1. CALL TO ORDER – Board Chairman Carol Merrell

Board Chairman Carol Merrell called to order the June 2, 2017, Board Retreat at 8:30 a.m.

Vice President of Academic Affairs Clark Harris introduced himself and shared his educational background and some personal information about his family.

2. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. Board/CEO Expectations – Roles and Responsibilities Exercise – Board Chairman Carol Merrell, President Joe Schaffer

The “Roles and Responsibilities” of the Board and the President are recorded as written on the whiteboard during discussion.

The following were identified as “Roles and Responsibilities” of the President.

- honest
- leadership
- forward-thinking
- commitment to student success
- transparent keep Board informed about issues
- advocate for LCCC and education
- communication – heads up on issues – listening to faculty and staff to resolve problems – no surprises
- eat and sleep the mission of the College
- balanced budget
- bleed blue and gold blood for LCCC
- no partiality of trustees – unity in direction
- data-driven, utilizes the evidence of culture, evidence-informed and people-oriented
- continue to represent the College in the community, the State, and nationally
- strategic planning engagement
- mutual respect and trust

Tara suggested the trustees consider other holistic aspects that address whether the President’s needs are being met, such as a balanced work life; i.e., are the trustees supporting the President in a way that encourages him to fulfill his mission. The Board needs a barometer for determining the President’s satisfaction.
The following were identified as “Roles and Responsibilities” of the Board.

- open, honest feedback on his [President’s] performance
- give him [President] cover so he can do the hard work he needs to do
- represent your constituencies (you are elected to represent the community – being a conduit to the community)
- be invested and committed
- support his [President’s] decisions regarding his team – hard because we [trustees] develop relationships with people
- individual relationships and ability to interact socially with the Board
- guidance
- support
- allow the President to run the College on a day-to-day basis – be mindful of the trustees role – they [trustees] are not the President
- work together for a common goal
- active engagement in meetings and in the community
- speaking in one voice after a vote is taken – support Board decisions
- use the chain of command between the President and the College staff – refer complaints to the President or their supervisor
- do not ask for special favors from the President

The Board and the President concluded the exercise was valuable.

B. Student Success: Completion Goal Tracking – President Joe Schaffer

President Schaffer provided data that showed progress is being made in the College’s graduation (completion) rates but not as fast as he would like. The rates have been as low as 11.70 in 2012 and as high as 23.70 in 2015 (2015 is the end-year of the range of the data available). The rates have likely climbed again in 2016, and the College’s rates are no longer the lowest in the State. When transfer rates are added, the graduation/completion rates significantly jump. The goal is to reach 36% higher within the next four years. The Board set a goal beginning with academic year 2012-13 of increasing completions by 5% each year through the year 2022. The completions rose as high as 857 in 2014-15 and then began a gradual decline to 724 in 2016-17, which is still higher than the 698 completions in 2012-13. The dramatic increase in 2013-24 and 2014-15 is believed to be due to a backlog of students completing their degrees during this timeframe after having been enrolled at the College for some time. President Schaffer emphasized the goal, although realistic, is going to be tough to reach, especially when the goal is 1,111 students graduating in the year 2022.

President Schaffer noted enrollment impacts completion rates and pointed out that the increase and decrease in Wyoming’s community college enrollments from 2005-06 through 2014-15 mirrors that of the College’s. He also observed that the marked increase in enrollments coincides with the recession years. The question is what impact enrollment is having on the number of credentials. Speaking to credential productivity, President Schaffer stated that in any one year, the College should have a certain proportion of graduating students. Given that students take three years (the new standard) to complete their graduation requirements at a community college, then one-third (30%) of those students should be completing every year. In 2013, for every 100 FTE, only 17% of students completed–way lower than the one-third (30%) rate. The completion rate has been as high as 24% in 2014-15, dropping to 21.9% in 2016-17. Although the completion rate is not at the preferred 30%, the productivity rate has been fairly stable, even during periods of enrollment decline. Three metrics should be used to evaluate student
success rates—degree and certificate production, graduation rates, and credential productivity rates. Trustee Erickson asked that “down the road” the Board discuss a more reasonable goal other than the 5% for student completions taking into consideration the three metrics noted above. President Schaffer noted the University chose a 2% completion rate and that the 5% is likely a “stretch goal.” He suggested the Board hold that conversation in September when he brings forward his Institutional Effectiveness Report, which will give an overall perspective on all of the College’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). He added the workforce degree productivity (completions) has improved substantially in contrast to the low number of transfer-oriented student completions.

President Schaffer concluded his comments stating nearly every Commission agenda has a 15-page enrollment report but no completions’ report. He suggested that since the community colleges are performance-based funded, showing the number of completions that show performance outcomes would be a motivator.

C. Compensation and Classification Study Update – President Joe Schaffer

In 2015, the Board determined an examination of the College’s compensation model was a needed priority. The model made sense at the time of its development. However, its use of professional salary bands, a faculty step and grade table, and a classified step and grade table is not manageable or market driven. An employee’s salary is based on experience and educational advancement. The system can also create compression of salaries, where a new employee’s beginning salary is higher than that of a long-term employee. In answer to this, a draft Compensation Policy was presented during their October 7, 2015, Board Meeting. That policy stated the Board believes compensation at LCCC should be:

- Externally competitive – Salary alignment with the market
- Internally equitable – Job alignment within job family and College-wide
- Readily updated – Market sources and data available
- Easily understood – Non-complex system
- Fiscally responsible – Equitable salary adjustments within established budget

In order to fully address the College’s compensation system, an external consultant Evergreen Solutions, LLC, was hired through a bidding process to perform a compensation and classification study for the College. Their task was to conduct the study to ensure: 1) each employee’s position classification reflects its duties and responsibilities and 2) the salary range assignment is internally equitable and competitive within the College’s employment markets. The study began on September 12, 2016, with an employee orientation and outreach session and included the following deliverables:

- Titling and Hierarch
- Classification System
- Position Descriptions
- Salary and Wages
- Implementation

During the retreat discussion, the Board expressed interest in the College being the employer of choice, compensation being fair, a systematic process being established for determining and maintaining appropriate compensation, and salaries and wages being competitive within the range of defined job markets. Points of discussion and information focused on:

- What makes Laramie County Community College the employer of choice?
- What salary/wage range should be established as the minimum?
• How will new hires be placed into the system? Evergreen provided three options that evaluate candidates regarding prior experience and meeting minimum qualifications for the job.
• How will the College’s current employees progress through the pay bands over time? Evergreen recommended the following three progression tools be used and that the current classifications of administrator, faculty, classified and professional staff also include one for managerial.
  o Structural: (Cost of Living Adjustments) based on a verifiable index
  o Classification: based on market analysis, ability to recruit, and competition for these positions (and complexity of job)
  o Individual: based on a performance management system.
• The minimum salary at which an employee would be hired.
  o The proposed Compensation System includes tables of salary bands for Classified Staff, Professional Staff, Managerial Staff, Administrators, and Faculty along with levels, grades, and minimum, midpoint, and maximum salaries for each of these categories.

Additional information shared during the extended conversation included:

• No current employee will experience any decrease in salary. Evergreen is recommending any salary below minimum to the minimum of their respective salary band. That adjustment would cost the College approximately $500,000. To bring those same salaries to a midpoint, the cost would be $3 million. The adjustment costs would not be budget neutral.
• Based on the proposed salary bands, there are some employee salaries below market value in every classification.
• State employees are hired at the midpoint or higher.
• College and University Professional Association for Human Resources’ (CUPA-HR) data was used to determine faculty salaries. CUPA-HR annually performs a nationwide sample that is a nationally accepted model. Evergreen’s classifications are the same as CUPA-HR’s. President Schaffer noted the source information will be included in Evergreen’s report. In addition to the national data set, data from surveys of Wyoming’s community colleges and the University were also attained. The survey for classified and professional staff salaries will be expanded to include data from Colorado, Utah, and Nebraska.
• Evergreen recommended the proposed system be updated with new data every three years.
• LCCC candidate pools include employees whose current salaries are at the midpoint range of the position for which they are applying.
• New hires should be provided with the cost of the College’s benefits as part of the total salary compensation package.
• A recommendation for funding the new salary priorities is needed. The College may be committed to funding these changes out of institutional dollars when no State dollars are allocated. If the College does this, the Legislature may decide to not include the College (or community colleges) in a State pay plan when one is funded.
• Is experience relevant and valuable to the institution? If so, how would that be demonstrated? The relevancy of degrees is another consideration. Longevity does not necessarily equate to effectiveness.
• What criteria will be used to move employees on their respective salary bands?
  o Inflationary, Cost of Living Adjustments based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI)
  o Market Analysis, longevity, activity, performance? If the College were to commit to a longevity-based increase, that increase would have to take place each year. If performance-based, the competency based-model that is in production will provide the parameters for performance increases.
• The Board should determine if changes to the Compensation Policy draft need to be made.
• The Board generally agreed that based on the information provided, an employee’s minimum starting salary/wage should fall in the median salary/wage for that employee’s specific job market.
D.  **Building Forward v2 – Projects and Campaign – President Joe Schaffer**

President Schaffer is working on supporting materials for the Building Forward v2 project and will bring these to the Board during another meeting.

3.  **CEO EVALUATION PROCESS** – Board Chairman Carol Merrell, President Joe Schaffer

Trustee Ketcham asked if the President’s evaluation could be done later in the year. Board Chairman Merrell stated President Schaffer’s contract stipulates his evaluation be performed before the end of the fiscal year. Counsel Tara Nethercott believed the evaluation could be done at the Board’s discretion, noting doing so within the fiscal year would be best. President Schaffer’s contract is in its second year of a three-year contract and could be amended if the Board wished to do so.

President Schaffer’s performance evaluation will be distributed electronically by end of business Monday, June 5th; completed evaluations are due by end of business Friday, June 16th.

President Schaffer stated a recommendation for the designation of an emeritus faculty will be brought forward on June 28th.

4.  **APPROVAL ITEM**

A.  **Authorization to Expend Unanticipated Perkins Funds** – President Joe Schaffer, Sponsored Awards and Compliance Director Victoria Steel

President Schaffer explained that because the federal government determined Perkins funds were not being allocated correctly, some colleges lost funds and others gained funds. LCCC is among those who received additional funds. Perkins funds must be spent by June 30th. The funds will not roll over. If they are not spent, they will revert back to the State. Firm estimates are pending for purchases to be made in accordance with Perkins regulations.

Trustee Soto moved and Trustee Ketcham seconded,

**MOTION:** That the Board of Trustees approves the expenditure of up to $120,000 in remaining FY17 Perkins Grant Funds for items as proposed in the memorandum that may exceed the spending authority threshold of $60,000.

**DISCUSSION:** None

**MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

5.  **PUBLIC COMMENT** (Public comment may be made on anything not on the agenda. Comments may be limited to five minutes) – Board Chairman Carol Merrell

None

6.  **ADJOURNMENT** – Board Chairman Carol Merrell

Trustee Erickson moved and Trustee Soto seconded.

**MOTION:** That the Board of Trustees adjourns the June 2, 2017, Board Retreat.
MOTION CARRIED unanimously, and Board Chairman Carol Merrell adjourned the June 2, 2017, Board Retreat at 11:30 a.m. as so moved.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Boreing
Board Recording Secretary