



**LARAMIE COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**Quality Highlights Report
HLC Comprehensive Quality Review**

September 9, 2019

Laramie County Community College

1400 East College Drive

Cheyenne, WY 82007

President

Dr. Joe Schaffer

jschaffer@lccc.wy.edu

Phone: 307-778-1102

Accreditation Liaison Officer

Dr. Kim Bender

kbender@lccc.wy.edu

307-778-4337

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Overview.....	3
Strategic Challenges	3
Systems Appraisal Feedback for HLC Accreditation Criteria: Team Ratings and LCCC Responses	8
Systems Appraisal Feedback for AQIP Category Ratings: Reacting Ratings and LCCC Responses	11
2019 Highlights for LCCC: Updates and New Information	12
Conclusion	15
Appendix A. KPIs Annual Report Card, 2013-2019	16
Appendix B: Function Assessment Context for Accounts Receivable	16
Appendix C: Function Assessment Peer Review Standards Rubric	19
Appendix D: Report of Academic Program Assessment Activity for 2019 Calendar Year.....	21
Appendix E: LCCC Summary of Responses to 2019 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report.....	25
Appendix F: Assessment Rubric for Essential Student Experiences	45
Appendix G: Guided Pathways 2.0 Project Management Monitoring Table	51
Appendix H: Public Relations Campaign Prioritization Rubric	54
Appendix I: Public Relations Campaigns for 2020	56

INTRODUCTION

Within this HLC review cycle and likely beyond, the institution has never undertaken more continuous quality improvement work than during the opening of 2019. The College's continuous quality improvement work for 2019 engaged much of the institution's workforce. Guided Pathways 2.0 involved about 115 faculty and staff working on nine must-have committees and about 100 staff and administrators worked to develop 85 non-academic functions assessment context plans. Five academic programs were involved in program review activities and several academic programs reported data related to annual assessment planning. The College's KPI system and reporting format was revised. During the summer, employees underwent training for and begin entering information into the College's new performance management system. The College is also implementing EAB Navigate, an enterprise student success platform that enhances communication and partnerships with students, faculty and staff to support and strengthen student outcomes. Multiple 2019 grant awards provided funding for expanding training in apprenticeship areas. The College underwent construction on multiple fronts, including the grand opening of the redesigned Ludden Library, which also earned the 2019 state library award, start-up construction of the new residence hall as well as the remodel and expansion of the Fine Arts Building, re-design of lower EEC that now houses 23 Institutional Effectiveness staff, and façade refurbishment for the Business Building.

OVERVIEW

Laramie County Community College (LCCC) is a public, two-year comprehensive community College serving Laramie and Albany counties in Southeast Wyoming. The main campus is in Cheyenne (Laramie County and the state capital). The College has a branch campus in Laramie (Albany County and the home of the University of Wyoming) and two outreach centers in Laramie County -- one in Pine Bluffs, WY and the other on the F.E. Warren Air Force Base. LCCC was established in 1968. An elected seven-member board of trustees governs the College.

This report includes College responses to multiple features of the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report including strategic challenges for the institution, reviewer ratings for HLC criteria deemed as "adequate", and "reacting" or "reacting/systematic" ratings for the AQIP Categories. Additionally, the report provides brief summaries of updates and institutional highlights that the institution experienced from early December 2018 to October 2019.

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK: STRATEGIC CHALLENGES AND LCCC RESPONSES

Challenge One: Transitioning into Pathways while retaining the CQI framework:

Over the course of the past eight years, continuous quality improvement (CQI) has been deeply integrated into the culture and processes of LCCC. The institution operates five macro continuous improvement processes: 1. Strategic Planning, 2. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), 3. annual non-academic functions assessment, 4. annual academic assessment, and 5. academic program review. The non-academic function five-year review process is under development. The Division of Institutional Effectiveness works to integrate these five processes to produce a syntheses of evaluation capacity that results in improvement planning aligned to the LCCC mission. Several of these CQI processes have evolved over the review cycle as a result of multiple HLC Action Projects, especially the last project for

assessing non-academic service and support functions in 2018. This action project and twelve others are located on the College portal at the Institutional Projects Virtual Office (see

<https://lcccwy.sharepoint.com/Offices/InstitutionalProjects/projectarchive/SitePages/Home.aspx>).

CQIs such as strategic planning, KPIs and annual non-academic functions have realized some improvements during 2019. These are described below. While the CQIs of annual academic program assessment and academic program review realized few improvements for 2019, this section provides evidence that these are still operating normally without suspension of activity.

In addition, some of our CQI processes are undergoing transitions to adapt to the new expectations of Guided Pathways 2.0. This spring the Pathway General Education Must-Have Team developed a new general education policy and procedure (see

<http://policies.lccc.wy.edu/Files/Procedure%20202.2P%20General%20Education-Final-CCapr26-19.pdf>).

The procedure includes an assessment methodology. The Competencies Must-Have Team has developed a glossary of assessment terms as well as drafts of a 17-page assessment manual and an assessment framework (see glossary using the following link:

<https://lcccwy.sharepoint.com/sites/Pathways/Resources/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FPathways%2FResources%2FPathways%20Glossary%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FPathways%2FResources> .

CQIs Experiencing Improvements

1. Finishing Strong on the Strategic Plan

LCCC launched its current strategic plan in the fall of 2013. That plan went through a comprehensive “refresh” and update in 2016. In the fall of 2018, just prior to submitting the institution’s last systems portfolio, LCCC released a second refresh of the strategic plan titled “Focus: 2018-2020.” This iteration of the living plan is focused on the final elements of the plan that were/are in progress or yet to be completed. Collectively, since the start in 2013, the improvements the institution has made as a result of the strategic planning process are nothing short of amazing.

With consideration of the progress on the Focus elements of the plan, LCCC has is clearly nearing a complete success on achieving all elements of its strategic plan. For example, since the submission of the 2018 systems portfolio, the institution has: neared a complete transformation of its programs and services to improve student success via the Guided Pathways work; finalized and is well underway to full implementation of its new, market-based classification and compensation model, has successfully launched a new performance management process, conducted strategic enrollment management (SEM) assessment planning, designed and started a service and support function assessment process, and initiated the final major capital construction projects in the facilities master plan.

The institution is on track and on the mark to successfully complete the strategic plan by the summer of 2020. Shortly thereafter, LCCC will repeat the process and cycle of strategic planning. It is estimated that the Board of Trustees would consider and adopt LCCC’s next strategic plan in the summer of 2021.

2. Revision of LCCC’s KPI Process is Underway

The KPI system was established through shared governance in 2012 and has been used to evaluate LCCC’s performance since then. The KPI system and process has been designed to help articulate the College’s mission statement into measurable assessments to help the campus ascertain institutional effectiveness towards mission attainment. The system includes a series of both effectiveness and

efficiency indicators. The IR office collects data on 72 discrete measures that fall under nine categories such as student preparation and achievement, transfer preparation, campus climate, fiscal stewardship and others.

To further improve this important CQI resource, Institutional Research assembled a KPI Advisory Committee this summer to review the current KPI system and to recommend improvements. This Committee includes a College Board of Trustee member to ensure that metrics and their presentations are clear to external data end users and serve the needs of decision makers.

The purpose of this committee is to examine and refine, if necessary, the institution's key performance indicators (KPIs). With this end, there are four objectives.

1. Examine the current KPI system and determine which indicators should remain when assessing the institution and identify those to remove.
2. Identify methodologies that should be changed for remaining indicators.
3. Examine the current KPI system and determine what indicators should be added.
4. Identify different audiences of the KPI system and how the results should be reported to those audiences.

Already the Committee has improved the Fiscal Stewardship KPI section, making it a more accurate indicator. IR has refashioned the presentation format of the indicator metrics that displays time-trend analysis for all 72 measures, which are easily exported for report generation. Each year IR displays a KPI Annual Report Card on the LCCC Website (see Appendix A) to effectively communicate institutional performance to the College community and external stakeholders. The objective is to have the KPIs amended by January 2020 and the new KPI report complete by August 1, 2020. We anticipate that Guided Pathways 2.0 as well as our work in function assessment will shape many of these changes.

3. Non-Academic Functions Assessment

In 2018, LCCC introduced an annual non-academic assessment process called Function Assessment Planning, the development of which originated at a Strategy Forum in 2017. This large initiative was a response to two 2015 Appraisal Feedback strategic challenges related to 1. *using specific results to directly establish objective targets for improvement in all areas* and 2. *LCCC will benefit by extending the scope of its benchmarking efforts*. In early 2019, at the end of this process' first cycle, the College took time to review all aspects of the process and make significant revisions and improvements. After revisiting the foundation of the process and its assumptions and reviewing the results of the first cycle, the President, Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness, and Institutional Projects Coordinator tailored the process to build upon the first cycle while realigning the process to better fit the institutional needs. This group then met with the 36 functional areas across campus to verify the work from cycle one and validate the information going forward into cycle two.

With these meetings, cycle two began with an improved structure and renewed engagement. Early in the cycle, functions revalidated the definition of their function and the organization of work within their areas. This resulted in a reorganization of the functional hierarchy for many, most notably our ITS department, which aligned their functions to better capture their performance. The hierarchy of functions decreased from 126 in the first cycle to 88 in the second cycle for a total of 88 assessment plans. This number is expected to grow in the future as a few functions are added across campus.

Each function built upon their work in cycle one to refine their purpose, establish related overall performance indicators and focus their stakeholder descriptions and feedback systems. Functions also defined measures and benchmarks (see Appendix B). Currently the context portion of the Function Assessment Plans are moving into the Peer Review process, which has also undergone significant improvement. Using a newly developed Function Assessment Peer Review Standards Rubric (see Appendix C) and peer-review teams intentionally designed to involve stakeholders, the peer-review feedback is anticipated to be more meaningful. The peer-reviewed context portions of the assessment plan will set the foundation for the collection of data and operational planning from which improvements will be identified. The current schedule is for functions to collect data in Fall 2019 with analysis in early 2020 and operational planning with the identification of improvements in Spring 2020.

CQIs Sustaining Activity Over Time Without Suspension

4. Annual Academic Assessment

LCCC successfully completed the 2018-2019 annual academic program assessment cycle. The Report of Academic Program Assessment Activity was updated in May 2019 (See Appendix D), and reveals that 90 percent of programs had completed assessment plans in calendar year 2019, 47 percent responded to peer-review comments for Calendar year 2018, 71 percent reported data results in calendar year 2018, and 46 percent reported data results in calendar year 2019. In May 2019, the nine-member peer-review team reviewed 18 assessment plans and entered reviewer feedback comments into the Campus Labs assessment management module for planning. This updated annual assessment activity demonstrates that the College sustained its normal assessment process without interruption for 2018-2019.

5. Annual Academic Program Review

In spring 2019, LCCC successfully completed the 2018-2019 academic program review cycle and submitted the recommendations below to the faculty-based Academic Standards Committee (LCCC’s curriculum committee). The sixteen-member peer-review team rated each of the five program review self-studies twice using the Academic Program Review Rubric and met face-to-face with all programs. Reviewers provided feedback comments to program sections rated below the accepted minimum rating.

Acceptance of Program Review <u>without</u> Contingencies for Follow-Up Reporting	Acceptance of Program Review <u>with</u> Contingencies for Follow-Up Reporting
Health Information Systems	Computer Information Systems and Cybersecurity
Equine Science	Surgical Technology
Exercise Science	

Four academic programs are participating in the 2019-2020 program review process beginning September 2019 with an orientation training. Programs have until January 27, 2020 to complete their self-studies, which will be peer reviewed by the faculty-based Academic Standards subcommittee for program review during February 2020.

**2019-20 Program Review Schedule
Updated 8/1/19**

School	Program	Program Leads
A&H	1. Art	Ron Medina
BATS	2. Welding	Sam Graham
HSW	3. Diagnostic Medical Sonography	Adrienne Wade
M&S	4. Paralegal	Jodi Weppner

[Challenge Two: Performance evaluation system and Faculty Development clarification and consolidation](#)

Over this review cycle (since 2012) for HLC accreditation, LCCC has made substantial investments in and progress towards improved, competency-based employee development and performance management. The institution has done so through two primary emphasis. The first is a competency-based faculty development model delivered through the Center for Excellence in Teaching (CET). The CET was first established in 2013 as the Center for Teaching and Learning with the goal of developing a “world-class” community college faculty per the LCCC Vision statement. The second is through the human resource development office in HR, which began in 2017 to develop competency-based employee performance expectations and development options to encourage improvements in existing roles and preparation for future roles.

Both elements have merged into a developing performance management framework that is the basis of LCCC’s new system. The model incorporates three fundamental components for performance assessment and employee development. These include:

1. Functional Performance – Employee performance in fulfilling the core responsibilities or essential functions of a role. Functional job performance is WHAT an employee is asked to do and is reflected in one’s expectations for the role he/she holds described within their position description and/or job summary. For faculty, these expectations are formed by the newly develop faculty competencies.
2. Behavioral Performance – Employee performance in reflecting desired interpersonal and culture-based employee behaviors. Behavioral job performance pertains to HOW an employee gets things done and includes aspects associated with LCCC’s core and aspirational values.
3. Objective Based Performance – Employee performance in achieving the annual improvement goals set collaboratively each year.

The College’s performance evaluation model has been implemented within an on-line platform beginning July 1, 2019. This platform, developed by SABA and used by the State of Wyoming for over 7 years, has allowed the College to collaborate with the state for system access, training, implementation, and ongoing support. The system has three primary phases: initial planning, mid-term review, and final evaluation. This offers LCCC supervisors and employees the opportunity to meet multiple times throughout the rating cycle and discuss goals, expectations, achievements, and professional development opportunities. Performance evaluation forms are tailored to each of LCCC’s six employee classifications (i.e., Administrators, Managers, Professionals, Classified Employees, Faculty, and Faculty-Managers). The system also allows for individual performance feedback from other employees across campus which can be considered in the final evaluation if relevant.

The College has also formalized the process for prioritizing professional development for employees. Funding is set aside each year at the cabinet level and earmarked for specific leadership programs. Human Resources manages the request process by collecting nomination forms, determining applicant eligibility for programs, and providing notification of nominee selection. Further, the newly implemented performance management system has a feature to document an employee's professional development goals, plan, and achievements. Faculty continue to utilize the Center for Excellence in Teaching (CET) for additional professional development opportunities.

The next step in this transformation is to update the procedures to reflect the new process and timelines and to create a developmental resource library for use by all LCCC employees. HR is currently conducting extensive training across campus on the new system including both group, one-on-one, and hands-on sessions. The College is well on its way toward meeting this strategic challenge.

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK FOR HLC CRITERIA: TEAM SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS FOR CRITERIA WITH ADEQUATE RATINGS AND LCCC RESPONSES

The Appraisal Feedback Team, in their response to our 2018 System Portfolio rated six of 21 core components as adequate as well as four sub-core components of core component C. For core component C, the team identified four opportunities to strengthen performance on processes related to instructor evaluation, assurance of instructor professional development for currency of discipline, student access to instructors, and professional development for staff that supports appropriate qualifications. Other than this area of the Criteria, the other "adequate" ratings were more widely dispersed through the criteria to include the topics of 1. adequate data resources for identifying emergent or current under-represented stakeholders, 2. ensuring faculty oversight of academic matters, 3. quality assurance for online education, 4. formal alignment of curricular and co-curricular experiences, and 5. identify programs for which specialized accreditation is available but do not hold it.

In June 2019, the President's Cabinet developed College responses to all of the Appraisal's adequate HLC criteria ratings in a report entitled [LCCC Summary of Responses to 2019 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report](#) (see Appendix E). Although LCCC responses to 1.C.1 (under-represented stakeholders), 3.A.3 (quality assurance for online education, the 3.C. parts 3,4,5, and 6 (faculty and staff professional development) are articulated below in this main report, a complete description of all LCCC responses to adequate ratings of HLC criteria appears in the [LCCC Summary of Responses](#) referenced above.

[Adequate Rating: Identifying Under-Represented Stakeholders](#)

1.C.1: Evidence regarding the degree to which the College inquires into the full diversity of its stakeholders could be strengthened by detailing how the methods cited in the Portfolio generate data and information that can be broadly aggregated and analyzed. Little discussion is included of how emerging and/or currently under-represented stakeholders (students included) are identified.

The College has taken steps during 2019 to better monitor key stakeholders through a variety of means using technology and formative evaluation. First, the onboarding of EAB Navigate software, which is currently being installed in 2019, will pool together multiple data points, including demographics and other student categories. This platform will help monitor student performance in real time, providing predictive analytics given student success indicators and student profiles. Second, LCCC's office of

institutional research is working with the Wyoming Community College Commission (WCCC) to customize analytic dashboards and more granular predictive models to provide student service professionals such as advisors with tools to help students. Both EAB and the work with the WCCC will help LCCC better to understand the diversity of its campus.

Though LCCC consists mostly of white and Hispanic students, multiculturalism consists of more than, for example, race and gender. In addition, LCCC's office of institutional research recently hired an anthropologist, whose background in ethnography and critical theory will help LCCC to better understand its population through inductive qualitative methods. When profiles or patterns emerge from this ethnographic work, LCCC's quantitative experts will follow up with surveys and other deductive methodologies. These mixed approaches will help the College better understand the diversity of its population.

IR has increased studies that reveal more information about the diversity of LCCC's students and potential students in the College's service area. IR's data analyst recently conducted a study examining proportions of demographic populations in the Cheyenne area as compared to those at LCCC. Even though the institution matched its community's proportions, IR found non-white students to fall short on outcomes. This instigated conversations about ways to close the achievement gap.

This spring LCCC's institutional research staff completed a study of a scholarship program (Rediscover LCCC) for older non-traditional students. This program was evaluated for its persistence and completion, and these students completed at higher rates. IR conducted focus groups to learn more in-depth information about this under-represented population. The results of this report were presented at the LCCC Board of Trustees Retreat in August 2019 to further connect administrators and the Board of Trustees with non-traditional student voices and concerns. LCCC is also in the process of conducting a study, based on work at Houston Community college, to generate different profiles of LCCC students to determine underrepresented populations and then to provide support.

As LCCC continues to develop strategies and interventions, the institution will monitor the achievement gap to evaluate its progress. In sum, LCCC's use of technology, data science, qualitative and quantitative methods, as well as custom reports, has helped the College to continue to improve its understanding of its own multicultural campus.

[Adequate Rating: Address Quality Assurance Processes Specific to Online Education](#)

3.A.3: The Portfolio does not address quality assurance processes specific to online education or the review and monitoring of instructional design quality for online instruction. Evidence for these processes will be needed during the Comprehensive Quality Review.

The College employs the same process for evaluating and ensuring course rigor and quality across all programs, modalities, and locations. Enrolled students in all modalities are surveyed with a common instrument. The aggregated feedback is made available to faculty at the conclusion of the semester and faculty are encouraged to consider the feedback received as they prepare for the subsequent semester. Faculty are further encouraged to survey students mid-semester as a CQI measure while courses are underway. The Center for Excellence in Teaching (CET) provides a common question bank for mid-semester surveys. The bank is available in Canvas and provides the opportunity for faculty to understand the course experience regarding engagement, course design, and instruction.

Although not currently used, the College intends to use the Open Suny Course Quality Review Rubric (OSCQR) rubric as a part of its quality assurance plans associated with expanded online offerings. Having conducted a crosswalk between it and the faculty assessment tool, make the OSCQR an excellent tool for assessing online programs/course and for identifying important steps for CQI in that realm.

The CET encourages the use of department-based Master Courses in Canvas. These course environments are not accessible to students, rather they serve to support the collaborative design and development of a course. The completed Master Course is copied to all course sections to assure that the content, quality and rigor of the course is consistent for all students.

In addition, the CET collaborated with faculty to create the Online Introduction to Canvas course, which is available for self-enrollment by all students. The course was designed to introduce the tools in the LMS and to provide current information regarding navigation, getting assistance, gaining access, and communications in Canvas. A global announcement regarding course availability is made at the start of every semester block. Additionally, students are surveyed regarding their experience in the course and its effectiveness in preparing them for success in their academic courses. Survey results are used to revise the course each semester.

Last, the College launched the Canvas LMS in June 2018. Prior to launch all faculty had access to a wide selection of on-ground and synchronous webinar training. Other technologies were implemented in this same time frame, and they were selected for their compatibility with the LMS and applicability to quality online instruction. Through this process what had become a disparate collection of academic technology tools has been pared to create a more consistent learning experience for students across the College. As a result, technology tools that are common to several disciplines—remote exam proctoring, video conferencing, collaboration and file sharing, for example—are encountered by students in their first semester and used throughout their studies. Faculty are provided on-ground and remote training in these technologies to support their implementation. A resource area for online learning at LCCC is at: <https://www.lccc.wy.edu/academics/online/index.aspx> .

[Adequate Rating: Core Component 3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.](#)

The institution selected this core component for added emphasis in this report, because it relates to the institution's second Strategic Challenge for implementation of its new performance management system.

3.C.3-Progress in digitizing and standardizing processes for course evaluation review by the deans.

The Excellence in Instruction Guided Pathways team is working to improve the student evaluations, and the faculty observation forms. These will all be tied to the 24 instructional competencies that were identified by the team.

3.C.4-Implementing a Comprehensive Professional Development Plan for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles

Faculty minimum and preferred qualifications are reflected in position descriptions (PDs). PDs are updated at least annually to reflect current educational and experience requirements. Opportunities and resources are readily available for professional development. The newly implemented automated performance management system will provide the framework for supervisors and employees to

collaborate on professional development goals and planning. It will provide a centralized documentation resource that records all faculty professional development experiences to assist in coherency of development and accuracy of evaluations.

3.C.5-Include Details About the Extent to Which Students’ Needs Regarding Instructor Access Are Met

The deans and program directors informally monitor faculty being available during office hours and in responding to emails within a reasonable time period. They also review student course evaluations for comments in relation to faculty availability and responsiveness. Each school office shares any concerns voiced by students to the dean to follow-up with the faculty. The College is also implementing EAB Navigate and there will be a robust notetaking component that will allow advisors and others in the college to share student communications, and concerns.

LCCC Student Questionnaire Results for Spring 2019 (Four-Point Scale)			
Evaluation Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation	# of Classes
About Your Course and Your Instructor - The instructor is available during posted office hours.	3.78	0.56	755
About Your Course and Your Instructor - The instructor answers my email/inquiries in a timely manner (within 48 hours).	3.75	0.61	755
Source: Extracted from Course Evaluations, Campus Labs 8-29-2019			

3.C.6-Staff Members Providing Student Support Services Are Appropriately Qualified

Student support services staff minimum and preferred qualifications are reflected in position descriptions (PDs). PDs are updated at least annually to reflect current educational and experience requirements. Opportunities and resources are readily available for professional development. The newly implemented automated performance management system will provide the framework for supervisors and employees to collaborate on professional development goals and planning. It will provide a centralized documentation resource that records all faculty professional development experiences to assist in coherency of development and accuracy of evaluations.

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK: TEAM CATEGORY RATINGS OF REACTING OR REACTING/SYSTEMATIC AND LCCC RESPONSES

LCCC was very pleased to see the significant increase in the level of reviewers’ maturity ratings from the 2015 Appraisal Feedback Report to the 2019 Appraisal Feedback Report. The 2015 Appraisal contained 94 reacting ratings compared to 31 reacting items for the 2019 Appraisal, roughly 30 percent of the 2015 total. The findings indicate consistent positive movement along the maturity scale, which is encouraging to the institution as it reinforces the continuous quality improvement work accomplished over the review period. Even so, the institution had 31 reacting or reacting/systematic ratings with 55 percent of those found in the R (results) sections.

In June 2019, the President's Cabinet developed College responses to all 31 of the 2019 Appraisal Feedback Report's reacting and reacting/systematic ratings in a report entitled [LCCC Summary of Responses to 2019 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report](#) (see Appendix E). Because of limited space, this report provides one example relating to the formal alignment of curriculum to co-curricular experiences. Appraisal reviewers produced multiple Appraisal references to opportunities for LCCC to improve its alignment of curricular and co-curricular experiences, making it more formal and measurable. These opportunities surface in an adequate rating for core component 3.E.1 and in two Appraisal category areas (1P1 and 1P2).

The institution's participation in Guided Pathways 2.0 has presented the College with the opportunity to improve formal curricular and co-curricular alignment along with strengthening the assessment of co-curricular experiences. The Pathways Essential Student Experiences team has identified three competency areas of experiential learning—Collaboration, Immersion, and Synthesis & Application. Each competency includes five traits such as teamwork, negotiation, and conflict management for the collaboration competency area. All students, including online students, will be expected to demonstrate achievement of these competencies by earning two micro badges per macro badge that aligns with objectives for their AAS/AS/AA degrees. During spring the team developed three assessment rubrics, one for each of the experience areas. The rubrics are being reviewed. They demonstrate formalism for assessment coupled with the badging system, which demonstrates attainment of the competencies described in the rubrics (see Appendix F). The team is still working on developing the process to assess achievement of the micro and macro badges.

2019 HIGHLIGHTS FOR LCCC: UPDATES AND NEW INFORMATION

[Guided Pathways 2.0](#)

This report already presented information on a number of 2019 highlights that are described in above sections, such as *Challenge One: Transitioning into Pathways while retaining the CQI framework*, which contains information on strategic planning progress, functions assessment context development, and the kick off for revision of the KPIs. This section primarily focuses on updates related to Pathways 2.0, revision of LCCC's Composite Financial Index (CFI) information, increased capacity to research stakeholder needs, implementation of EAB Navigator, advancement of privacy protection, and new or revised policies and procedures.

Pathways 2.0 updates include development of a new General Education policy and procedure. All courses that are listed as having General Education status lost the status for the 2020-21 catalog. A new list of 47 courses were identified as priority courses by the General Education subcommittee, of which 45 of them were updated by faculty and went through the Academic Standards Committee approval process during the summer of 2019.

In addition, seven Pathways have been identified to help students focus their career interest and engage as a member of communities of interest specific to each pathway. Faculty developed program maps for each of the Pathways. The program maps include all of the coursework listed by semester. Each Pathway degree has a first semester that has common courses with most other programs in the Pathway. During fall 2019 in-service, the Course & Program Competencies must-have committee provided instruction on writing competencies and led the faculty to align the program and course competencies for each program. During early summer, the Excellence in Instruction must-have committee held a four-day

Sprint, in which the faculty identified the training structure that will be used to teach new faculty the 24 faculty competencies that faculty must demonstrate for continuing contract status.

The Co-requisite Developmental Math & English must-have committee developed new placement protocol procedures, that will heavily focus on high school GPA for placement and included user guided self-placement as a placement strategy. The Streamlined Entry process moved orientation to an online process, and implemented a new fall semester event known as “The Day Before.” The College welcomed approximately 400 new students and their families to campus who were welcomed by the College President and interacted with the staff and faculty from the school that they were entering.

Overall, for 2019, the Pathways project managers developed a table of milestones to be completed by faculty and staff. Below is an excerpt from the table that displays the broad variety of activity. A complete listing of 22 completed milestones is available in Appendix G.

**Excerpt from Guided Pathways 2.0 Project Management Monitoring Table
(four of 22 entries)**

Milestone Target Date	Team Name	Milestone Description	Progress/ Status
6/30/2019	Entry Process	Career exploration solution identified: Students need to have career exploration available to them before and during the application process. Solutions to this include working with K-12 and industry partners as well as technology to provide career exploration when a student applies. Completed 6/30/19 with the selection of Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI). The service uses Emsi’s comprehensive labor market data to help students find careers that match their strengths and discover programs at LCCC that will prepare them for success.	Complete
7/17/2019	Advising	Advising model finalized: The advising model will have undergone an extensive campus vetting process that included students, student affairs, and faculty. It will include the charter must-haves. New milestone date moved from 3/31/19 to 5/31/19. Completed 7/17/19.	Complete
8/10/2019	Competencies	Assessment framework proposed to ALT and revised: The team will create an assessment framework to evaluate course and program competencies and assessments, vet this framework through ALT, then revise it accordingly. Completed 8/10/19	Complete
8/16/2019	Competencies	Completion of faculty in-service where program competencies and traits are mapped in pathway degrees and discrete degrees.	Complete

[LCCC’s Composite Financial Index \(CFI\)](#)

In May 2019, LCCC independently discovered that it mistakenly entered incorrect Composite Financial Index (CFI) information into the HLC 2019 Institutional Update. Under advisement from LCCC’s Liaison

Dr. Jeff Rosen, the institution contacted Michael Seuring, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer who recommended we send him a revised Financial Data Worksheet that excludes the impact of GASB 68 and GASB 75. VP/CFO Seuring stated *HLC's position on asking institutions to submit two sets of financials/ratios was suggested in a recent update to Strategic Financial Analysis in Higher Education, 7th edition. I'm hoping an 8th version will be published soon addressing the recent GASB and FASB changes in a more formal fashion.*

Increased Capacity-Building for Identifying Stakeholders, Gathering Their Feedback, and Responding to Needs.

Many instances of this capacity building occurred in 2019 with the functions assessment emphasis on stakeholder feedback and stakeholder-based peer-review, Pathways vetting of new processes, and IR hiring of a qualitative researcher for interacting with stakeholders. Soon after the hiring of a qualitative researcher in January, student research interviews, focus groups, and open-ended comments on surveys have been analyzed to capture student perceptions and concerns. The researcher has analyzed annual student forum data from 2018 and 2019 to help LCCC understand the needs of its students. For example, one recent study used surveys and interviews to examine student interest in eSports to determine if an eSports program would benefit LCCC. This research helped to establish a committee of staff, faculty, and students. Another comprehensive, qualitative study of LCCC's Counseling Center better resulted in better understanding of student concerns about mental health care options and treatment. Each of these studies include a recommendations section that inform staff on how to improve students' experiences at LCCC. These reports have been distributed to LCCC stakeholders including staff, executives, and the Board of Trustees to ensure student feedback is heard (student comments and transcripts are included verbatim in reports).

A more recent example of building stakeholder feedback capacity comes from the Public Relations area in Institutional Advancement. Annually, the Public Relations (PR) department in Institutional Advancement informally prioritized public relations campaign needs. In 2019, it collaborated with the College's widely representative 20-member Learning Leadership Team (LLT) to design a process for managing the prioritization of campaigns (marketing projects) based on stakeholder feedback. LLT members and PR developed a process, created a prioritization rubric, and managed the first rating exercise this summer with a resulting 22-item listing of priority campaigns. The prioritization process runs annually. Campaign requests are evaluated on an annual basis. Please see Appendix H to view the Public Relations Campaign Prioritization Rubric, and see Appendix I to view Public Relations Campaigns for 2020.

College Implementation of EAB Navigate

During spring and summer 2019, the Chief Technology Officer, Director of Student Success and Planning, and Pathway committee members led the implementation of EAB Navigate working directly with the EAB staff liaison. The Beta Advising Model was implemented in August 2019. In Fall 2019, LCCC will be implementing the EAB Navigate software platform that enhances communication and partnerships with students, faculty and staff to support and strengthen student success. It ensures that students have the information and resources necessary to complete their academic, career and life goals. It is a single location for student information, including academic plans/courses and performance; allowing Faculty and staff to make referrals to campus resources and raise concerns about students' performance and behavior. Navigate guides students through their college experience beginning with applying; through applying for financial aid, scheduling advising appointments, planning courses and exploring Pathways.

[HLC updated activities for PPIS working group](#)

In the fall of 2018 the Privacy Protection and Information Security Working Group presented to school and department meetings across campus. During the 2018-2019 year, as a result of these meetings, several processes were identified as needing solutions for information protection improvements. Email system improvements included better transmission of information being submitted in-person by students, the ability to conduct system scans for PPI being transmitted via email, the ability for individuals to encrypt emails that include protected information, displaying a warning banner if an email originates from off campus, and the creation of a 24/7 monitored ITS email for reporting any potentially harmful emails sent to an LCCC email account. A Smartsheet (FERPA and GLBA certified third-party vendor) information submission, storage and access solution was created for the additional materials needed for potential and current students in health sciences programs (e.g., immunization records). An AdobeWorkflow solution was created for the School of Outreach and Workforce Development for the secure routing of employee hiring paperwork (the school hires a large volume of short-term personnel for summer camps, lifelong learning, and customized training offerings).

[Policies and Procedures Approved in 2019](#)

During the fall of 2018 and the spring of 2019, the following LCCC policies and procedures went through the approval process and were adopted: General Education Procedure 2.2P, General Admissions Procedure 3.1P (Revised), Transfer of Credit Procedure 3.18P (Revised), and Compensation Policy 6.11. In the fall of 2019, in order to align LCCC practices with changing regulations, one policy and two procedures were adopted under Temporary Executive order and began the full approval process: Student Discipline Adjudication Procedure 3.16P, Integrity and Standards of Practice Policy 9.8, and Privacy Protection and Information Security Procedure 9.8P (see <http://policies.lccc.wy.edu/Files/Procedure%209.8P%20Privacy%20Protection%20and%20Information%20Security%20-TEO-JSaug2-19.pdf>).

CONCLUSION

As the CQI efforts of HLC move on from the Academic Quality Improvement Program towards CQI expression in other accreditation pathways, LCCC has benefited to the point where it has the critical mass of experience to carry on with what has now become a tradition of CQI at the College. Engrained in the institution's culture of CQI is a multi-dimensional system of quality assurance processes that interact with one another and are consistently led by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness. The institution has steadily invested in new hires for this department over the review cycle (seven staff members, including an associate vice president who is a President's Cabinet member). The recent highlights reported here demonstrate growing capacity for stakeholder identification, data resources for obtaining higher integrity feedback, and expanded assessment planning for data analysis and informing improvements. Organizational learning and its companion knowledge management are accelerating formative change at the institution.

This fall the institution looks forward to meeting and working with the Comprehensive Quality Review Team and helping the reviewers learn more about the College while engaging them in conversations that help the institution develop solutions to the hard-to-solve problems that challenge further progress towards full maturity along the continuous improvement journey.

APPENDICES

Appendix A



LCCC Key Performance Indicators Annual Report Card

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Overall Grade:	C	C	B	B	B	C	B
Key Effectiveness Indicators							
A. Student Participation and Achievement	C	C	C	C	B	B	B
B. Academic Preparation	C	C	C	B	B	C	B
C. Transfer Preparation	B	B	B	C	C	C	B
D. Workforce Development	B	B	B	B	C	C	C
E. Community Development	B	B	B	C	B	B	B
Key Efficiency Indicators							
F. Instructional Productivity	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
G. Fiscal Stewardship	D	C	B	B	B	D	A
H. College Affordability	B	C	B	C	B	B	A
I. Campus Climate	B	C	C	C	B	B	B

LCCC IR Office, MAP, 09/04/2019

Appendix B

2019 Function Assessment Context: Accounts Receivable

Purpose Statement: Why does this function exist and for what purpose?:

Accounts receivable exists to ensure proper receipt and recording of payments and collections of debts owed to the college. This is done through the provision of an effective and efficient process for the notification, monitoring, collection, and reporting of revenues owed to the College. These resources are critical for the successful delivery of activities associated with our educational mission.

Function Assessment Rating Levels:

No Applicable Content,

Reviewer Written Feedback for Each Section:

Test Comment: K.Bender-8-29-2019

Stakeholders: Who are the function's primary stakeholders and why?:

Students with open receivables – these are students that owe LCCC for tuition, fees and/or residence hall.

Budget Office – they are dependent on the actual revenue meeting projections that have been used as the basis for annual operating budgets.

Stakeholders: What feedback system(s) are used to gather stakeholder input on the function's performance?:

Student stakeholder survey – An informal survey with students with open receivables, inquiring if they understand why they owe and know options available for payment.

Budget Office interview – Meet annually with the LCCC Budget Director, to learn if our account receivable processes are meeting the expectations of the budget office to inform the Budget Office of collections status.

Function Assessment Rating Levels:

Reviewer Written Feedback for Each Section:

Assessment: (INDICATORS): What are the indicators of the function's performance?:

1. Notification: Notify students numerous times and various ways
2. Monitoring: Ageing of receivables
3. Collections: Receivables turned over to collections (less is better)
4. Reporting: Notify appropriate individuals of balances due at various time periods

Function Assessment Rating Levels:

Reviewer Written Feedback for Each Section:

Assessment (MEASURES): What data are generated to determine current levels of performance on the indicators?:

1. Notification: Number of times each student is notified of debt owed. How the student is notified, when and how.
2. Monitoring: The proportion of the total receivables owed to the college that is collected by mid-semester (end of week eight in spring and fall semesters).
3. Collections: The number of accounts turned over to collections six months after the end of the semester; and the total amounts turned over to collections six months after the end of the semester. (Fall and Spring semesters)
4. Report receivables throughout semester: Total at beginning of semester, mid-semester, end semester and total amount turned over to collections.

Function Assessment Rating Levels:

Reviewer Written Feedback for Each Section:

Assessment (BENCHMARKS): What benchmarks do you use to determine if outcomes are good, bad, or average?:

Only internal benchmarks will be used – external are not readily available that are comparable to LCCC.

1. Notification: This will be benchmarked each semester, (omit Summer semester) to compare total number of personal contacts with students with accounts receivables to previous semesters. Number of maximum attempts to contact will be kept on students that are turned over to collections.

2. Monitoring: This will be benchmarked to the three-year average of proportion collected by mid-semester (end of week eight)

3. Collections: This will be benchmarked each semester, Fall and Spring (omit Summer) to compare total Account Receivables to previous semesters at six months after the end of each semester. It will be reflected as a percent of total receivables, plus actual amount due to LCCC.

4. Reporting: This will be benchmarked each semester, to compare actual open receivables to previous semesters to assist in budget projections.

Appendix C

FUNCTION ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW STANDARDS RUBRIC					
Sections	Function Assessment Quality Standards	No Applicable Content <i>The function did not provide content.</i>	Developing <i>The function satisfies a minority of the standards and requires improvement.*</i>	Satisfactory <i>The function satisfies a majority, but not all of the standards.*</i>	Mature <i>The function thoroughly meets all of the standards</i>
Purpose Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a concise (2-3 sentences) and specific explanation of the function’s purpose including why the College established the function— why it exists, and explains what primary activities it carries out to achieve the function’s purpose. • The purpose statement uses descriptive language that suggests measurement and may include adjectives such as effective, consistent, accessible, reliable, aesthetic, timely, convenient, and others. • Relates the purpose to the LCCC mission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How the function either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transforms students’ lives through inspired learning; and/or ▪ How the function aligns with academic preparation, transfer preparation, workforce development or community development. ○ Language may align to the “why” of the purpose. 	There is no content entered or content is not relevant to the section.	Meets a minority of the standards	Meets a majority of the standards	Meets all of the standards as written
Stakeholders and Feedback Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a list of the function’s primary/ key stakeholders both internal and external (e.g., students using the function’s services, employees dependent upon the function’s performance, federal/state agencies, or others). • Describes how the function engages their stakeholders and what feedback systems are in place to gather stakeholder input on the function’s performance. • Provides enough specificity in stakeholder groups and feedback methods to produce meaningful and measurable feedback on the function’s performance. 	There is no content entered or content is not relevant to the section.	Meets a minority of the standards	Meets a majority of the standards	Meets all of the standards as written

Sections	Function Assessment Quality Standards	No Applicable Content <i>The function did not provide content.</i>	Developing <i>The function satisfies a minority of the standards and requires improvement.*</i>	Satisfactory <i>The function satisfies a majority, but not all of the standards.*</i>	Mature <i>The function thoroughly meets all of the standards</i>
Assessment: Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lists 2-5 meaningful/ impactful indicators that address overall performance of the function. Demonstrates the level of accomplishment or performance of the function’s activity. Aligns with the purpose statement and responds to primary stakeholders’ needs. 	There is no content entered or content is not relevant to the section.	Meets a minority of the standards	Meets a majority of the standards	Meets all of the standards as written
Assessment: Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with the indicator. Describes the specific process the function uses to collect data on each indicator. Provides at least one measure for every indicator. Provides specificity and enough detail so the measures are replicable. 	There is no content entered or content is not relevant to the section.	Meets a minority of the standards	Meets a majority of the standards	Meets all of the standards as written
Assessment: Benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides at least one comparable benchmark for every measure. Benchmarks are aligned with the measure and indicator. Includes external benchmarks from reputable sources and/ or internal benchmarks drawn from historical averages or targets (external benchmarks are encouraged when available). 	There is no content entered or content is not relevant to the section.	Meets a minority of the standards	Meets a majority of the standards	Meets all of the standards as written
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When considering the context as a whole, please give it an overall rating. Is it generally in the developing, satisfactory or mature category? 	There is no content entered or content is not relevant to the function	Function meets a minority of standards for all sections and is overall developing in its planning context.	Function meets the majority of standards for all sections and is overall satisfactory in its planning context.	Function meets the standards for all sections and is overall mature in its planning context.
*For qualitative feedback regarding a function’s rating of Developing or Satisfactory, please see the comments provided by peer reviewers.					

Appendix D

Report of Academic Program Assessment Activity for 2019 Calendar Year as of 5-11-19

Purpose of this table

The purpose of the table is to describe the College's academic assessment activity as of February 25, 2019. Academic programs are scheduled to have their program assessment plan changes plus data summaries and improvement descriptions posted in Aquila (Campus Labs) by the end of Friday, March 8. Programs that still need to respond to their May 2018 SLA peer review comments must select calendar year 2018 to view them and enter responses. Any planning changes would need to be made in calendar year 2019.

<u>Program Assessment Plans</u> Tracking includes program competencies and operational outcomes. X Signifies Task Completed - Signifies Task Incomplete	<u>Program's Assessment Plan is Complete in 2019 with at Least 2 Learning Competencies and at Least 2 Operational Outcomes</u>	<u>2018 Calendar Yr. Program Provides Responses to SLA Peer-Review Feedback for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes</u>	<u>2018 Calendar Yr. Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes</u>	<u>*Programs Completing Program Review in 2018-19 are exempt from plan reporting in 2019 or responding to SLA Peer-Review in Calendar Year 2019</u>	<u>2019 Calendar Yr. Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes</u>
School of Arts and Humanities					
Art	X	X	X		X
English	X	X	X		X
Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts	A&H is waiting on UW to rebuild degree before completing this assessment plan. (not in counts)				
*Mass Media & Multimedia	X	X - 2017	X - 2017		-
Music	X	X	X		X
Spanish	X	X	X		X
Theatre A.A.	X	X	X		X
Sub-Total	6 of 6=100%	6 of 6=100%	6 of 6=100%	0 of 6=0%	5 or 6 = 83%
Educ. Moved to M&S 2019					

Program Assessment Plans Tracking includes program competencies and operational outcomes. X Signifies Task Completed - Signifies Task Incomplete	Program's Assessment Plan is Complete in 2019 with at Least 2 Learning Competencies and at Least 2 Operational Outcomes	2018 Calendar Yr. Program Provides Responses to SLA Peer-Review Feedback for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes	2018 Calendar Yr. Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes	*Programs Completing Program Review in 2018-19 are exempt from plan reporting in 2019 or responding to SLA Peer-Review in Calendar Year 2019	2019 Calendar Yr. Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes
School of Bus. Agric. & Technical Studies					
Accounting A.A.S.	X	X	X		Plan Removed
*Agribusiness Tech.	X	X - 2017	X - 2017		X
*Agriculture A.S.	X	- 2017	X - 2017		-
*Agriculture-Production Tech	X	- 2017	- 2017		X
Auto Body Repair	X	X	X		X
Automotive Tech.	X	-	-		-
Business Transfer	X	X	X		X
Business CTE	X	X	X		X
Computer Info Systems A.A.S.	X	-	-	X	
Construction Management	X	-	-		-
Cybersecurity A.A.S.	-	-	-	X	
Diesel Technology	X	-	X		X
*Engineering Technology	X	X - 2017	X - 2017		1 of 4 completed
*Engineering Tech. Drafting and Design	X	X - 2017	X - 2017		1 of 4 completed
Equine Business Mgmt.	X	-	-	X	
Equine Training Mgmt.	X	-	-	X	
Equine Science A.S.	X	-	-	X	
HVAC	X	n/a	n/a	Suspended. To begin classes fall 2018	-

<u>Program Assessment Plans</u> Tracking includes program competencies and operational outcomes. X Signifies Task Completed - Signifies Task Incomplete	Program's Assessment Plan is Complete in 2019 with at Least 2 Learning Competencies and at Least 2 Operational Outcomes	<u>2018 Calendar Yr.</u> Program Provides Responses to SLA Peer-Review Feedback for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes	<u>2018 Calendar Yr.</u> Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes	*Programs Completing Program Review in 2018-19 are exempt from plan reporting in 2019 or responding to SLA Peer-Review in Calendar Year 2019	<u>2019 Calendar Yr.</u> Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes
*Industrial Maintenance	X	No Plan in 2017	No Plan in 2017		X
*Technical Studies	-	No Plan in 2017	No Plan in 2017		X
Welding	X	-	-		X
Wind Energy A.A.S.	-	-	-		-
Sub-Total	19 of 22=86%	7 of 22=32%	9 of 22= 41%	5 of 22=23%	9 of 16 = 56%
School of Health Sciences and Wellness					
*Dental Hygiene	X	X - 2017	X - 2017		-
Diag. Med Sonography	X	X	X		X
EMS Paramedics	X	X	X		Data for 1 of 5 sections
Exercise Science A.S.	X	-	X	X	
Exercise Science Phys. Ed	X	X	X	X	
Exercise Science Sports Mgmt.	X	-	X	X	
Fire Science Tech A.A.S	X	-	X		-
Health Inform Tech Mgmt.	X	X	X	X	
*Health Sciences	X	New Plan 2017	X - 2017		-
Nursing ADN	X	X	X		Data for 1 of 4 sections
Physical Therapy Assist	X	X	X		X
Radiography	X	X	X		X
Surgical Technology	X	X	X	X	
Sub-Total	13 of 13= 100%	9 of 13=69%	13 of 13= 100%	5 of 13= 38%	3 or 8 = 38%

<u>Program Assessment Plans</u> Tracking includes program competencies and operational outcomes. X Signifies Task Completed - Signifies Task Incomplete	Program's Assessment Plan is Complete in 2019 with at Least 2 Learning Competencies and at Least 2 Operational Outcomes	<u>2018 Calendar Yr.</u> Program Provides Responses to SLA Peer-Review Feedback for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes	<u>2018 Calendar Yr.</u> Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes	*Programs Completing Program Review in 2018-19 are exempt from plan reporting in 2019 or responding to SLA Peer-Review in Calendar Year 2019	<u>2019 Calendar Yr.</u> Program's Assessment Plan Reports Data for the Majority of Competencies and Outcomes
School of Math and Science					
Computer Science	X	-	X		-
*Criminal Justice (Corrections/Pre-Law)	X	- 2017	- 2017		-
*Criminal Justice Law Enforce	X	- 2017	X - 2017		-
Education	X	X	X		Data for 2 of 4 sections
Engineering A.S.	X	-	-		X
History	X	-	X		-
*Mathematics	-	- 2017	X - 2017		- New Plan Developed
Natural Science A.S.	X	X	X		X Data for 2 of 4 sections
Paralegal	X	-	-		-
Psychology	X	- 2016	X - 2016	Plan revised 2018	New Plan-waiting f/data
Social Sciences	-	-	-		-
Sub-Total Anthro/Engin./Govt.Studies/ Hum. Serv, Removed in 2019	9 of 11= 82%	2 of 11=20%	7 of 11=64%	0 of 11=0%	1 of 11 = 9%
TOTAL INSTITUTION	46 of 51= 90%	24 of 51= 47%	36 of 51= 71%	10 of 51= 20%	19 of 41 = 46%

Source: Institutional Effectiveness, Report of Assessment Activity for Calendar Year 2019

Appendix E

LCCC Summary of Responses to 2019 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

1 - Reflective Overview

SUMMARY STATEMENTS OF THE HLC TEAM THAT MAY GUIDE COLLEGE RESPONSES

Category 1: The MCOR establishes a connection between a given course, the institutional competency or competencies the course addresses, and how the competency or competencies is assessed. It appears that this initiative is still in process since approximately 64% of all programs reporting data in 2018. The College is still working out how to balance uniformity, e.g., in rubric use, and design of assessments that yield useful and actionable data.

Category 2

The work in this area is expanding through the college's participation in the Guided Pathways 2.0 initiative. Policies and procedures pertaining to faculty responsiveness and availability to students are in place. Similarly, processes are in place for students to develop academic plans with an advisor; however, the College acknowledges continued challenges in the areas of student advisement and engagement.

Category 3

The College evaluates employees using a policy/plan from 1989 but is currently developing a new process that includes four phases: Initial planning, content process development, systematic development/configuration, and training and implementation.

Category 5

Processes for sharing data and information and encouraging all units and programs to utilize peer and benchmarking data are advancing but not yet fully matured. New technologies are a great step in the right direction for making information readily available.

LCCC reports significant gains in the areas of protecting student and employee information and deployment of technology tools to improve access to data and service responsiveness. The College is taking steps to bolster cybersecurity but has much work remaining to meet all 30 of the standards set forth by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council.

IMPROVEMENTS IDENTIFIED BY THE TEAM

Since roughly 2012, LCCC has initiated the following improvements, some of which are fully implemented and others that are still in process:

- The MCOR (Master Course Outline of Record), which guides all curricula and courses
- Five cycles of program review (8 per year, or 45 completed out of 78 programs)
- Deployment of data dashboards built in Tableau
- Articulation agreements and advancing apprenticeship education
- Building a one-stop student services building and designing the provision of services according to a new service model
- Creation of an institutional Strategic Plan in 2014
- Creation of a campus Master Plan in 2016
- Creation of an institutional Continuous Quality Improvement model
- Implementation of assessment processes for all service units and support functions
- Improved access to peer and benchmarking data
- Implementation of technology tools, e.g., Zoom, a portal, a new LMS,

2 - Strategic Challenges Analysis

Strategic Challenges are those most closely related to an institution’s ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning and quality improvement goals.

Transitioning into Pathways while retaining the CQI framework:

The challenge the College faces is the transition to a new Pathway while retaining a clear and widely understood CQI model. While CQI principles are instantiated in the reforms and improvements made to date, many processes are young or in need of repetition to be fully institutionalized. All programs need to be reviewed; all non-academic units need to implement functional unit assessment plans; the current strategic planning cycle needs to be completed—and repeated; a comprehensive and strategic enrollment management plan is to be developed; updated and uniform performance evaluation and professional development processes need to be implemented; and, overall, the College needs to continue improving employee engagement and trust.

Performance evaluation system and Faculty Development clarification and consolidation:

The College is developing a new performance management process, but implementation of that process remains a challenge. Similarly, LCCC has work yet to do in the area of professional development. LCCC has hired a development expert in HR, which is an important first step. The team noted that multiple sources of professional development funding—along with CET programming—exist on campus. Clarifying or perhaps consolidating funding sources and the criteria used in dispensing development funds may advance the college’s goals of augmenting transparency and trust among all employees.

3 - Accreditation Evidence Screening Summary

Systems Appraisal teams screen the institution’s Systems Portfolio evidence in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. This step is designed to position the institution for success during the subsequent review to reaffirm the institution’s accreditation.

As part of this Systems Appraisal screening process, teams indicate whether each Core Component is “strong, clear, and well-presented,” “adequate but could be improved,” or “unclear or incomplete.” When the Criteria and Core Components are reviewed formally for reaffirmation of accreditation, peer reviewers must determine whether each is "met", "met with concerns", or "not met".

INSTRUCTIONS: Place your initials in the appropriate columns and place narratives **directly below** each section in the gray-shaded row.

Requested changes made by October 1, 2019

Planning for requested changes developed by October 1, 2019

Clarifications of communication completed by October 1, 2019

1.C - Core Component 1.C-/ adequate--AVPIE

1.C.1 Evidence regarding the degree to which the College inquires into the full diversity of its stakeholders could be improved by detailing how the methods cited above generate data and information that can be broadly aggregated and analyzed. Little discussion is included of how emerging and/or currently under-represented stakeholders (students included) are identified.

Response Narrative:

After the onboarding process, LCCC has plans in place to better continue to monitor key stakeholders through a variety of means using technology and formative evaluation. First, the onboarding of EAB software, which is currently being installed, will pool together multiple data points, including demographics and other student categories. This software will help monitor student performance in real time, providing predictive analytics given student success indicators and student profiles. Second, LCCC’s office of institutional research is working with the Wyoming Community College Commission (WCCC) to customize analytic dashboards and

	KB	

<p>more granular predictive models to provide student service professionals such as advisors with tools to help students. Both EAB and this work with the WCCC will help LCCC better to understand the diversity of its campus.</p> <p>Though LCCC consists mostly of white and Hispanic students, multiculturalism consists of more than, for example, race and gender. In addition, LCCC’s office of institutional research recently hired an anthropologist, whose background in ethnography and critical theory will help LCCC to better understand its population through inductive qualitative methods. When profiles or patterns emerge from this ethnographic work, LCCC’s quantitative experts will follow up with surveys and other deductive methodologies. These mixed approaches will help us better to understand the diversity of our population. LCCC has already begun reaching out to the community to better understand how well the institution matches Cheyenne, WY. Our data analyst recently conducted a study examining proportions of demographic populations in the area as compared to at LCCC. Even though we matched our community’s proportions, we found non-white students to fall short on outcomes. This instigated conversations about ways to close the achievement gap. In addition, LCCC recently implemented a scholarship program for students older than the traditional student. This program was evaluated for its persistence and completion, and these students completed at higher rates. LCCC is also conducting a study, based on work at Houston Community college, to generate different profiles of our students to determine underrepresented populations and then to provide support. Finally, LCCC was recently awarded the National Governors’ Association Educate for Opportunity Grant. The IR office was instrumental in shaping this grant, which is designed to identify common metrics, understanding, and language around assessing educational outcomes in order to communicate amongst a diversity of stakeholders, which will help us to identify and accommodate underrepresented populations. As we continue to develop strategies and interventions, we will monitor the achievement gap to evaluate our progress. In sum, LCCC’s use of technology, data science, qualitative and quantitative methods, as well as custom reports, has helped us to continue to improve our understanding of our own multicultural campus, brought to light issues that need addressing such as the achievement gap, and promises to inspire more ways that we can help all our students succeed.</p>			
<p>2.C - Core Component 2.C / adequate—President 2.C.4 Evidence for 2.C.4. could be strengthened by detailing what structures, policies, and processes exist to ensure faculty oversight of academic matters and the role of the Faculty Senate in governance.</p>			JMS
<p>Response Narrative: Two things are worth noting here that were likely not communicated effectively enough in our Systems Portfolios. First (1), the College’s primary academic oversight group is Academic Standards Committee. The Academic Standards Committee’s primary function is to promote and maintain high academic standards that lead to student success at LCCC consistent with its overall mission. This is accomplished by approving programs and curricula offered by the College that are relevant to identified community needs, have well-defined student learning competencies comparable with curricula from peer institutions, are aligned with the entrance expectations for students’ next step (e.g., next course level, transfer to a four-year curriculum, job entry, etc.), while also being designed to promote student success. The Academic Standards Committee oversees the development, review and modification of programs, curricula, and the assessment of student learning in a manner that recognizes the interconnected nature of these functions within the College.</p> <p>The structure of the Academic Standards Committee is purposefully designed to ensure that the direction of the Academy is predominantly governed by faculty. The committee’s voting</p>			

<p>membership is principally made up of faculty (about 60% of voting members are faculty). Faculty members appointed to the committee are elected by the faculty of their respective school at LCCC ensuring faculty-driven representation. In addition, the structure of its subcommittees ensures faculty leadership on primary roles in areas such as the assessment of student learning program review, and general education. These subcommittees are chaired by faculty. The procedure is available at http://policies.lccc.wy.edu/Files/Procedure%202.12P%20Academic%20Standards%20Committee-CCmay13-16.pdf.</p> <p>Second (2), the College’s overall shared governance structure is designed to ensure appropriate and adequate representation of all major constituency groups on campus. This is accomplished through LCCC’s College Council. The LCCC College Council is a representative, shared governance body designed to ensure the College is effectively and efficiently achieving the institution’s mission. The College Council facilitates this through timely, factual, and clear communication between constituent groups regarding major institutional decisions. It promotes transparent and respectful communications at all levels of the college community to ensure collaborative and committed decisions are made regarding the direction of the College. It will serve as a deliberating body to discuss college-wide issues, to make collaborative decisions, and to formulate recommendations to the President of the College.</p> <p>The Council specifically includes faculty members who serve as voting members. These include faculty appointed from the LCCC Faculty Senate, as well as faculty who are nominated and elected at-large. This process is facilitated by the Faculty Senate. In both cases, this is designed purposefully to establish the Senate’s voice and role in institutional shared governance. The procedure for College Council is available at: http://policies.lccc.wy.edu/Files/Procedure%201.15P%20College%20Council%20Revised-CCmay22-18EA.pdf</p>			
<p>3.A - Core Component 3.A / adequate—VPAA 3.A.3. –VPAA The Portfolio does not address quality assurance processes specific to online education or the review and monitoring of instructional design quality for online instruction. Evidence for these processes will be needed during the Comprehensive Quality Review.</p>		CRH	
<p>Response Narrative: LCCC established online instruction as an important area to address in the campus-wide Guided Pathways efforts. One of the nine teams was focused on Excellence in Instruction. That team established online instruction as one of the critical areas to address, by establishing the objective to “Apply research-based best practices to establish standard criteria for LCCC online education.”</p> <p>Included in this component is the development of a framework that will define the academic technology proficiencies required for faculty teaching in the online environment. Also included in this work is the identification of training opportunities to support faculty development in developing the expected technology proficiency as well as competence in the design, development, and delivery of online instruction. This project will also identify the course components and instructional strategies expected of all online and hybrid courses and the process for online and hybrid course and online program assessment. Finally, the development of a criteria-based system for online and hybrid course scheduling and the identification of the support services that must be in place for all distance students are included in this work.</p> <p>This Guided Pathways committee has made tremendous progress in establishing the guidelines. One of the major activities was a five-day Sprint activity in the summer of 2018 that brought faculty and administrators together to review the current state of online education at LCCC and to develop a framework for the identification and development of faculty well-prepared for</p>			

<p>online instructional assignments. Components identified in the framework include a faculty skills inventory, a three-tiered development program to support faculty competency, and a cyclical peer review and supervisor assessment to assure currency and effectiveness. All tiers in the proposed development structure provide scaffolded focus on Course Design, Student Engagement, and Instructor’s Skills.</p> <p>Progress on implementation has been made as a component of Guided Pathways. The team researched faculty skills inventories from several institutions and has drafted the inventory for LCCC Online. That draft was vetted across the faculty in the Fall 2018 semester. The team has also selected the OSCQR (Open Suny Course Quality Review) Rubric as the proposed instrument through which instructional design will be assessed. Alignment between these two instruments is in place. Anticipated work in the Summer 2019 semester includes the identification of accessible training opportunities such that the first cadre of well-prepared and credentialed online faculty can be developed. We anticipate utilizing a train-the-trainer model. Additional work will involve an examination of Canvas Data in order to identify the metrics that pertain to Course Design, Student Engagement, and Instructor Skills and to then establish success measures against which to assess our effectiveness.</p>			
<p>3.C - Core Component 3.C / adequate—</p> <p>3.C.3 –VPAA: Evidence to strengthen the achievement of Core Component 3.C.3. may include information on the institution’s progress in digitizing and standardizing processes for course evaluation review by the deans.</p> <p>3.C.4 –HR Evidence to strengthen the achievement of Core Component 3.C.4. may be developed as the College works to create a comprehensive professional development plan.</p> <p>3.C.5 –VPAA Evidence to strengthen the achievement of Core Component 3.C.5. may include details about the extent to which students’ needs regarding instructor access are met.</p> <p>3.C.6 --HR Evidence to strengthen the achievement of Core Component 3.C.6. promises to emerge from work underway currently to review and improve professional development at the College.</p>	<p>TJM</p> <p>TJM</p>	<p>CRH</p>	<p>CRH</p>
<p>Response Narrative:</p> <p>3.C.3 - The Excellence in Instruction Guided Pathways team is working to improve the student evaluations, and the faculty observation forms. These will all be tied to the 24 instructional competencies that were identified by the team.</p> <p>3.C.4 - Faculty minimum and preferred qualifications are reflected in position descriptions. PDs are updated at least annually to reflect current educational and experience requirements. Opportunities and resources are readily available for professional development. The newly implemented automated performance management system will provide the framework for supervisors and employees to collaborate on professional development goals and planning. It will provide a centralized documentation resource that records all faculty professional development experiences to assist in coherency of development and accuracy of evaluations.</p> <p>3.C.5 - The deans and program directors informally monitor faculty being available during office hours and in responding to emails within a reasonable time period. They also review student course evaluations for comments in relation to faculty availability and responsiveness. Each school office shares any concerns voiced by students to the dean to follow-up with the faculty. The College is also implementing EAB Navigate and there will be a robust notetaking component that will allow advisors and others in the college to share student communications, and concerns.</p> <p>3.C.6 - Student support services staff minimum and preferred qualifications are reflected in position descriptions. PDs are updated at least annually to reflect current educational and experience requirements. Opportunities and resources are readily available for professional development. The newly implemented automated performance management system will provide the framework for supervisors and employees to collaborate on professional</p>			

development goals and planning. It will provide a centralized documentation resource that records all faculty professional development experiences to assist in coherency of development and accuracy of evaluations.			
3.E - Core Component 3.E / adequate—VPAA 3.E.1 Co-curricular activities have assessment plans, and the College is aware of the need to develop ways to make the alignment of curricular and co-curricular more formal and measurable in order to strengthen evidence that Core Component 3.E.1 is met.		CRH	
Response Narrative: The Guided Pathways Essential Student Experiences team has identified three areas that students must achieve experience. The students must earn macro badges in the three areas, collaboration, immersion, and Synthesis/Application. Students will achieve macro badges by earning two micro badges per macro badge aligning with objectives for their AAS/AS/AA. Each macro badge has five micro badges available to earn. Most of these experiences will be co-curricular, although some experiences may be extracurricular in nature. The team is still working on developing the process to assess achievement of the micro and macro badges.			
4.A - Core Component 4.A / adequate—VPAA 4.A.5 Evidence for this Core Component could be strengthened by stating which programs, if any, have specialized accreditation available but do not hold it.		CRH	
Response Narrative: Most programs meet the standards for the appropriate industry standards. The HVAC program is not accredited by HVAC Excellence, and will likely attempt in the future. Health Information Technology Management program is seeking AHIMA accreditation, and the self-study is ready to submit. We also have some areas where faculty can become certified and will in the future. These areas include one equine instructor that is not certified by Certified Horsemanship Association; one of the three welding instructors will earn AWS Certified Welding Inspector; and one instructor will become a NCCER certified trainer.			
5.C - Core Component 5.C / clear—President 5.C.3 Evidence regarding the role of the Faculty Senate and its contributions to and role in decision making would enhance the evaluation that this Core Component is met.			JMS
Response Narrative: Please see response above under 2.C.4 as I believe this adequately explains the role, and importance of that role, of faculty and the Faculty Senate in the decision-making process at LCCC. Further evidence could be made available through the disaggregation of the Employee Engagement (campus climate) surveys by looking solely at faculty responses.			
4 - Quality of Systems Portfolio			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From a technical communications perspective, the Portfolio was very well written. Conveying a composite understanding of a dynamic institution in linear, narrative prose is a challenge that the writers of this Portfolio met. The team appreciated the clarity of the text. The team also appreciated the candid presentation of facts, dynamics, campus culture, and campus history. Processes were not always well linked to data; however, in many cases this was caused by a lack of data or the newness of a process. Similarly, external benchmarking was not always available. The 'interpretations and insights gained' sections could have been more revelatory and sometimes consisted of observations rather than inferences or tentative conclusions. Certain complex and inter-related processes took effort to understand, but the team recognized the word-count constraints. In general, the evidence linked to the text was well selected and pertinent 			

5 - AQIP Category Feedback

The Systems Appraisal Feedback Report addresses each AQIP Category by identifying strengths and opportunities for improvement. These comments should be straightforward and consultative, and should align to the maturity tables.

INSTRUCTIONS: Place your initials in the appropriate columns and place narratives **directly below** each section in the gray-shaded row.

Requested changes made by October 1, 2019

Planning for requested changes developed by October 1, 2019

Clarifications of communication completed by October 1, 2019

I - Helping Students Learn

1P1 Designing, aligning and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2) / reacting—VPAA & VPSS

The college’s Student Organization Procedure outlines the process for organizing, approving, and implementing co-curricular learning activities. The Office of Student Life oversees and administers the function and creation of student groups and co-curricular activities; however, designing the outcomes of co-curricular activities to support specific curricular elements is still an informal process. Co-curricular activities have assessment plans, and the College is aware of the need to develop ways to make the alignment of curricular and co-curricular more formal and measurable.

CRH

Response Narrative:

The Academic Affairs side of the house does not do any formal assessment of co-curricular activities. Some informal reviews are done, as part of faculty evaluations as they relate to faculty assignment, such as seeing the participation level and success of teams such as Livestock Show Team or Ranch Horse Team. The College needs to define activities that are co-curricular and extra-curricular. Then we need to develop an assessment process to evaluate the co-curricular activities.

1P1 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2) / reacting-systematic—VPAA and AVPIE

The College defines its process for selecting the tools, methods, and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning as “collaborative and ongoing.” Institutional rubrics and MCORs were developed and implemented through college-wide conversations. As part of these conversations, faculty “identified and began using common course assessments (CCA) to evaluate learning of institutional competencies.” The CCA is used to assess student performance each semester. Over time, the College perceived inconsistencies in assessment and the challenges inherent in applying a single process to a wide array of programs and courses. Steps were taken to strengthen this process, including the adoption of CurriQunet to map the curricula. Results were published on a Tableau dashboard. The Systems Portfolio does not fully discuss the CCA tool and its approach e.g., objective evaluation based on content or evaluative information based on student perception. The processes in this area, once standardized and institutionalized, will ensure systematic level of maturity.

KB

Response Narrative:

The Common Course Assessment tool is a Master Course of Record (MCOR) requirement that defines the assessment method for all courses, primarily for measuring student learning performance on the college’s nine institutional competencies: Quantitative reasoning - Scientific reasoning - Problem solving - Information literacy - Written communication - Verbal communication - Interpersonal Communication – Collaboration - Cultural Awareness - Aesthetic analysis. All courses must use the Common Course Assessment section of the MCOR (see section displayed below) to describe how faculty teaching a course or sections of a course will assess at least one of the nine learning institutional competencies using a defined assignment that is aligned to a uniform institutional rubric specified for

that leaning competency; there are nine rubrics Faculty use the LMS to align this CCA assignment to their course and link it to the corresponding institutional rubric that is used for recording student learning performance for each of the rubric traits (typically 4 to 6 traits). This direct assessment is based on instructor evaluation of student work related to a course learning competency which is aligned in the MCOR to a program level competency. Annually, Institutional research pulls the faculty members' rubric ratings and organizes them into Tableau dashboards for easy viewing at the course section level and includes data ranging from 2014-15 to present. Faculty can use this data resource to enter data reports into their annual assessment plans, using Campus Labs planning. Some faculty also use the institutional rubrics to measure their program-specific learning competencies. Gradually, more faculty have been designing their own rubrics to measure program specific competencies rather than use the institutional rubrics. As we move to the Pathways 2.0 model, LCCC will be moving away from the institutional competencies approach and use a more traditional general education assessment process separate from the program-specific assessment process. It is likely that faculty will still use a common assessment approach to general education assessment, but it will be specific to each competency type, e.g., written communication will have its own assessment method distinct from other general education competencies.

Master Course Outline of Record (MCOR) for Laramie County Community College

Section begins on page 5 of the MCOR document.	
Common Course Assessment(s) CCA	
<i>Please identify at least one common summative assessment that your faculty team has agreed to use in <u>ALL</u> sections of this course. Describe the assessment tool to be used, scoring system, assessment conditions (time allotted, proctored, etc.), and which institutional competency(ies) rubric(s) will be used to evaluate this assessment. This common course assessment will be used to collect ongoing institutional competency data.</i>	
Common Course Assessment Details	
Is this a summative assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will this assessment be used in all sections?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
How much time will students have to complete the assessment?	Click here to enter text.
At what point in the course will the assessment occur?	Click here to enter text.
Describe the assessment tool (i.e., portfolio to include 5 original works, reflection paper 5-7 pages in length, 15 short answer questions as part of the comprehensive exam, etc.):	Click here to enter text.
Describe the assessment conditions (i.e., open book, take-home assignment, group project to be completed during the final exam period, etc.):	Click here to enter text.
Describe the scoring system and Institutional rubric/s to be used:	Click here to enter text.
If this course is seeking Gen Ed approval, does the common course assessment use the institutional rubric that aligns with the Gen Ed criteria topic?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

1R1 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting—VPAA and AVPIE Although positive trends were apparent in the data, variance in the data set hampered interpretation. For example, data for five of the ten institutional competencies showed positive trends in student achievement relative to learning outcomes, yet the College admitted “inconsistencies in how common course assessments are administered, assessed, and reported.” The institutional leadership has engaged with the college community to discuss and		CRH	
		KB	

<p>interpret results from the internal Laramie County Community College - Final Report - 3/13/2019</p> <p>Page 15 assessments. That discussion led to the conclusion that some procedures were unclear, and some faculty (especially new hires) were unfamiliar with the process and utility of the assessment. Recent changes in courses also hinder year-to-year comparisons. As a result, most data collected since the new process was designed in 2014 are not instructive. The College appears to be asking the right questions and working to mature this process in an intelligent manner.</p>			
<p>Response Narrative:</p> <p>Two of the nine Guided Pathways teams are directly related to this topic, Program and Course Competencies; and General Education. Through those and other efforts we are planning to develop a new system for assessing Common Course Assessment. All General Education courses will lose their general education status for the Fall 2020 semester, and we have fast tracked the updating of 45 priority general education courses. Those courses will be finished this summer, and elements of the CCA are being included in the approval process.</p> <p>KB: The new general education assessment process is described in LCCC general education procedure 2.2P. No longer will general education and non-general education courses all be using a common course assessment to measure an institutional competency. Instead, only those faculty members instructing in a general education competency area, such as written communication, be responsible for developing the assessment process and conducting the learning research and reporting. This will attach greater self-interest in aligning the assessment method to the production of valid learning data. In August, all full-time academic faculty work for two In-Services days to develop a comprehensive mapping of course competencies to program-level competencies for pathway degrees and specific programs that will help strengthen the integrity of the assessment process. A General Education Guide being drafted in summer 2019 will provide a formal, consistent training resource for new and continuing faculty.</p>			
<p>1P2 Designing, aligning and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2) / reacting—VPAA</p> <p>The College employs several methods for designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning. Through participation in the AACC Pathways 2.0 project, an Essential Student Experiences program is being developed and implemented that includes purposeful co-curricular activities and assessment of the learning embedded in the activities. The faculty, through the program review process, must design and align co-curricular activities to support learning. In addition, the internal faculty peer review of these program reviews ensures such opportunities developed and implemented satisfy student learning within co-curricular activities. As noted earlier, the Office of Student Life is working toward more formalized, standardized, and measurable processes for aligning the co-curriculum with the curricula of academic programs. Within the portfolio, there are areas noticeably absent from the discussion such as how online students are engaged or designed into co-curricular activities.</p>		CRH	
<p>Response Narrative: (Repeated from Core Component 3.E.1) The Guided Pathways Essential Student Experiences team has identified three areas that students must achieve experience. The students must earn macro badges in the three areas, collaboration, immersion, and Synthesis/Application. Students will achieve macro badges by earning two micro badges per macro badge aligning with objectives for their AAS/AS/AA. Each macro badge has five micro badges available to earn. Most of these experiences will be co-curricular, although some experiences may be extracurricular in nature. The team is still working on developing the process to assess achievement of the micro and macro badges.</p>			

<p>1P2 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2) / reacting-systematic-VPAA & AVPIE</p> <p>LCCC uses purchased, externally developed tools to manage the assessment of its programs. A campus committee of faculty and staff developed nine rubrics to internally assess programs. The combination of Campus Labs management software and the internal rubrics is beginning to provide information on each course and each program on an annual basis. As the College reviews all programs using the rubrics in Campus Labs and standardizes this process, maturity in this area may move rapidly into being solidly systematic.</p>		KB CRH	
<p>Response Narrative:</p> <p>The Office of Institutional Effectiveness together with Academic Standards Committee operates a home-grown five-year cycle program review process that ensures each program is operating an annual student learning assessment methodology and that improvements are emerging as a result (operating five years). The College plans to sustain this regular, comprehensive review of programs' annual student learning assessment activity, because it has consistently improved annual program assessment over the last five years. It will be adapted to respond to the new College emphasis on Guided Pathways 2.0 expectations. In August, all full-time academic faculty work for two In-Services days to develop a comprehensive mapping of course competencies to program-level competencies that will help strengthen the integrity of the assessment process. The Campus Labs contract was just renewed for another five years and is fully capable of supporting the Guided Pathways transition.</p>			
<p>1R3 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting-systematic—VPAA & AVPIE</p> <p>The College produces an annual, institution-wide assessment report for its Board of Trustees; the third such report was released in December 2017. In that report, analysis of 11 programs offers evidence of program analysis at a high level of detail. LCCC reports that there has been clear growth in compliance and improved understanding among the faculty as this reporting process is used. The current template, standards, and rubrics used therein were created in 2016; therefore, application is still at a systematic level of maturity. Although the College has an emerging practice of self-evaluation and reporting, it is not clear to the Team that the culture of the institution yet embraces that practice. Compliance rates for data delivery and for peer review responses do not yet suggest widespread support. General observations are made in this section, but little in-depth interpretation of the results is offered. If, as reported in the Portfolio, the faculty continue to gain expertise in meaningful self- and peer evaluation, maturity in this area could rise fairly rapidly.</p>		KB CRH	
<p>Response Narrative:</p> <p>As the institution transitions to its Guided Pathways 2.0 structure, it has approved a new general education policy and procedure that has new assessment guidelines for general education program assessment. The process adds more faculty accountability and self-interest to the student learning evaluation methodology. Faculty instructing courses in each of the general education competency areas, such as written communication or human cultures and others, are responsible for developing, sustaining and reporting assessment information to improve learning. In addition, the faculty have assumed greater leadership roles on the Academic Standards Committee for three assessment-related subcommittees including annual program assessment, program review, and general education. They are playing a bigger role in the improvement of program review templates and in the design of general education assessment. A Guided Pathways 2.0 Competencies Committee has developed an assessment guidelines manual and glossary to direct program assessment practices on campus. These efforts point toward a growing commitment to the culture of continuous quality improvement and practices of self-evaluation.</p>			
<p>1R5 Summary results of measures (include tables and figures where appropriate) / reacting—VPSS & AVPIE</p> <p>The Portfolio offers descriptive statistics related to integrity. Data on Code of Conduct</p>		JLH KB	

<p>violations documented in Maxient for two years. When this tool was implemented is unclear. Similarly, data from two years of IRB reviews are reported. LCCC reported 43 violations of the student conduct code in 2017-18. Of those, 39 were first time incidences. The remaining four were required to participate in Academic Integrity Seminar. The Portfolio does not report any instances in which a student was expelled as a result of academic misconduct. LCCC's IRB received and acted on seven applications during the 2017-18 academic year. The Portfolio does not address who is involved in collecting such data, or how the results are shared. The College could improve their maturity level by providing longitudinal data and / or placing results in the context of expectations or acceptable performance.</p>			
<p>Response Narrative: The Maxient tool has been in place for many years (likely about 10 or more) and is mainly used for Student Conduct and Title IX case adjudication and tracking. The use of the tool for academic integrity issues is what is new. It is correct that no students have been expelled for academic integrity violations, though the College procedure does have expulsion as a possible sanction. All course syllabi include language informing students of the policy and procedure for academic integrity violations, though it is difficult to tell whether all faculty are consistent with how they teach and ensure students understand the issue fully. The data would suggest that the first violations, which are handled by the instructor, tend to be the final offense for most students. The few that repeat the offense and then have the additional online seminar and writing assignment report that they have a clearer understanding of the issue and we have not had further offenses or ones that are so egregious on first or second offense as to merit expulsion.</p> <p>KB: The Department of Sponsored Awards and Compliance (SAAC) manages the IRB process at LCCC. It ensures currency with compliance guidelines, sustains a committee structure and calls meetings when needed, enforces the LCCC IRB policy/procedure, manages research requests process and communicates decisions and collects data. Applications to the IRB are submitted to SAAC and, along with their project status, are maintained in SmartSheet. The sheet is shared with the AVP of Institutional Effectiveness and VP Academic Affairs. Performance metrics for this area are included in the annual SAAC function assessment plan Institutional Compliance Functional Assessment Process.</p>			JLH
<p>1R5 Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks / reacting—VPSS & AVPIE</p> <p>As is the case with most institutions, LCCC does not have external benchmarks for integrity violations. The portfolio suggests that no academic integrity data exist before 2017-18. There are no internal or external benchmarks for academic integrity. The College intends to use the 43 violations as a base against which to compare future years. Over time, trended data garnered from Maxient will enable the College to set and strive for realistic internal targets. Doing so will help the College move forward in its quality journey. (8)</p>		KB	
<p>Response Narrative: As recommended by the Appraisal Feedback team, the institution plans to use the 43 violations (2017-18) and the total for 2018-19 as part of its analysis of Maxient data and establish an internal target baseline for 2019-2020. The baseline will be disaggregated to include totals and percentages for first-time and second offenders. Plans are to collect the data annually and develop trend-based reporting that informs analysis for improving processes. The Dean of Students Office will be responsible for managing this reporting action. The Student Conduct</p>			

function within the Student Life functional area will be monitoring student behavior data for the purpose of responding to spikes in student behaviors with appropriate programming.			
SUMMARY OF CATEGORY 1—HELPING STUDENTS LEARN The processes not described in this Systematic Category pertain to distance education and the monitoring and assessment of instructional design and student access to institutional resources and services.			
II - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs			
2P1 Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services / reacting—VPSS Although LCCC lists three methods to identify new student groups, i.e., feedback from external agencies, needs assessments with internal and external stakeholders, and academic advisory committees, the Portfolio does not describe the process employed to evaluate and apply the information gained or how prospective student groups are determined to fit within the scope of the mission and vision of the College. In addition, external stakeholder influence over student organizations appears to be very far-reaching, so this process should be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness.			JLH
Response Narrative: Establishing new student groups and supporting them is a challenge at most community colleges, likely due to the short time students are there and the varying interests each diverse entering class of students. The link with external stakeholders is largely a link to assist students in connecting with networking opportunities that could also lead to employment or effective professional relationships. The external stakeholders named are ones that can connect with curricular areas and often creates opportunities students find relevant to their studies. The process will be reviewed for effectiveness though, as the opportunities and student participation can vary greatly year by year. The new hire (January 2019) of a qualitative research analyst in Institutional Research is already strengthening capacity to identify under-represented stakeholders and new programs like Discover LCCC is one response for new program opportunities.			
2P1 Meeting changing student needs / reacting—VPSS To address changing student needs, LCCC invites Student Government Association officers to meet with the President’s Cabinet and the College Council. The College also established a Student Veterans Task Force in spring 2018 that meets twice annually. The College makes agendas and minutes of the meetings available online. It is unclear how often minutes are posted making it difficult to determine how well the process is working. The President’s written response to the March 3, 2017 Student Forum gave reviewers insight into how one part of the process functions. To further clarify the process and provide evidence of its effectiveness, LCCC could include minutes from multiple meetings that indicate student needs identified, communicated, and resolved. More details about an established and repeatable process are needed to move this to Systematic.	JLH		
Response Narrative: The College will provide minutes from multiple meetings for the October visit. The Veterans Task force is a newer group, and in October should have materials from at least two meetings. See the Quality Highlights Report section for identifying under-represented stakeholders for improvements in qualitative research that is giving added visibility to students’ needs, and it includes College responses to students’ feedback in the annual Student Forums.			
2R1 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting—VPSS LCCC is beginning to analyze results and gain insights from its analyses. No KPI results are reported. A six-year series of assessments of student satisfaction and engagement is available and does not show definitive trends. Results of the advising assessment using the CCSSE metrics suggest that changes are necessary since 52% are satisfied with student / faculty interaction, 54% are satisfied with support of student learners, and 11% make use of skills labs. The Portfolio does not indicate who provides interpretations of results. The College is			JLH

<p>encouraged to continue honing its measures for evaluating the extent to which student needs are met.</p>			
<p>Response Narrative: The Office of Institutional Research conducts the CCSSE and SENSE surveys for the College and receives the result, then distributes the high-level results published by the vendor. More support for interpretation of relevant items for our various areas of need will be included in the Function Assessment process that is also new to the College, but offers disciplined review, analysis, and action in the functional areas based on metrics established. Along with this, the Guided Pathways work is further putting more rigor and discipline around continuous improvement of operations that are changing. Institutional Research has recognized the above reviewer feedback and is planning to produce analytic summaries of survey findings and the new hire of a qualitative researcher will strengthen these analyses.</p>			
<p>2P2 Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1) / reacting-systematic--VPSS LCCC uses its academic program and service/support function review processes along with the goals and strategies in its strategic plan to meet retention, persistence and completion targets. In the case statement provided to AACC as part of the Guided Pathways 2.0 project application process, the College lists three pieces of evidence they are not meeting the promises made to students. The College is to be commended for recognizing the need to improve and for undertaking the Guided Pathways Project. Continued development of processes to address these issues will move the work to Systematic.</p>		JLH	
<p>Response Narrative: The Guided Pathways 2.0 project is moving the College up in maturity in this area. The examination of the current state of the various processes for intake of students, advising, and supporting students that was done nearly two years ago, and the past year's planning and design of changed approaches, with implementation happening now and over the 2019/20 academic year hold great promise for not only significant changes in student persistence, retention, and completion, but also continuous attention to annually evaluating and making improvements based on results will specifically bring these areas to Systematic status.</p>			
<p>2R2 Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks / reacting— AVPIE LCCC met their internal target for three of eight measures and six of eight external targets identified in their KPI report. The College acknowledges it has yet to establish internal targets or benchmarks for program-level persistence measures. Establishing these will mature the work in this area to systematic.</p>		KB	
<p>Response Narrative: Currently, LCCC is moving towards developing a program retention dashboard and analytics tool in collaboration with the WCCC's newly hired data scientist, Michael Barber. Dr. Mark Perkins, director of Institutional Research at LCCC is co-chair of the WCCC's Research Committee. This committee is charged with taking research requests and utilizing the state-wide data system. LCCC has requested this program persistence analysis and dashboard. The creation of this dashboard will include all seven community colleges in Wyoming. Therefore, not only will it provide LCCC with its own program persistence, but it will also provide benchmark data from the other six community colleges. When this is installed, LCCC will complete a baseline analysis and work to establish internal target levels.</p>			
<p>2P3 Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership / reacting--VPSS The College indicates the processes for identifying new stakeholder groups varies widely but have some commonalities, e.g., engaged communications, information gathering, data analysis, and outreach. The College provided a table listing their Key Stakeholders, expectations, and how they are engaged. In order to mature this work, LCCC needs to identify a formal process for new stakeholder identification. This work appears to be done by many different areas but not coordinated or analyzed as a whole.</p>		JLH	

<p>Response Narrative: Creating a formal process for new stakeholder identification and centralizing information regarding the many stakeholders and partners the College has in various areas of its operations is needed in order to more strategically communicate and partner with them more effectively. Under the leadership of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the College is implementing formal function assessment across the College. Within this process is a formal element of identifying key stakeholders for each function and the obtaining of feedback from those stakeholders. In the fall of 2019 the functions will have gone through their peer review of planning context and begin collecting feedback from stakeholders along with other data. Beginning early 2020, functions will analyze these data to inform new action planning to strengthen programming based on stakeholder feedback.</p>			
<p>2P3 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs / reacting—VPSS The College uses a range of tools to identify stakeholder needs including survey tools, the CCSSE Focus Group Tool Kit, and face-to-face meetings with focused agendas. It is unclear who determines which method is most appropriate. Each tool is selected based on the immediate needs of the question being posed. That tool may be a survey, RFP, focus group or another approach. To mature the work in this area, the College could be more systematic in formulating questions before issues occur. More specifics on how tools or methods are selected would enhance future Portfolios.</p>	JLH		
<p>Response Narrative: The College has embraced the use of elements of formal project management in many areas, and most visibly, in the Guided Pathways 2.0 project. This has provided the focus mentioned in 2P3 as the discipline requires the groups beginning any project to go through steps of identifying the project charter and scope of work, key stakeholders, best tools for doing the work needed, timelines, documentation needs, communication needs, and resources needed. We are maturing in our use of this discipline, and realizing promising results. The College has three individuals with this expertise who are providing the support for others who are just learning, but have projects to do. The process is used for all software implementations, the Guided Pathways work, reorganizations of departments, construction projects, etc.</p>			
<p>2R3 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting—VPSS LCCC provides some broad observations pertaining to results related to the effectiveness of their processes for meeting stakeholder needs. More robust and germane data could be acquired via a standardized survey of advisory board members surveys and employer surveys and/or focus groups. The data collection process is early in its development and relatively little information is available to date. As data collection persists and analysis processes are refined, the college will mature in this area.</p>		JLH	
<p>Response Narrative: The Function Assessment process includes specific addressing of feedback from key stakeholders for each function. The data collection processes are underway, and over the fall each function will establish baselines and benchmarks, including feedback from key stakeholders and analysis of results. In addition, areas such as Student Services now have access (January 2019) to expanded qualitative research capacity of IR, including focus group expertise.</p>			
<p>2R4 Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks / reacting—VPSS The College documents numbers and kinds of complaints but has not established any benchmarks. Data collection in this area is emerging and benchmarks may be developed after a pattern has emerged. As the College moves forward with a centralized complaint management system, making comparisons and setting internal benchmarks will be possible. (9)</p>		JLH	
<p>Response Narrative: The Function Assessment process includes specific addressing of feedback from key stakeholders for each function. The data collection processes are underway, and over the fall each function will establish baselines and benchmarks. This should help improve and mature the area of complaints.</p>			

<p>SUMMARY OF CATEGORY 2 – MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS The College is encouraged to continue along these lines and, as they participate in the Guided Pathways 2.0 Project, continually focus their metrics to gather more actionable data. The College should also continue to develop “ambitious but attainable” targets (as HLC Criteria 4C1 reads) for retention, progression, and graduation and identify appropriate external benchmarks to further evaluate the effectiveness of their processes.</p> <p>CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES Identifying external targets Accruing actionable data and analyzing it (not just summative numbers) and processes are repeated year over year, such as the functional unit assessment.</p>			
III - Valuing Employees			
<p>3R1 Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks / reacting—HR Student-to-faculty ratios are included in the KPI report, and benchmarks are offered. The source of the data is not clearly specified. KPIs were mentioned as internal targets for adequacy of instructional and non-instructional staffing; however, only one was specifically identified: faculty-to-student ratios.</p>			TJM
<p>Response Narrative: The source is identified as NCCBP and IPEDS data for the 7 WY Community colleges.</p>			
<p>3P2 Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees / reacting—HR The College currently uses a performance evaluation system established in 1989. LCCC’s strategic plan directs the institution to develop a new performance management process. To design this new process, the College will employ a 4-phase approach: initial planning, content/process development, system development/configuration, and training/implementation. Once the new evaluation system is in place, the College should see maturity in this area. Work on this overhaul initiative is moving along, and the steps in the process described in the Portfolio promise to yield very good results.</p>		TJM	
<p>Response Narrative: Automated performance management system will go live on July 1, 2019. Once the system is launched we will update the outdated procedure. The new system evaluates on how the work is accomplished in conjunction with the technical aspects of the work.</p>			
<p>3P2 Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services / reacting-systematic—HR Position descriptions connect core responsibilities and essential functions to the college’s mission, vision, and core and aspirational values. While basic processes are in place, there is not a systematic evaluation system aligned to institutional objectives. Much is dependent on the working relationship between the supervisor and employee and the thoroughness of the annual review process. Use of online documentation and tools within the evaluation platform could standardize both the process and the data generated by evaluations.</p>		TJM	
<p>Response Narrative: The new online performance management system aligns with institutional objectives and provides a systematic approach to evaluations with clear windows for completion and a tracking system to follow up.</p>			
<p>3R2 Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks / reacting—HR The College used benchmark data from a comparison group of institutions to evaluate certain measures related to employee engagement and satisfaction. The College has switched to a similar, but internally developed, survey. After several years of trended data is accrued, internal benchmarks can be set.</p>		TJM	
<p>Response Narrative: We completed the second internal evaluation. The trended data is accruing.</p>			
<p>3R2 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting-systematic—HR</p>		TJM	

While making sustained progress in employee satisfaction, engagement, guidance, and development, the College acknowledges falling short of national benchmarks in many areas. Use of the new Employee Experience survey over time plus the impact of other improvement initiatives cited under this Category should yield additional gains.			
Response Narrative: We will continue compiling data and looking for national benchmarks.			
3P3 Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4) / reacting-systematic—HR & VPAA The data offered for the spring 2018 Employee Experience survey do not enable reviewers to evaluate the level or extent of faculty participation in CET offerings. Earlier sections of the Portfolio describe how new faculty members are oriented and trained, but the Portfolio is silent on what methods are used to ensure senior faculty engage in ongoing development. More information could move this work to Systematic.		CRH TJM	
Response Narrative: Note: This will include a combination of the new performance management system myPATH and the extensive work done with the Guided Pathways Excellence in Instruction committee. The Excellence in Instruction committee members participated in a four-day Sprint activity that looked at the process to provide the training for new faculty in the 24 faculty competencies. As part of this discussion a delegation from Human Resources joined the team to identify some valuable compromises in the myPATH system that will be specific for faculty. This will be a comprehensive system that ALL faculty will utilize in cooperation with their dean to make sure they are providing evidence of achieving the 24 faculty competencies and the other elements of myPATH.			
3P3 Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6) / reacting-systematic—HR & VPSS The College has the standard resources and opportunities for staff development offered by most colleges. Understanding the rate of participation among employees is difficult for reviewers as the only data provided (e.g., in Figure 3R3a-1 and a-2) report on all employees, including faculty. The “n” of respondents for the data in Figure 3R3a-1 is approximately 260, and the results are on the positive side. As this employee experience survey is repeated and trended results are accrued, staff in the CET and HR will have the information needed to make improvements.		TJM	
Response Narrative: We will continue to grow the professional development opportunities for student support staff members. The new performance management system (myPATH) will guide supervisors and employees to develop a detailed professional development plan.			
3R3 Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks / reacting-systematic—HR The College uses internal measures for assessment, so external benchmarks are not available. LCCC’s targets are relevant and the assessment process is repeatable. The historical ‘benchmark’ data is difficult to interpret as Figure 3R3b-1 does not include institutional data.	TJM		
Response Narrative: Will try to provide institutional data or an explanation.			
3R3 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting-systematic—HR The College acknowledges that employee satisfaction with training and development are far short of national standards. A step to implement institutional change was made by hiring a development position in HR. Maturing in the area of training and development may entail taking inventory of the multiple sources of professional development funding--along with CET programming--in order to optimize how limited development resources are distributed. (10)	TJM		
Response Narrative: We will develop an inventory of training and development			
SUMMARY OF CATEGORY 3 – VALUING EMPLOYEES Currently, annual evaluation processes appear to be somewhat outdated, but the			

<p>College is actively working on a complete overhaul of the evaluation cycle, including deploying the forms and sharing the results. These actions promise to be very effective and to build both transparency and trust. Processes related to professional development and training are new or in development. As these processes mature, the College will see the maturity level in areas of this category improve.</p>			
IV - Planning and Leading			
<p>4P1 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys) / reacting—President & HR LCCC primarily uses the Employee Experience Survey (previously, the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz (RNL CESS) to assess the efficacy of communication of and engagement with the college’s mission, vision and values. An important improvement the College currently is undertaking entails building focused discussions of values into orientation processes. Moving this process to a systematic level of maturity may necessitate reaching even further in the hiring process and incorporating some means of querying prospective employees on their values. (1)</p>		<p>JMS TJM</p>	
<p>Response Narrative: HR (Dr. Baker) can provide more details to this. But specifically with the development and implementation of the new Performance Management System, changes to employee onboarding, and the recruitment process itself, all are indicative of the work the College is doing to systematize the communication (and assessment of understanding and fit) of the mission, vision, and values into essential processes, including new employee orientation. Formative evidence is currently available such as: video introduction to all job openings by the President, inclusion of standard mission, vision and values language in all position descriptions, the assessment of behavioral demonstration of the belief and support of the mission, vision, and values into the performance management process, etc.</p>			
SUMMARY OF CATEGORY 4 - PLANNING AND LEADING			
<p>While the College has a clear leadership structure at the institutional level that provides defined communication channels and collaboration opportunities, the evaluation of the structure and efficiency and effectiveness of the leadership is still in development. In addition, the role and authority of the Faculty Senate is not well-defined in the portfolio. While faculty are clearly represented on the College Council and the Learning Leadership Team, it is unclear how or if faculty use the Senate to communicate concerns, needs, and vision to the administration.</p>			
V - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship			
<p>5R1 Interpretation of results and insights gained / reacting—AVPIE The College reports that the data collection process is young and response rates are low, which, in the case of IR led to unreliable data for interpretation. Three years of data on the completion of ITS support desk requests are the beginning of trended results, but improvements are attributed, in part, “to personnel training, professional development and an increased focus on closing tickets in a timely manner.” In general, generalizations and interpretations cannot be offered. Increasing response rates and considering the development of other measures that can inform the decision-making process as a means of improving could mature the process.</p>		<p>KB</p>	
<p>Response Narrative: Below is information describing current efforts and future planning for developing other measures that do not rely only on client response rates and promise to provide more information for reliable data interpretation. LCCC is comprehensively expanding its function self-evaluation capacity which includes all non-academic units setting performance indicators and corresponding targets and/or benchmarks as a requirement of the 88 assessment plans. Below are examples taken from function assessment plans recently formed in June 2019. Plans exist for the physical plant, security, student services, and many other areas that are creating a more mature process for CQI activity in the non-academic areas. Functions will use these plans to collect data in fall 2019 and will complete analyses and form improvements in spring 2020.</p>			

<p><u>Indicator for IT End User Technology:</u> Technology is kept modern and varied Target and Benchmark: Per reports from Lansweeper 80% of operating systems are less than three years old. These are internal standards that have been developed by ITS.</p> <p><u>IT Cybersecurity Indicator:</u> Training is necessary part of all cyber security systems. Users are always the easiest part of the system to exploit. Target and benchmark: We expect 80% of employees will finish the training session on or before the due date. This is an internal standard that have been developed by ITS.</p> <p><u>IT Networking Indicator:</u> Bandwidth available to end users Target and Benchmark: Available bandwidth on links from core network to campus network closets are no more than 60% utilized during operational hours calculated by the Statseeker link utilization report. These are internal standards that have been developed by ITS.</p> <p><u>IT Server Performance Indicator:</u> Server and application performance. Target and Benchmark: Servers are kept running at acceptable performance levels 95% of total uptime* (8191 hours) in a calendar year. Acceptable performance server CPU level - the average server CPU activity is not to exceed 80%. Acceptable performance SQL Server Page Life Expectancy (PLE) level - the average SQL Server Page Life Expectancy (PLE) level is to remain above the calculated minimum based on the amount of installed ram on the server. The CPU benchmark is obtained externally from the industry standard used by SolarWinds Performance Analyzer. The SQL ram PLE benchmark is obtained externally based on a calculation used by Microsoft Most Valuable Professionals (MVPs)**.</p> <p><u>Indicator for Student Wellness:</u> Symptom Reduction: Percentage of students utilizing Student Wellness services, including individual counseling and health clinic care, within the academic year who report a total reduction in symptoms as a result of the services received. Target Benchmark: Symptom Reduction: The Center for Collegiate Mental Health (CCMH) developed the CCAPS instruments, which have strong psychometric properties and a rational/empirical design relevant to counseling center’s clinical work. CCAPS norms are established based on more than 388,000 students seeking counseling services from institutions across the United States (CCMH, 2018). Therefore, CCAPS data will be used as a benchmark for student wellness counseling services outcomes. We will become a member of CCMH and will be implementing CCAPS in July at which time we will have access to the CCMH and CCAPS data to establish student wellness benchmarks.</p> <p><u>Indicator for IE Projects Facilitating Assessment Planning:</u> Effective engagement of the functions in the assessment process Target and Benchmark: The benchmark/ target for completed plans will be 90% for each cycle. This number is drawn from the mid-cycle numbers in the first year of Function Assessment and will be updated as more cycle and trend information becomes available. B. The benchmark/ target for on-time plans will be 85% for each cycle. This number is drawn from the mid-cycle numbers in the first year of Function Assessment and will be updated as more cycle and trend information becomes available.</p> <p><u>Indicator for Facilities Management:</u> Preventative Maintenance (PM)/Repair practices on all equipment, systems and facilities. Target and Benchmark: Using work order management system SchoolDude tacker, complete 85% of assigned preventative maintenance items in the first 3 Weeks completing 100% within the month.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>Indicator for IR Operational Reporting: Timely delivery of operational and external reports with a high level of accuracy, scheduling them for auto-delivery when available to improve delivery reliability.</p> <p>Target and Benchmark: Fewer late reports indicate higher performance. Conduct a pilot study of our archived data and, perhaps, other offices' data to determine a benchmark and norm our performance from those indicators.</p>																							
<p>5R2 Comparison of results with internal targets & external benchmarks / reacting—VPAF & AVPIE</p> <p>Explicit benchmarks are not available but implicit benchmarks provide guidance about effectiveness. For example, work order completion exceeded the goal of 90%, although the time frame for that assessment was not offered. Completion time for projects met target values (i.e., 75% in seven days, 100% within 30 days). The College is still identifying internal targets in other areas through the functional unit assessment process. LCCC is encouraged to complete the process of target identification and seek out additional appropriate external benchmarks. No information is available against which to judge academic performance; however, the college reports that new systems are being brought on line to provide information for that purpose.</p>		KB																					
<p>Response Narrative:</p> <p>The College President Joe Schaffer oversaw a thorough re-evaluation of the institution's function assessment during spring 2019. He led 15 meetings with all functional area leaders and emphasized developing a more valid context for planning that focused on developing more focused purpose statements, higher impact indicators, and firm targets that included either internal or external benchmarks. About 130 function plans were redesigned to offer these new planning contexts during May 2019. They will be peer-reviewed later in the summer. The emphasis placed on developing benchmarks was based on the rationale for functions to prove that their targets were valid according to external performance or based on time trend data performance of the function, which is tied to some quality-based characteristics.</p>																							
<p>5R2 Interpretation results and insights gained / reacting-systematic—VPAF</p> <p>LCCC observes that "most resource management processes are working well and meeting College expectations." It is unclear if adequate information has been accrued to support this observation. Data collection strategies are young and data available are limited. Interpreting the results of budget process results, the College identified the critical importance of stakeholder feedback processes and department-level budget management tools. With an increased focus on fully spending budgetary allocations, physical infrastructure projects are being completed at a faster rate than planned. Recognizing the importance of internal and external collaboration is essential and the example provided of the statewide adoption of Canvas is helpful and should spur the College to seek out further collaborative relationships. (3)</p>		KB																					
<p>Response Narrative:</p> <p>KB: Bring visibility to the Administration and Finance institution-wide survey administered in spring 2017 and 2018. The survey asked College employees to rate performance related to timeliness, professionalism, knowledge/expertise, and satisfaction with function processes for 15 A & F functions. Ratings ranged from 80 to 95% satisfied/very satisfied for the number of respondents ranging from 60 to 77 on items.</p> <p>In addition, ITS provided the below data in 5R1 to support</p> <p>Table 5R1a-1-ITS-HELP Desk Completed Tickets</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="99 1745 1008 1917"> <thead> <tr> <th>Fiscal Year</th> <th>Total # of Tickets</th> <th>Closed within 5 Days</th> <th>% Complete within 5 Days</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013-2014</td> <td>4074</td> <td>3280</td> <td>80.51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-2015</td> <td>4537</td> <td>3755</td> <td>82.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-2016</td> <td>5469</td> <td>4695</td> <td>85.85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Three-year Avg (2013-2016)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>83.04%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Fiscal Year	Total # of Tickets	Closed within 5 Days	% Complete within 5 Days	2013-2014	4074	3280	80.51%	2014-2015	4537	3755	82.76%	2015-2016	5469	4695	85.85%	Three-year Avg (2013-2016)			83.04%			
Fiscal Year	Total # of Tickets	Closed within 5 Days	% Complete within 5 Days																				
2013-2014	4074	3280	80.51%																				
2014-2015	4537	3755	82.76%																				
2015-2016	5469	4695	85.85%																				
Three-year Avg (2013-2016)			83.04%																				

<p>The Systems Portfolio also offered an A & F table displaying all maintenance projects, building projects and ITS technology projects completed on time and in many cases under budget. While there is no client satisfaction feedback on these resources, some expectations were being met.</p> <p>However, the College realizes more evaluation resources must be put in place to create capacity for drawing insights for strengthening performance. The institution recently revised all of its 130 function assessment plans to include more valid measures and benchmarks (May 2019) that promise to produce much more high-impact data, including client perceptions of satisfaction, that will significantly expand information that function area staff members can use to form interpretations and develop insights into how to strengthen resource performance. Data gathering for functions is scheduled for fall 2019 and function staff analysis of these data along with conclusions about what processes need strengthening is scheduled for early spring 2020.</p>			
<p>SUMMARY OF CATEGORY FIVE – KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP The College is encouraged to establish internal targets where needed to measure effectiveness of the processes and provide indicators of how well the College’s processes are helping them meet the identified KPIs. With continued work and the improvements planned, processes under this Category will quickly mature, and more forward-looking decisions will become possible.</p>			
<p>VI - Quality Overview</p>			
<p>SUMMARY OF CATEGORY SIX – QUALITY OVERVIEW The College is encouraged to continue making the same type of substantive changes that brought them to this point as doing so will keep them on a successful CQI path. (0)</p>			
<p>Total portfolio items = 212 (C1=50 / C2=51 / C3=29 / C4=41 / C5=27 / C6=14) Total reacting or reacting-systematic = 31 for 15% reacting rating items 17 of 31 reacting items or 55% were from the R section 2014 Appraisal Feedback Report contained 94 reacting rating items. The 2018 Appraisal contained one-third this amount with 31.</p>			

Appendix F

Assessment Rubric for Essential Student Experiences

The Three Experiences a student will achieve:

1. Collaboration: Students must work in a group setting with at least 2 other group members to achieve a common goal within a project.
2. Immersion: Students will apply knowledge, through interaction and engagement with a culture or community outside of their own that they have had little to no prior experience resulting in a transformative experience.
3. Synthesis and Application: Students identify and transfer their skills learned in academic, collaborative, and immersive experiences to work toward their desired professional and personal goals to become a more informed and interconnected global citizen.

Different types of Assessments for each Experience: The assessment will be described on a pre-approval form. A checklist with the following assessments will be listed. There will be an “other” box on the form for those assessments not listed.

Collaboration:

1. observation, report, presentation or reflection on a curriculum-based or community-based group assignment

Immersion:

1. observation, report, presentation or reflection on a curriculum-based or community-based assignment

Synthesis and Application:

1. observation, report, presentation or reflection on a curriculum-based or community-based assignment

Collaboration Competency

Traits/Criteria	Exemplary – 4	Proficient – 3	Developing – 2	Unsatisfactory – 1	Score
Teamwork	Student took an effective leadership role in a team setting in which they demonstrated to have actively contributed to a project working with other team members.	Student actively worked in a team setting in which they demonstrated to have contributed to a project working with other team members.	Student worked in a team setting in which they demonstrated to have occasionally contributed to a project working with other team members.	Student did not work in a team setting and did not demonstrate to have contributed to a project working with other team members.	
Negotiation	Student took an active leadership role and demonstrated effective communication between group members to implement strategies from each group member and exhibited compromise when it came to group ideas.	Student demonstrated effective communication between group members to implement strategies from each group member and exhibited compromise when it came to group ideas.	Student demonstrated occasional effective communication between group members to implement strategies from each group member and exhibited compromise when it came to group ideas.	Student did not demonstrate effective communication between group members to implement strategies from each group member.	
Conflict Management	Student took an effective leadership role and exhibited the ability and commitment to collaborate with others within a project and navigated through conflicting ideas or strategies in order to achieve a common goal of producing a quality end product.	Student exhibited the ability and commitment to collaborate with others within a project and navigated through conflicting ideas or strategies in order to achieve a common goal of producing a quality end product.	Student exhibited the ability and commitment to collaborate with others within a project and occasionally navigated through conflicting ideas or strategies in order to achieve a common goal of producing a quality end product.	Student did not exhibit the ability and commitment to collaborate with others within a project.	

Civil Discourse	Student took an effective leadership role in treating other group members respectfully and was constructive in their communication with others by using positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and body language to convey positive attitudes about the group and its work.	Student demonstrated treating other group members respectfully and was constructive in their communication with others by using positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and body language to convey positive attitudes about the group and its work.	Student demonstrated treating other group members respectfully and was constructive in their communication with others by occasionally using positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and body language to convey positive attitudes about the group and its work.	Student did not treat other group members respectfully and was not constructive in their communication with others.	
Emotional Intelligence	Student took a leadership role to motivate other group members in a positive manner by showing empathy and expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish their goal.	Student showed they were able to motivate other group members in a positive manner by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish their goal.	Student showed they were able to occasionally motivate other group members in a positive manner by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish their goal.	Student did not motivate other group members in a positive manner and did not express confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish their goal.	

Immersion Competency

Traits/Criteria	Exemplary – 4	Proficient – 3	Developing – 2	Unsatisfactory – 1	Score
Relation to Self	Student demonstrated an exceptional understanding of valuing a different culture or community in relation to their own through thoughtful and critical reflection.	Student demonstrated an adequate understanding of a different culture or community in relation to their own through thoughtful and critical reflection.	Student demonstrated a developing understanding of a different culture or community in relation to their own through thoughtful and critical reflection.	Student did not complete a thoughtful and critical reflection.	
Active Listening	Student exemplified active listening to members of different cultures and communities.	Student demonstrated proficient active listening to members of different cultures and communities.	Student demonstrated developing active listening skills to members of different cultures and communities.	Student did not practice active listening to members of different cultures and communities.	

Social Awareness	Student demonstrated an exceptional understanding of social justice issues impacting the community they immersed in and identified their role on awareness and potential actions within the social issue.	Student demonstrated a proficient understanding of social justice issues impacting the community they immersed in and identified their role on awareness and potential actions within the social issue.	Student demonstrated a developing understanding of social justice issues impacting the community they are immersed in and identified their role on awareness and potential actions within the social issue.	Student did not demonstrate an understanding of social justice issues impacting the community they immersed themselves in.	
Perspective	Student effectively demonstrated their own perspectives were challenged because of the experience and discussed in depth how the experience impacted their own personal perspective and influenced others.	Student demonstrated their own perspectives were challenged because of the experience and adequately discussed how the experience impacted their own personal perspective.	Student demonstrated their own perspectives were challenged because of the experience and communicated a developing understanding of how the experience has impacted their own personal perspectives and experiences.	Student did not demonstrate their own perspectives were challenged as a result of the experience.	
Social Capital/Impact on Community	Student demonstrated how social capital plays a role within the community and how their actions had a transformative effect on others including the community and team members.	Student demonstrated how social capital plays a role within the community they immersed in and how their actions had a positive impact on others including the community and team members.	Student demonstrated how social capital plays a role within the community they immersed in and has a developing understanding of how they impacted others in the community.	Student did not demonstrate how social capital plays a role within the community they immersed themselves in.	

Synthesis and Application Competency

Traits/Criteria	Exemplary – 4	Proficient – 3	Developing – 2	Unsatisfactory – 1	Score
Goal Setting	Student articulated personal skills gained from their essential student experience and offered detailed evidence or examples on their relation (how they affect) to personal and professional goals.	Student articulated personal skills gained from their essential student experience and offered some evidence or examples on their relation (how they affect) to personal and professional goals.	Student articulates personal skills gained from their essential student experience and offered little evidence that may influence their personal and professional goals.	Student did not articulate personal skills gained from their essential student experience.	
Strengths and Weaknesses	Student articulated their strengths and weaknesses in relation to personal and professional goals with detailed evidence and examples.	Student articulated their strengths and weaknesses in relation to personal and professional goals with some detail and some examples.	Student articulated their strengths and weaknesses in relation to personal and professional goals with little detail and little examples.	Student did not articulate their strengths and weaknesses in relation to personal and professional goals.	
Self-Advocacy	Student demonstrated self-advocacy and was able to persuasively advocate for their selves through the skills learned within their essential student experiences.	Student demonstrated self-advocacy through the skills learned within their essential student experiences.	Student demonstrated self-advocacy and was able to express thoughts and ideas that indicate a developing understanding of skills learned within their essential student experiences.	Student did not demonstrate self-advocacy through their essential student experiences.	
Critical Thinking	Student demonstrated they applied a thorough process of critical thinking to their personal and professional goals by applying skills they learned in the essential student experiences and effectively explained how they used these skills to problem solve.	Student applied critical thinking to personal and professional goals by applying skills they learned in the essential student experiences and explained how they used these skills to problem solve.	Student demonstrated a developing process of critical thinking to personal and professional goals by applying skills they learned in the essential student experiences and provided a developing explanation of how they used these skills to problem solve.	Student did not apply critical thinking to personal and professional goals and did not explain how they used these skills to problem solve.	

Global Citizen	Student effectively articulated how their essential student experiences have broadened their perspective and how this can be applied to their professional and personal lives beyond LCCC with clear examples of such growth.	Students articulated how their essential student experiences has broadened their perspectives and how this can be applied to their professional and personal lives beyond LCCC.	Student attempted to articulate in developing terms how their essential student experiences has broadened their perspective and attempted to express how this can be applied to their professional and personal lives beyond LCCC.	Student did not articulate how their essential student experiences has broadened their perspectives.	
----------------	---	---	--	--	--

Appendix G

Guided Pathways 2.0 Project Management Monitoring Table

Milestone Target Date	Team Name	Milestone Description	Progress/Status
1/31/2019	Eagles' Academies	Academy Name and Program groupings finalized: Potential program groupings will meet through Oct.-Nov. to discuss and agree upon feasibility of each academy grouping. Finalized academy groupings will then be sent to ALT, LLT, President's Cabinet, and the Board of Trustees for approval. Completed 1/23/19	Complete
2/15/2019	Competencies	Glossary of Terms and Assessment Framework: The team will compile a list of relevant terms, consult the literature, and thus define these terms in a glossary. New milestone date moved from 12/13/18 to 2/15/19.	Complete
3/31/2019	Entry Process	New intake/ enrollment process developed: A new intake/enrollment process will be developed that will streamline the process for students. This process will become focused on the relationship and not the transactions. Completed 5/31/19	Complete
3/31/2019	Gen Ed 2.0	General Education Procedure (Procedure 2.2P) approved by Academic Standards Committee: With changes being made to the way LCCC approaches general education (Procedure 2.2P), the Academic Standards Committee approval will demonstrate that those changes align with the mission of the institution by serving our students. Completed 3/31/19	Complete
4/30/2019	Gen Ed 2.0	General Education Procedure (Procedure 2.2P) approved by College Council & President's Cabinet: College Council and Cabinet will further vet the changes to LCCC's approach to general education by having it reviewed by non-faculty, institution-wide bodies. Approval at these levels will ensure that stakeholders across the college have an opportunity to shape the procedure. Completed 4/30/2019	Complete
5/1/2019	Entry Process	New Admissions process and procedure. Completed 5/1/19	Complete
5/31/2019	Co-Req Math and English	Math gateway courses identified and created in a requisite model: The team will survey faculty to identify the Math competencies required in each degree program. Based on that information, the team will create 2-4 gateway Math courses. Each of the gateway math courses will have a corresponding Co-Requisite course to provide needed academic support to help students be successful in the gateway course. This will include creating the course MCORs including competencies, course content, and assessments.	Complete

5/31/2019	Competencies	Competency and trait portion of manual and process for training: The team will identify the steps required to create course and program competencies and traits, compose this manual, and use this manual to generate competencies and traits. This manual will not only include a guide, but also key terms, important flow charts, and other elements necessary to guide a successful competency and trait process. Completed 5/31/19	Complete
6/30/2019	Entry Process	Career exploration solution identified: Students need to have career exploration available to them before and during the application process. Solutions to this include working with K-12 and industry partners as well as technology to provide career exploration when a student applies. Completed 6/30/19 with the selection of EMSI.	Complete
7/17/2019	Advising	Advising model finalized: The advising model will have undergone an extensive campus vetting process that included students, student affairs, and faculty. It will include the charter must-haves. New milestone date moved from 3/31/19 to 5/31/19. Completed 7/17/19.	Complete
7/30/2019	Gen Ed 2.0	MCORs of key general education courses submitted to ASC: High-enrollment General Education courses will serve as the first wave of courses to be aligned with the revised General Education procedure. The MCORs for those courses will be revised and submitted to ASC for approval. Completed 7/30/2019	Complete
7/31/2019	Eagles' Academies	In conjunction with Program Maps, draft the Pathways/Academy degrees. Completed 7/31/19	Complete
7/31/2019	Program Maps	In conjunction with Eagles' Academies, draft the Pathways/Academy degrees. Completed 7/31/19	Complete
7/31/2019	Gen Ed 2.0	General Education MCORs to ASC for approval: One of the best practices for revising General Education is to ensure that it is not done half measure. This milestone will ensure that any course that is to be part of the revised curriculum is updated, so it can be included in the Fall 2020 semester. Completed 7/31/2019	Complete
8/10/2019	Competencies	Assessment framework proposed to ALT and revised: The team will create an assessment framework to evaluate course and program competencies and assessments, vet this framework through ALT, then revise it accordingly. Completed 8/10/19	Complete
8/16/2019	Competencies	Completion of faculty in-service where program competencies and traits are mapped in pathway degrees and discrete degrees.	Complete
8/16/2019	Entry Process	Final Program decisions for 20/21 academic year needed for Colleague/Recruit. To be used for recruitment/application for	Complete

		admissions, which open September 2019. Moved Milestone from 4/30/19 to 8/16/19.	
8/20/2019	Entry Process	Transition year for FA 2019 students: restructure Orientation/Plan The Day Before	Complete
8/20/2019	Entry Process	Update admissions application for fall 2020 to include pathways/programs/career coach	In process (will be complete by 9/1/19)
8/31/2019	Entry Process	Identify career exploration opportunities within the COLS curriculum	In process
8/31/2019	Entry Process	Recruitment materials printed for Fall 2020 students	Complete
8/31/2019	Program Maps	Training on program map templates: Program Maps Co-Leads and Charter team members will visit school meetings and individual academic departments to train the faculty on how to fill out the program map template. Training will include suggestions (guided by Gen ed adoptions and Eagle's Academies recommendations) on course sequencing, inclusion of milestones (guided by Competencies and Experiences), and the incorporation of career and transfer information.	Complete

Appendix H

Public Relations Campaign Prioritization Rubric

Campaign:							
A. Mission Alignment							
<p>How does your campaign align with the mission of LCCC? The areas of the mission include a. Academic Preparation b. Transfer preparation c. Workforce Development and d. Community Development (campaigns may align with more than one area). For more information visit http://www.lccc.wy.edu/StrategicPlan</p>							
Criteria Definitions	10 points	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points	Score
	Aligns significantly with all four areas of the mission	Has alignment with all four areas of the mission	Significantly aligns with 2-3 areas of the mission		Aligns with 1-2 areas of the mission	Does not align with the mission	0
Comments							
B. Recruitment/Retention							
<p>Does your campaign support recruitment and/or retention of students at LCCC? If so, please explain the direct connection and impact. (Recruitment and/ or retention does not have to relate only to traditional and non-traditional students, this could include activities that expose youth to LCCC, i.e. SEEK, LIFE classes, athletics, cultural events, etc.)</p>							
Criteria Definitions	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points	Score
	Campaign shows significant connection to recruitment/ retention activities	Campaign may lead to recruitment/ retention of students		Campaign has minimal opportunity to impact recruitment/ retention		Campaign will not impact recruitment/ retention	0
Comments							

C. Revenue Generation							
<p>Does your campaign provide revenue generating opportunities for LCCC? If so, please explain these opportunities and who is benefiting from the revenue. if so please explain these opportunities and who is benefiting from the revenue. (Revenue generating, may be in the form of donor relations, ticket sales, donations, scholarship support, etc.)</p>							
Criteria Definitions	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points	Score
	Campaign will have a significant impact on revenue generating opportunities for LCCC	Campaign may lead to revenue generating opportunities for LCCC		Campaign has minimal opportunity to provide revenue generating opportunities for LCCC;		Campaign will not lead to revenue generating opportunities for LCCC	0
Comments							
D. Stakeholder Engagement							
<p>How will your campaign create an opportunity for stakeholder engagement and what is the anticipated engagement capacity resulting from your campaign? (Stakeholders can be from the College, Community or a specific service/academic area. Capacity represents that number of people that will engage with LCCC as a result of the campaign, if an exact number can't be provided an educated estimate is appropriate.)</p>							
Criteria Definitions	10 points	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points	Score
	Campaign will provide significant stakeholder engagement with LCCC	Campaign may provide stakeholder engagement with LCCC		Campaign has minimal opportunity for stakeholder engagement with LCCC		Campaign provides no opportunity for stakeholder engagement with LCCC	0
Comments							

Appendix I

Public Relations Campaigns for 2020

Project Title	Division	Contact	Average Total Score	Estimated Scope	New	Refresh
				0-5		
Scholarship Luncheon	Foundation	Melissa Dishman	27.5	4	x	
Shawn Dubie Memorial Rodeo	Athletics	Cindy Henning	27	4	x	
Lariats-n-Lace	Foundation	Lisa Murphy	25.5	4	x	
STEM (Pathways) Days	Admissions	Sarah Hannes	23.5	5	x	
Athletics Promotions (roundball)	Athletics	Cindy Henning	22.5	5	x	
Cultural Series Events #1 - 3	Foundation	Lisa Murphy	19.5	3	x	
Employee Giving	Foundation	Melissa Dishman	17.5	3	x	
e-Sports	Athletics	Cindy Henning	16.5	4	x	
Fall Theatre Production	Theatre	Jason Pasqua	16.5	3	x	
Spring Theatre Production	Theatre	Jason Pasqua	16.5	3	x	
Annual Appeal	Foundation	Melissa Dishman	16	2	x	
Recruitment Package**	Music	Beth Kean	16	4	x	
Study Abroad Program	A&H	Juan Antonio Bernabeu	16	2		x
Student Honors Recital	Music	Beth Kean	15	3	x	
Employee Recognition Reception	Human Resources	Tammy Maas	14.5	4	x	
RAC Promotion	Recreation	Cindy Henning	14.5	5	x	
Recruitment Package**	Theatre	Jason Pasqua	14.5	4	x	

Project Title	Division	Contact	Average Total Score		Estimated Scope	New	Refresh
					0-5		
High Plains Register Publication	English	Kristen Abraham	14		1	x	
Faculty Recitals	Music	Beth Kean	13		3	x	
Fall Concert -Instrumental	Music	Frank Cook	13		3	x	
Fall Concert -Vocal	Music	Beth Kean	13		3	x	
Finale Concert -Instrumental	Music	Frank Cook	13		3	x	
Finale Concert -Vocal	Music	Beth Kean	13		3	x	
Holiday Concert -Instrumental	Music	Frank Cook	13		3	x	
Holiday Concert -Vocal	Music	Beth Kean	13		3	x	
Spring Concert -Instrumental	Music	Frank Cook	13		3	x	
Spring Concert -Vocal	Music	Beth Kean	13		3	x	
Employee Benefits Fair	Human Resources	Tammy Maas	11		2	x	
HPR Open Mic	English	Kristen Abraham	11		2	x	