Perkins money. (Later discussion determined the purchase of jewelry tools would not qualify for Perkins money.)
- The tools are for jewelry not welding.
- A plan needs to be in place for the check-out and return of the tools.
- The jewelry tools could enhance the course but their introduction into the course would not necessarily be considered innovative.

11) [Innovation Funds Request – Social Sciences Speakers Series](#) – Carrier, Cassells, Gearhart, Ludwig, Marcum, Morrell, Sanford, Weppner

Score 533; Funds Requested \$20,000

Comments/Clarifications

- Understanding the significance of the project was difficult without the speakers being identified.
- No detailed budget was submitted.
- The speakers' programs should be tied to curriculum.
- A variety of potential funding mechanisms such as grants or individual endowments exist for piloting a program like this.
- The project could produce programs that could be fairly impressive.
- The Foundation staff, who are experienced in the tedious negotiation of contracts, were not included on the team nor were they consulted.
- This is a nothing ventured, nothing gained proposal.
- Jodi Weppner stated she was listed as a proposal team member but did not help write the proposal.

## **THE VOTE**

The total innovation funds available for award is \$100,000. The total amount requested is \$245,584 for the 11 proposals submitted. The entire amount may be awarded; some of the monies may be awarded; or none of the monies may be awarded. College Council may ask for additional information before deciding whether or not to fund a proposal. Each proposal will be considered, and a vote will be taken to support or not support funding that proposal as written. Also, a proposal may be partially funded.

- 1) [Collaborative Model for Online Innovation](#) – Balsiger, Hawkins, Goyal, Bryant, Kilty, Reece, Keney, Authier, Kisinger, Holmes, Sanford, Gearhart, Carrier, Klumpp, Weppner, Shelby, Moncrief

Score 741; Funds Requested \$17,300

Lisa Murphy moved and Judy Hay seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Collaborative Model for Online Innovation* proposal as written.

**AMENDED MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Collaborative Model for Online Innovation* proposal with a clarified budget.

**DISCUSSION:** President Schaffer and Kim Bender will be responsible for accepting the clarified budget.

**MOTION CARRIED** with one abstention from Jodi Weppner.

Les Balsiger thanked the College Council for their funding of the proposal.

- 2) [School Tools – Metals Tool Kits](#) – Wilson

Score 461; Funds Requested \$5,120

Terry Harper moved and Kylie Foster seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *School Tools – Metals Tool Kits* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** Previous discussion suggested the tools should be funded from the division budget. Depending upon the vote's outcome, that suggestion would be shared with the proposer.

**MOTION FAILED.**

- 3) [HD Video Conferencing and Collaboration Solutions](#) – Bunya, Marley, Matthews

Score 636; Funds Requested \$18,998

Terry Harper moved and Burt Davis seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *HD Video Conferencing and Collaboration Solutions* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** The HD Video conferencing equipment is important and pressing but should be submitted for one-time funding. President Schaffer stated if the motion fails, other funding will be found.

**MOTION FAILED.** Chad Marley abstained.

4) [Recruitment for the CST Degree Completion Program](#) – Snyder

Score 570; Funds Requested \$3,000

Terry Harper moved and Judy Hay seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Recruitment for the CST Degree Completion Program* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** None

**MOTION CARRIED** with two no votes.

5) [Music Dept. Wenger Practice Modules](#) – Hall, Ransom

Score 421; Funds Requested \$100,000

Terry Harper moved and Burt Davis seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Music Dept. Wenger Practice Modules* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** The motion is to support the request as presented at \$100,000.

**MOTION FAILED** unanimously.

6) [Social Sciences Speakers Series](#) – Carrier, Cassells, Gearhart, Ludwig, Marcum, Morrell, Sanford, Weppner

Score 533; Funds Requested \$20,000

Terry Harper moved and Kylie Foster seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Social Sciences Speakers Series* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** None

**MOTION FAILED** unanimously.

7) [High Definition Student Media Broadcasting Initiative](#) – O'Brien, Schliske

Score 590; Funds Requested \$20,000

Terry Harper moved and Kylie Foster seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *High Definition Student Media Broadcasting Initiative* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** Some College Council members voiced their support for a refined proposal as previously discussed. Therefore, the College Council tabled the motion until all the proposals have been acted upon and the total monies awarded are determined.

**MOTION TABLED.**

- 8) [Modern Languages and iPad Air Tablets](#) – Bernabéu, Caldon

Score 529; Funds Requested \$12,160

Terry Harper moved and Judy Hay seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Modern Languages and iPad Air Tablets* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** None

**MOTION FAILED** unanimously.

- 9) [Reach Local Redirection Advertising](#) – Stockton

Score 747; Funds Requested \$14,400

Judy Hay moved and Terry Harper seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Reach Local Redirection Advertising* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** Lisa Murphy will abstain from the vote. Because the need for an evaluation tool that would require a refined proposal was expressed, the motion was tabled.

**MOTION TABLED.**

- 10) [Development of Instructional Materials and Assessment Tools Phase 2](#) – Adachi, Chakhad, McIntire

Score 666; Funds Requested \$20,000

Terry Harper moved and Kylie Foster seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Development of Instructional Materials and Assessment Tools Phase 2* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** If Phase 2 is not funded, Phase 1 continues. The Phase 2 proposal will likely be re-submitted during the next round of innovation funds in the fall.

**MOTION FAILED.**

- 11) [Innovation Funds Request – Diesel Technology – Success After Completion](#) – LaFaso, Robbins, Van Why

Score 566; Funds Requested \$14,606.25

Terry Harper moved and Kylie Foster seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Development of Instructional Materials and Assessment Tools Phase 2* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** Perkins funds are available to provide funding for this project.

**MOTION FAILED** unanimously.

The Perkins funding option will be included in the feedback provided to the proposal team.

The College Council returned to the proposals nos. 7) and 9) above that had tabled motions.

7) [High Definition Student Media Broadcasting Initiative](#) – O'Brien, Schliske

Score 590; Funds Requested \$20,000

Previously

Terry Harper moved and Kylie Foster seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *High Definition Student Media Broadcasting Initiative* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** Some College Council members voiced their support for a refined proposal as previously discussed. Therefore, the College Council tabled the motion until all the proposals have been acted upon and the total monies awarded are determined.

**MOTION TABLED.**

Continued Consideration

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:** The College Council may amend the motion to include a recommendation for refinement of the proposal or vote on the motion. Two concerns were expressed during the previous discussion that the proposal did not include an evaluation tool or a clear indication of how the proposal would be tied to student learning.

Follow-up comments included College Council student representative support for the proposal because of their experience in high school in a similar setting and their belief high school students would pursue a degree in broadcasting if it were offered at LCCC. Also pointed out was the proposal was presented only as a service to the community and does not make a connection to student learning; i.e., it's not connected to curriculum or instructional effectiveness.

The University of Wyoming discontinued their program and years ago LCCC discontinued their program because neither had enough students to sustain the program. The proposal has merit but it needs to be fleshed out.

Hearing no further comment or motion to amend the motion before College Council, Kari Brown-Herbst called for a vote.

**MOTION FAILED.**

The proposers will be provided the College Council feedback. President Schaffer also encouraged faculty representatives to visit with the proposal team.

9) [Reach Local Redirection Advertising](#) – Stockton

Score 747; Funds Requested \$14,400

Previously

Judy Hay moved and Terry Harper seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council supports the *Reach Local Redirection Advertising* proposal as written.

**DISCUSSION:** Lisa Murphy will abstain from the vote. Because the need for an evaluation tool was expressed that would require a refined proposal, motion was tabled.

**MOTION TABLED.**

Continued Discussion

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:** The need for a process for evaluating the effectiveness of the proposal. Pointed out was wording in the proposal that states an evaluation process will be performed. However, how the evaluation process will be performed is not defined. President Schaffer will communicate the importance of a fully developed evaluation process. College Council will also see the project's quarterly report.

**MOTION CARRIED** unanimously. Lisa Murphy abstained.

#### **SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS RECEIVING INNOVATIONS FUNDS – TOTAL \$34,700**

- 1) [Collaborative Model for Online Innovation](#) – Balsiger, Hawkins, Goyal, Bryant, Kilty, Reece, Keney, Authier, Kisinger, Holmes, Sanford, Gearhart, Carrier, Klumpp, Weppner, Shelby, Moncrief

Funds Requested and Awarded \$17,300

- 4) [Recruitment for the CST Degree Completion Program](#) – Snyder

Funds Requested and Awarded \$3,000

- 9) [Reach Local Redirection Advertising](#) – Stockton

Funds Requested and Awarded \$14,400

#### **6. Policies and Procedures for Ratification and Recommendation**

Burt Davis moved and Lisa Murphy seconded,

**MOTION:** That the College Council vote on the policies and procedures A. through F. as a block; whereas the policies would be recommended for approval by the Board and the procedures would be ratified for President Schaffer's signature.

**DISCUSSION:** Terry Harper asked that the varying capitalization of credit, non-credit and diplomas be uniform in Degrees and Certificates Procedure No. 2.1P. President Schaffer noted an exception process exists for waiving a program so that it does not have to meet the credit hour limitations under this procedure. He will visit with the Board about a timeline for coming into compliance with this procedure, which he believes will take from one-and-a-half to two years. The process for phasing in programs will be prioritized. Kari Brown-Herbst also noted the same concerns were discussed during the Academic Standards Committee meeting yesterday.

**MOTION CARRIED** with one no vote.

- A. [Degrees and Certificates Policy No. 2.1 – Feedback Due 12-23-13 – Feedback Received](#) – Vice President Fierro
- B. [Degrees and Certificates Procedure No. 2.1P – Feedback Due 12-23-13 – No Feedback Received](#) – Vice President Hoglund
- C. [Academic Appeals Policy No. 2.16 – Feedback Due 12-23-13 – No Feedback Received](#) – Vice President Fierro
- D. [Academic Appeals Procedure No. 2.16P – Feedback Due 12-23-13 – No Feedback Received](#) – Vice President Fierro
- E. [Property Control Procedure 5.1P – REVISED – Feedback Due 12-23-13](#) – Vice President Hoglund
- F. [Policy Development Procedure 1.2.11P - REVISED](#) – President Schaffer

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

7. **Enrollment Reports** – Ann Murray

The enrollment report was for Monday, January 6<sup>th</sup> (1 week prior to the start of the spring 2014 semester).

8. **Human Resources Recruitment (Position Vacancy Status) Report** – President Schaffer

Searches are active for five positions. Applications are with committees for three other positions.

9. **Constituent Feedback**

No discussion

**ADJOURNMENT**

10. **Adjournment** – Kari Brown-Herbst, Co-chair

College Council Co-chair Kari Brown-Herbst adjourned the January 10, 2014, College Council meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Boreing  
Recorder

		Member	Representative Area	Term Start Date	Term End Date
1.	P	President Joe Schaffer	President – ex officio (non-voting)	N/A	N/A
2.	P	Jennifer Anderson	Mid-level Manager (Nominated at Large; Appointed by the President)	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
3.	P	Kim Bender	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
4.	P	Kari Brown-Herbst	Faculty – Elected at Large	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
5.	E	Aaron Casteel	Classified Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
6.	P	Burt Davis	Faculty – Appointed by Faculty Senate	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
7.	P	Amy Ehlman	Classified Staff (replaced Classified Staff President Kim Adams)	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
8.	E	José Fierro	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/a
9.	P	Kylie Foster	SGA (Student Government Association); Elected by SGA	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
10.	P	Terry Harper	Mid-level Manager (Nominated at Large; Appointed by the President)	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
11.	P	Judy Hay	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
12.	P	Carol Hoglund	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
13.	E	Peggie Kresl-Hotz	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
14.	P	Stacy Maestas	Professional Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
15.	P	Chad Marley	Mid-level Manager (Nominated at Large; Appointed by the President)	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
16.	P	Lisa Murphy	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
17.	P	Ann Murray	Institution Research Manager – ex officio (non-voting)	N/A	N/A
18.	P	Jayne Myrick	Budget Coordinator – ex officio (non-voting)	N/A	N/A
19.	E	Chrissy Renfro	Professional Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
20.	E	Daniel (Dan) Russell	SGA (Student Government Association); Elected by SGA	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
21.	P	Jeff Shmidl	Faculty – Elected at Large	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
22.	P	Kathleen Urban	President's Cabinet	N/A	N/A
23.	P	Katy Wells	SGA (Student Government Association); Elected by SGA	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
24.	P	Jodi Weppner	Professional Staff Vice President	Fall 2012	Spring 2014
25.	P	Dawn Williams	Classified Staff – Elected at Large	Fall 2013	Spring 2015
26.	P	Vicki Boreing	Recorder (non-voting)	N/A	N/A
27.	P	Les Balsiger	Guest	N/A	N/A
28.	P	Judy Ransom	Guest	N/A	N/A
*Key: P – Present E – Excused UE – Unexcused					