Madison Area Technical College
2016 AQIP Systems Portfolio Addendum

OVERVIEW

In response to the *2013 Systems Portfolio* of Madison Area Technical College (henceforth, the College), Higher Learning Commission reviewers identified opportunities for significant improvement in the following categories: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9. This addendum to the *2013 Systems Portfolio* reviews efforts the College has made to improve upon these opportunities. This report also provides information reviewers identified as not existing or related to the aforementioned categories and components 2C, 2D, and 2E of Core Criterion 2.

CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

1P17 – Determining that students have met learning and development expectations.
The College hired a full-time curriculum specialist in 2014 to lead the College's efforts to create new processes to assess whether students have met College-wide student learning objectives and learning and development expectations associated with the student's specific program.

The curriculum specialist created a [video](#) that presents a brief overview of the College's work prior to 2014 regarding assessment of student learning and provides a general overview of the process that was engaged beginning in 2015 to address the issue of assessing student learning.

Identifying common student learning objectives – As referenced in the *2013 Systems Portfolio*, during 2013 the College was updating its 2007 academic plan. This update included a review of the then titled eight "Core Abilities" related to common student learning objectives that were established in 1994.

To conduct this update, the College surveyed its program advisory board members (every program is required to have such a board) regarding the existing eight Core Abilities and their currency or appropriateness.[1] Over 350 individuals in 28 industries participated in the survey (an industry may be associated with multiple programs). The employers confirmed that these Core Abilities were still of great importance to the success of the employees they hire; a high-degree of proficiency in technical skills alone is not sufficient to an employee's success in the workplace, according to the respondents. The College's survey results were in-line with other national surveys examining the skills and knowledge employers desired in employees. See the [academic plan](#) for more details.

---

[1] The Core Abilities are: communication, critical thinking, self-management, social interaction, ethics, science and technology, mathematics, and global and cultural perspectives.

The College survey of its program advisory board members asked respondents to identify the amount of importance employers placed on each of the Core Abilities and their perception regarding the degree to which employees exhibited these competencies. From the survey, the College identified gaps between those competencies that employers valued the greatest, but which employees demonstrated the least amount of competence.[2] As part of this work, the College renamed Core Abilities as "Core Workforce Skills" to strengthen the internal focus on these skills being critical to the success of graduates in the workplace.

With an understanding of where gaps between performance and value of a skill existed, the College set about a process to determine how to assess these skills. Volunteer faculty members from across the College participated in workgroups that developed boundaries to articulate in a more granular fashion the desired skill to be obtained and how to assess the skill. The assessment rubric was tested repeatedly by faculty from multiple disciplines and adjusted. In fall 2015, participation in this assessment project was offered to more than 400 faculty members representing each school at the College providing degree credit programs. At this point, the participation of faculty is voluntary. The goal for spring 2016 is to confirm the effectiveness of the rubric, the ease of the data and artifact submission process, and assess how results are processed, prior to sending the all-faculty invitation for assessment participation in fall 2016.

Identifying program learning objectives – The curriculum consultant set as an initial project goal to analyze the currency and validity of existing program learning objectives. The consultant coordinated efforts with faculty, program directors, program advisory boards, and industry representatives to verify that learning objectives both aligned with the needs of industry and business and met state-wide curriculum standards, program accreditation standards, and transfer agreements. In 2014-15, 34 programs went through this process.

The objectives were selected according to performance-based design standards that answered the question: What skills need to be assessed? After skills were drafted by faculty, local industry representatives and program advisory boards determined if they matched expectations for the given occupation. Program faculty members then developed a crosswalk identifying where program learning objectives would be covered and assessed in each program course. A central repository was created for deans and faculty; it indicates what step in the assessment cycle a program is at and contains links to industry feedback, crosswalks, and rubrics. The College website and related program materials continue to be updated as the process unfolds.

---

[2] The Core Workforce Skills with the largest gaps were: self-management, critical thinking, social interaction, communication (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), and ethics.

1R2 – Performance results for common student learning and development objectives.

In fall 2015, 47 faculty members out of 400 that were invited, volunteered to assess whether students met, did not meet, or were not assessed on the various Core Workforce Skills[3]. Using a universal rubric, faculty selected a course and assignment, rated student demonstration of the skills, and submitted the results to the curriculum specialist. The process will be repeated annually with invitations going out to all faculty, rather than a subset as was done initially.

To support faculty with addressing identified skills gaps, a toolkit will be created to support new approaches in developing student performance related to the common learning objectives. In the future, the College will solicit program advisory board members to assess whether gaps between the perceived importance of a competency and the possession of the competency have improved and to identify any new emerging skills that employers believe employees should possess.

1R3 – Performance results for specific programs learning objectives.

In 2014-15, 34 programs (including less than one-year credentials, one- and two-year diplomas, and two-year degrees) validated their program learning objectives with industry and then identified specific courses where assessment of the learning objectives would occur. Starting in fall 2015, each semester faculty members will use the existing student information system (PeopleSoft) to record whether students are or are not meeting the program learning objectives. In 2016-17, aggregated student performance results will be accessible to faculty through the College's reporting system (Cognos). Results will be shared with program advisory board members during regularly scheduled meetings. Program faculty, with support from the College's curriculum specialist, are expected to annually analyze results and make curriculum adjustments as needed to support improved scores on the assessment.

In 2015-16, another 30 programs are expected to complete the validation process, create a cross-walk of the objectives to program courses, and identify specific courses where assessment of the learning objectives will occur. Thirty additional programs will undertake these same steps in 2016-17.

As student assessment results are documented, trends in performance are displayed over time in the College's reporting system. Faculty will then be equipped to adjust curriculum based on real data and determine if curriculum changes were effective.

---

[3] A standard response rate for non-stakeholders is 5%; a response rate of 11.8% is considered healthy.

CATEGORY 2: ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES

2R3 – Comparative results for accomplishing distinctive objectives.

The response to the *2013 Systems Portfolio* indicated that the College did not provide comparative results for its performance of continuing education and its work related to international education.

Continuing Education - The College provides two types of continuing education for individuals that are currently employed or seeking employment: professional development classes that are less than 24 hours of instruction and contract service training, typically delivered to a single employer at the worksite. Through the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) data portal, the College can compare its performance to the 15 other WTCS colleges in the area of credits completed.

Based on the analyses below, Madison College provided the 6th most amount of credits in professional development (Table 1) and the 4th most amount of credits in employer paid training (Table 2) over the 3-year period examined.

Table 1

Professional Development Seminars

	2011-12 Credits	2012-13 Credits	2013-14 Credits	3-Year Total Credits	Pct. Of 3-Year Total
Blackhawk	124.40	137.75	104.75	366.90	2.0%
Chippewa Valley	406.55	426.30	400.15	1,233.00	6.7%
Fox Valley	998.50	1,111.55	1,269.45	3,379.50	18.4%
Gateway	104.20	123.45	101.80	329.45	1.8%
Lakeshore	167.05	204.85	220.50	592.40	3.2%
Madison Area	345.30	642.80	751.20	1,739.30	9.5%
Mid-State	6.70	1.50	4.90	13.10	10.0%
Milwaukee Area	8.05	-	-	8.05	0.0%
Moraine Park	141.45	110.20	137.05	388.70	2.1%
Nicolet Area	105.70	135.10	154.75	395.55	2.2%
Northcentral	703.90	650.10	915.70	2,269.70	12.4%
Northeast Wisconsin	1,135.85	1,083.60	951.95	3,171.40	17.3%
Southwest Wisconsin	174.30	102.80	161.60	438.70	2.4%
Waukesha County	504.85	521.10	573.00	1,598.95	8.7%
Western	151.20	108.55	68.35	328.10	1.8%
Wisconsin Indianhead	661.15	738.95	715.70	2,115.80	11.5%
	5,739.15	6,098.60	6,530.85	18,368.60	

Table 2

Employer Paid Training

	2011-12 Credits	2012-13 Credits	2013-14 Credits	3-Year Total Credits	Pct. Of 3-Year Total
Blackhawk	363.45	352.80	480.85	1,197.10	1.2%
Chippewa Valley	882.00	839.50	687.50	2,409.00	2.5%
Fox Valley	-	-	2,556.65	2,556.65	2.7%
Gateway	2,577.70	3,515.75	4,648.00	10,741.45	11.2%
Lakeshore	1,458.05	1,497.95	1,677.60	4,633.60	4.8%
Madison Area	2,732.50	2,530.05	2,565.55	7,828.10	8.2%
Mid-State	954.20	714.75	675.90	2,344.85	2.4%
Milwaukee Area	9,768.60	7,101.10	6,244.70	23,114.40	24.1%
Moraine Park	1,599.95	1,634.05	1,284.95	4,518.95	4.7%
Nicolet Area	412.65	325.50	375.00	1,113.15	1.2%
Northcentral	2,166.30	1,945.30	2,211.00	6,322.60	6.6%
Northeast Wisconsin	2,203.85	1,954.75	2,661.65	6,820.25	7.1%
Southwest Wisconsin	1,120.50	946.55	645.25	2,712.30	2.8%
Waukesha County	3,030.40	2,708.20	2,992.00	8,730.60	9.1%
Western	3,462.05	2,052.95	1,516.65	7,031.65	7.3%
Wisconsin Indianhead	1,615.00	1,319.40	945.45	3,879.85	4.0%
	34,347.20	29,438.60	32,168.70	95,954.50	

International Education - The College uses multiple comparative measures to benchmark success and areas for improvement in international education including the following:

- *CAS Standards:* The Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) provides standards, guidelines and self-assessment tools for the measurement of *international student programs and services.* Beginning in the 2015-16 academic year, the College will implement an assessment cycle that identifies key areas of CAS standards for review, and will develop specific improvement responses in areas that are identified as targets for improvement.

- *Forum on Education Abroad Standards of Best Practice:* The Forum on Education Abroad (Forum EA) provides standards, guidelines, and self-assessment tools for the measurement of *study abroad programs.* Beginning in the 2015-16 academic year, the College will implement an assessment cycle that identifies key areas of Forum EA standards for review, and will develop specific improvement responses in areas that are revealed as targets for improvement.

- *CCID Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization:* Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) has developed a benchmarking and self-assessment framework for the measurement of *college-wide internationalization efforts* including rubric measures to assess each

category of college internationalization efforts on a scale from "seeking, building, reaching, to innovating." In the spring of 2015, the College began using the CCID framework to conduct a self-assessment and curriculum internationalization review of programs in the School of Business and Applied Arts (BAS). Lessons learned from the BAS pilot will be applied to other schools of the College as part of a continuous improvement plan for internationalization efforts.

- *IIE Open Doors Reports:* The Institute for International Education publishes annual data on *international student enrollments and study abroad participation.* Data disaggregated by associate's degree colleges provides comparison data with other institutions and provides national trends and predictive analysis. The College is regularly within the top 20 sending institutions for study abroad and uses these numbers as comparative tools to assess program success. The College is not listed among top receiving institutions for international students (dominated by coastal and international border colleges), but uses trend data to set annual targets and assess areas for improvement.

- *WTCS Benchmarking:* The Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Global Education Committee provides benchmarking data to compare international programs including both international students and study abroad. Most other WTCS colleges' international programs are much smaller in scope and less firmly established that those at the College; hence CCID and IIE benchmarks provide a more appropriate peer comparison in most areas.

- *Other Indicators:* The College also benchmarks its performance by applying for various recognition awards. In 2011, the College received the CCID Werner Kubsch Award for Outstanding Achievement in International Education and in 2015 it received the IIE Andrew Heiskell award for Innovation in International Education.

CATEGORY 4: VALUING PEOPLE

4P5 – How do you plan for changes in personnel?

At an institutional level, the College uses its budget process to identify priority positions to fund in the subsequent year. This process takes into consideration known and expected vacancies. The FY2015-16 budget development process was the first time this process was used in conjunction with shared governance. The provost and vice presidents, working with the deans and other managers, identified potential positions of need. The Cabinet, using a framework guided by the College's mission and strategic directives, and taking into consideration the College's fiscal constraints, identified from that pool of requested positions a select number of priorities to bring forward to the College community.[4] Through the new shared governance process (discussed in greater detail in the *2016 Highlights Report*), those requested positions were

---

[4] The Cabinet is comprised of the College's senior executives.

considered and recommended to the president for inclusion in the FY2015-16 budget. A similar process is being used for FY2016-17.

Within the academic schools, deans plan course schedules one-year in advance based on trend analysis of enrollment and examination of student waitlists for courses and programs. From this planned schedule, course sections are assigned to full-time faculty. Where necessary, courses are assigned to part-time faculty. The deans conduct on-going interviews with prospective part-time faculty in order to maintain a pool of qualified candidates. The prospective pool of part-time candidates combined with currently active part-time faculty provides the deans with the means of allocating instructors to course sections that will not be taught by full-time faculty and fill in for course sections that were planned to be taught by a full-time faculty member who leaves immediately prior to the start of the semester.

As faculty positions become vacant, the provost and the deans review the needs of the entire academic portfolio based upon enrollment, future labor market demand for graduates, and other indicators of the health of the programs. This faculty position review process will benefit from the data and analyses generated through the formal program assessment process that begins in the fall of 2016-17 and related analyses provided by the Academic Strategy and Analysis team; both of these projects are discussed in the separate, accompanying *2016 Highlights Report.*

All full-time employees, meeting certain qualifications, are eligible for early retirement; interested employees must file for early retirement in the fall. With that information, budget managers are aware of employees who will be leaving the institution by the start of the subsequent fiscal year (July 1). During the late fall and early spring, budget managers consider the known expected vacancies in planning and preparing budgets for the subsequent year.

4R2 – What are your performance results in valuing people?

The results of the 2014 Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) employee survey administration compared to the results of 2011 (Table 3) show that the College made positive change in its scores in the four factor areas.[5] This builds on the progress from 2011 when all scores showed improvement over 2008. The College scored in the highest possible range in 2014 in the Student Focus area and scored in the second highest range in the remaining three categories. The College experienced positive change in each area and made significant positive change in the area of Institutional Structure and in its overall score. The overall score for the institution was in the Consultative range.

---

[5] Employees respond to questions on a five-point scale. Each factor is comprised of multiple questions. The mean score for each question falls into one of four ranges: Collaborative (4.0-5.0), Consultative (3.0 to 3.99), Competitive (2.0-2.99), and Coercive (1.0-1.99). The cumulative mean score for the questions associated with a factor describe the climate of the institution related to that factor. The College administers the PACE survey approximately every two years.

Table 3

PACE Survey Results: Factor Overview

FACTOR	Madison College 2011	Madison College 2014
Institutional Structure	3.16	3.30*
Supervisory Relationships	3.56	3.62
Teamwork	3.61	3.64
Student Focus	3.95	4.01
Overall	3.53	3.62*

*Represents a statistically significant difference from prior survey administration.

Table 4 presents specific questions of the PACE survey related to the College's environment regarding valuing people.

Table 4

PACE Survey Results: Specific Questions Related to Valuing People

Question	Madison College 2011	Madison College 2014
The institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace	3.72	3.71
I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	2.79	2.92*
I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	2.88	2.84
This institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	3.12	3.24
Professional development and training opportunities are available	3.74	3.84
Madison College has a fair employee recognition and awards program	3.08	3.24*
I would recommend Madison College to others as a good place to work	3.76	3.81

*Represents a statistically significant difference from prior survey administration.

The College reviews its participation in professional development opportunities for its faculty, staff, and administrators. Table 5 outlines the participation rates over the past five years. The convocation participation figures drastically decrease in 2014-15. The decrease is due to presenting convocation two times per as opposed to four times per year.

Table 5

Professional Development Opportunities

Courses Attended through the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning	FY 10-11		FY 11 - 12		FY 12-13		FY 13-14		FY14-15	
	Number Attended	% of Total Eligible Participants	Number Attended	% of Total Eligible Participants	Number Attended	% of Total Eligible Participants	Number Attended	% of Total Eligible Participants	Number Attended	% of Total Eligible Participants
Faculty Certification Courses	613*	27%	556*	24%	559*	29%	480*	24%	566*	24%
Professional Development Workshops (all employees)	497	17%	849	28%	926	35%	1960	73%	1278	41%
Technology Training (all employees)	618	21%	773**	26%	530	20%	376	14%	833**	27%
Faculty Mentoring Program	75*	3%	57*	2%	50*	3%	49*	2%	40*	2%
Convocation	3,698***	124%	2,567***	85%	2,151***	82%	2,168***	81%	1,310***	42%

*Part-Time Faculty are included in the above analyses.

**Significant IT training provided due to implementation of campus-wide enterprise systems.

***2014-15 is the first year to hold only two Convocation sessions per academic year as opposed to four per academic year in the previous years. The number of attendants is the sum of attendees at each separate convocation offered.

The College examines trends in the areas of employee separation (excluding retirements), retirements, length of service, and filed grievances.

Separations, reported in Table 6, across the different employee groups have held relatively steady over the past five years across the employee groups.

Table 6

Employee Separation Data

Employee Group	Totals Per Year	Number of Separations	% of Separations
2011			
FT Faculty	490	3	0.60%
Admin	115	10	8.70%
Staff	493	32	6.50%
2012			
FT Faculty	486	2	0.40%
Admin	111	8	7.20%
Staff	502	15	3.00%
2013			
FT Faculty	467	3	0.60%
Admin	100	4	4.00%
Staff	494	16	3.20%
2014			
FT Faculty	486	3	0.60%
Admin	110	1	0.90%
Staff	482	2	0.40%
2015			
FT Faculty	479	2	0.40%
Admin	123	4	3.30%
Staff	497	15	3.00%

The 2014 retirement rates listed in Table 7 were greater than prior years due to the fact that December 2014 was at the time the last known opportunity for employees to take early retirement from the College per the final collective bargaining agreement completed prior to enactment of statutory changes related to collective bargaining – 2011 Wisconsin Act 10.[6] Subsequent policy decisions by the College, informed by shared governance, led to retention of an early retirement program beyond 2014, but with different terms of eligibility for employees.

---

[6] The *2016 Highlights Report* contains a detailed discussion of 2011 Wisconsin Act 10.

Table 7

Employee Retirement Data

Employee Group	Total Employees	Number of Retirements	Retirement Rate
2011			
FT Faculty	490	6	1.22%
Admin	115	5	4.35%
PSRP	493	11	2.23%
2012			
FT Faculty	486	19	3.91%
Admin	111	5	4.50%
PSRP	502	21	4.18%
2013			
FT Faculty	467	12	2.57%
Admin	100	10	10.00%
PSRP	494	14	2.83%
2014			
FT Faculty	483	38	7.87%
Admin	109	5	4.59%
PSRP	475	31	6.53%
2015			
FT Faculty	447	17	3.80%
Admin	122	2	1.64%
PSRP	496	15	3.02%

The average tenure among the different employee types in Table 8 has not changed dramatically, except the full-time faculty that see the average years of service increase by more than one year between 2014 and 2015.

Table 8

Average Tenure

Year	FT Faculty	Staff	Admin
2012	11.47	10.96	9.68
2013	11.48	10.96	9.63
2014	11.41	10.92	9.46
2015	12.64	10.54	9.25

Since 2011, annual grievances have been on a downward trend across all employee groups (Table 9).

Table 9

Annual Grievance Data

Employee Group	Total Employees	Number of Grievances	Grievance Rate
2011			
FT Faculty	490	2	0.40%
Admin	115	2	1.70%
PSRP	493	6	1.20%
2012			
FT Faculty	486	0	0.00%
Admin	111	0	0.00%
PSRP	502	1	0.20%
2013			
FT Faculty	467	2	0.40%
Admin	100	0	0.00%
PSRP	494	4	0.80%
2014			
FT Faculty	483	0	0.00%
Admin	109	0	0.00%
PSRP	475	1	0.20%
2015			
FT Faculty	447	1	0.20%
Admin	122	0	0.00%
PSRP	496	1	0.20%

4R4 – How do your results for the performance of your processes for valuing people compare with the performance results of other higher education organizations, and, if appropriate, of organizations outside of higher education?

Compared to other institutions (Table 10), the College's 2014 PACE employee survey scores in each of the four factor categories was less than the national norm by a significant difference.

Table 10

PACE Survey Comparative Results: Factor Overview

FACTOR	Madison College 2014	Norm Base 2014
Institutional Structure	3.30	3.47*
Supervisory Relationships	3.62	3.82*
Teamwork	3.64	3.84*
Student Focus	4.01	4.05*
Overall	3.62	3.77*

*Represents a statistically significant difference from Madison College.

When examining questions specifically related to valuing people and comparing it to the national norm, the College performed significantly poorer than peers in 2014 even as the College made progress compared to its past performance on these same questions in the 2011 administration of the survey. The final two questions detailed in Table 11 are custom questions and not administered by other institutions.

Table 11

PACE Survey Comparative Results: Specific Questions Related to Valuing People

Question	Madison College 2014	Norm Base 2014
The institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace	3.71	3.89*
I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	2.92	3.13*
I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	2.84	3.10*
This institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	3.24	3.44*
Professional development and training opportunities are available	3.84	3.81
Madison College has a fair employee recognition and awards program	3.24	N/A
I would recommend Madison College to others as a good place to work	3.81	N/A

*Represents statistically significant difference from Madison College.
N/A represents custom questions only administered by Madison College.

The College compares its rates of retirement, grievances, harassment, and per employee training expenditures to other institutions that participate in the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP) on an annual basis. The most recent data for 2015 is presented in Table 12.

Table 12

National Community College Benchmark Project 2015 – Select Data

Benchmark	Madison College Reported Value	National Percentile
Retirement Rate	4.13%	81st
Separation Rate	1.75%	5th
Grievances Rate	0.16%	49th
Harassment Rate	0.04%	44th
Development Training Expenditures per FTE employee	$523	76th

Compensation – Staff and Administrators - In 2014-15, the College, through a consultant, undertook a review of its salaries and wages for staff and administrators. The College identified as a goal to have base pay be at the 75th percentile of the market. After compiling the market data, the consultant provided the following analysis in Table 13.

Table 13

Compensation - Staff & Administrators

Percentile	Staff	Administrators
Market 50th Percentile	+35.35%	+11.33%
Market 75th Percentile	+16.52%	-6.80%

According to guidelines provided by the consultant, the analysis shows that the College's salaries for staff at the 75th percentile are highly competitive (16.52% greater than the salary at the 75th percentile) and that for administrators they are competitive (6.8% below the market at the 75th percentile). The College made internal adjustments to individual administrators with compensation that was below the 75th percentile market salary and have "red-circled" staff that were above the 75th percentile. The effect of red-circling an employee means that s/he will receive any annual compensation increases that are awarded, but they will not be added to the employee's base pay, until such time as the 75th percentile of the market aligns with the employee's base wage. These policies reflect a decision to mitigate substantial discrepancies in wages and salary between current and future employees.

Compensation – Full-time and Part-time Faculty - For both full-time and part-time faculty, the College uses salary data from the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR)

and the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) to understand its competitive position in the market. The data below is from the 2014 and 2015 surveys by CUPA-HR and WTCS.

Table 14

Compensation: Full-Time & Part-Time Faculty

	Full-Time Fauclty		Part-Time Faculty	
	Median Salary*	Madison College % Above/Below Median	Median Salary**	Madison College % Above/Below Median
Madison College - 2015	$94,802	N/A	$888	N/A
CUPA-HR- 2014	$62,117	52.62%	$893	-0.56%
WTCS - 2015	$73,800	28.46%	$763	16.38%

*Comparison of 9 and 10 month faculty contracts.

**Comparison of per credit wage for Madison College faculty with a Master's degree and less than 7 credits of prior experience.

In 2015-16, the College is beginning the process of developing a market analysis to assist with the setting of salaries for future faculty members. This process is needed to respond, in part, to strict limitations on the College's ability to raise revenue to support its operations via the property tax and the changes in statutes that limit collective bargaining to base wage increases not to exceed the annual rate of inflation.

CATEGORY 5: LEADING AND COMMUNICATING

5P8 – Process for improving the communication of the mission of the organization in a systematic fashion.

2013-14 Mission, Vision, Values and Strategic Planning Work - The process to create new mission, vision, and values statements began in October 2013. That fall 1,074 faculty, staff, administrators, and students from all campuses participated in face-to-face and on-line sessions to develop themes for these statements. Input from the employee and student sessions were reviewed by the Strategic Planning Committee and the information was sorted into main themes. Those main themes led to the creation of draft mission, vision, and values statements, which were prioritized by more than 1,000 members of the college community through an on-line survey.

The top draft statement selections of all survey respondents were reviewed by the President's Cabinet and the Strategic Planning Committee and presented to the District Board for their comments at the December 2013 Board Meeting. In January 2014, the District Board approved the new College mission, vision, and value statements.

Over 130 members of the College community participated in workshops at the January 2014 Convocation that focused on developing the strategic directives (goals) for the College and possible actions. The Strategic Planning Committee reviewed that input and refined it into six strategic directives with separate actions and considerations for each goal.

During the course of the 2013-14 academic year, and between the engagements of the entire College community regarding the mission statement and strategic directives, the Strategic Planning Committee members received and discussed presentations regarding the College's finances, future demographics, projected labor market demands within the District, interests of policy-makers and the public regarding higher education, and trends in course delivery method. This information along with the ideas generated by colleagues across the College assisted the Strategic Planning Committee with finalizing its work. The progress of the Strategic Planning Committee was regularly communicated to the College community via *Madison College Matters*, the College's thrice-weekly newsletter, and via process updates at convocation.

The research presentations provided to the Strategic Planning Committee and the resulting College strategic directives informed the work of the College's academic plan (IMPACT Initiative) and student services' plan (Pillars of Promise) that were completed in spring 2014 by separate planning committees that engaged members of the College community in developing these respective plans. At the end of the 2014 spring semester, the president hosted presentations for members of the College community and public at each of the District's nine campuses. The presentations reviewed the background data used to inform the College's strategic plan and associated academic and student services' plans, presented the goals of each of the plans, and reviewed the process used to create them.

Cabinet Communication Plan – 2014-15 and beyond - As part of improving communication to the College community about institutional priorities, updates on the progress of priorities, and providing College faculty, staff, and administrators with information necessary to participate in the work of shared governance, the president announced a new plan for communication in the spring of 2015.

The Cabinet agenda, which is shaped by the priorities of the shared governance process and the College's mission and strategic directives, is presented at the annual August and January convocations. Quarterly, the Cabinet presents electronic updates on institutional priorities to the College community. Each fall and spring at mid-semester, members of the Cabinet travel to each of the College's nine campuses and provide a priority issues update on items that the College is working on through shared governance and updates on other institutional priorities.

During the spring of 2015, the first electronic quarterly update and semi-annual Cabinet presentation were delivered. This process was repeated in fall of 2015 and is being planned for spring of 2016.

2015-16 academic year theme – Return to Our Foundations - Over the past 5 years, the College has experienced a number of significant changes driven by internal and external factors.

- *November 2010* – District voters approve a $134 million referendum for new facilities; the largest such referendum in the history of Wisconsin. This approval represented years of planning and community engagement by members of the College community.
- *February 2011* – The Wisconsin Legislature and Governor enact new legislation (2011 WI Act 10) significantly curtailing the rights and responsibilities of public sector labor unions. The College's full-time and part-time faculty and staff are all represented by unions.
- *January 2013* – Dr. Barhorst announces her retirement to take effective summer 2013.
- *August 2013* – Dr. Daniels assumes the presidency of the College.
- *March 2014* – Collective bargaining agreements with full-time faculty and staff enacted prior to 2011 Wisconsin Act 10's effective date expire.
- *2013-14 Academic Year* – Interest-based problem solving introduced to the College.
- *Fall 2014* – Shared governance, utilizing interest-based problem solving, formally begins at the College.[7]

Some of these actions, such as a transition in the presidency, are normal for any institution, while other actions, such as the passage of a $100 million plus referendum or creation of a new system of shared governance are items that may not even occur once during the tenure of most college and university employees. The volume and pace of significant actions experienced by this College is unprecedented. The collective effect of these actions impacted the culture of the College community and has caused the College community to pursue new ways and structures to facilitate the work of the College in achieving its mission.

With an understanding of the actions that occurred in the past five years, the Cabinet identified the theme for the 2015-16 academic year as returning to our foundations, focusing on how we "live" our mission. The president presented this theme at the August Convocation. The process of how to actualize the living of the College's mission is advancing through the introduction of new frameworks to guide how the College community will make decisions to live the mission in a manner consistent with the interest-based culture being established.

Frameworks to guide decision-making - The president convened a task force that met during the summer and early fall of 2015 to articulate and identify challenges that exist with regard to making decisions. The task force identified as challenges the need to explain "why" a decision is made and "how" a decision is made. From those discussions, members of the Cabinet engaged in the development of new frameworks to guide the College with answering the questions of "why" and "how" when making a decision.

---

[7] The *2016 Highlights Report* contains a detailed discussion of shared governance and interest-based problem solving.

The framework for "why" is shaped by the mission, vision, and values of the College and the associated strategic directives that were identified in 2013-14. The framework for "how" is grounded in the interest-based culture the College community is adopting and seeks to clarify the roles that different employee groups, shared governance entities, the Cabinet, President, and the District Board have in making decisions.

In November 2015, as part of the Cabinet's priority issues update to the College community, these frameworks for "why" and "how" were previewed at sessions conducted at each of the College's nine campuses. At the January 2016 Convocation, a session engaging the faculty, staff, and administrators in understanding and applying these frameworks to hypothetical decision-making situations related to how the College community might "live" the mission. In an effort to advance the use of these frameworks at the College the Office of Interest-based Problem Solving will develop courses for 2016-17 academic year that focus on the explanation, exploration, and use of these frameworks in an interest-based system of decision-making.

5R1 – Performance measures of leading and communicating

Madison College Matters Employee Newsletter – Historical Results - In 2012, the College undertook a college-wide survey research project regarding its employee newsletter, *Madison College Matters*, the primary tool for frequent communication to all faculty, staff, and administrators regarding internal events, college employees in the news, and other general announcements. At that time only 66% of 84 respondents found *Madison College Matters* to be a useful source of information. The research results led to a significant re-design of the newsletter, including the use of regular sections in the newsletter for which items would be published and a decrease in the number of articles appearing in each newsletter.

Another college-wide survey of all employees regarding *Madison College Matters* was conducted in spring of 2015. Ninety-seven percent of 323 respondents found it a useful source of information and 50% of 352 respondents indicated that it should continue to be published every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday; 31% thought it should be published one day per week; and 18% felt it should be published two times per week. Based on the data (survey responses and comments) *Madison College Matters* was retooled to include more embedded video and other media content. Additionally, articles no longer remain posted for extended periods of time; the expectation of readers is that content turn-over more frequently.

PACE Survey – Historical Results - The College participates in the national PACE employee survey administered by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE). Statistically significant positive changes related to specific questions about leadership and communication occurred with items listed in Table 15.

Table 15

PACE Survey Comparative Results:
Specific Questions Related to Leadership & Communication

Question	Madison College 2011	Madison College 2014
The extent to which I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums	3.38	3.50*
The extent to which information is shared within this institution	2.87	3.01*
The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	3.00	3.17*
The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	3.00	3.25*
The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.24	3.45*

*Represents a statistically significant difference from prior survey administration.

The College also administered ten custom questions, seven of which also appeared on the 2011 survey. All seven repeat questions showed improvement over 2011, including three that demonstrated statistically significant improvement. Two of the three new questions administered related to leading and communicating. Specifically, the question regarding whether employees had the opportunity to learn the basic principles of interest-based problem solving scored in the Collaborative range (4.01) and the question regarding whether employees had the opportunity to learn about shared governance principles just missed scoring in the Collaborative range (3.91).

NILIE also administered for the first-time as part of the PACE survey a sub-set of questions related to diversity. The College administered this section of the survey and, assuming NILIE offers it in the future, will administer it again. The survey consists of 27 questions and organizes them in the same four climate factor areas as the standard PACE questions. While the College has its results from 2014, historical and comparative data does not yet exist.

In summary, the PACE Diversity survey responses identified differences in the perceptions of institutional structure, supervisory relationships, teamwork, and student focus by employees of different racial/ethnic groups. In 66% of the questions, Whites had the highest range response rating; Latinos had the highest range response rate in 30% of the questions; and, Asians had the highest range response rate in the remaining questions. African-Americans had the lowest range response rating in 57% of the questions; individuals identifying as two or more races had the lowest range response rating in 15% of the questions; and, employees identifying as Other (which included Native Americans) had the lowest response rating in 28% of the questions.

The results of both the PACE Survey and the associated Diversity component have been presented to the College's Leadership Council (comprised of all academic and administrative managers), human resources staff members, and the shared governance Diversity and Community Relations Council. These results have been shared with the new Vice President of Equity, Inclusion, and Community Engagement.[8] The vice president, working with the shared governance system, the Leadership Council and various academic, student services, and administrative units of the college will develop a plan of action to address issues identified in the survey.

5R3 – Comparative results of leading and communicating

Madison College Matters – Comparative Results - In a review of other Wisconsin Technical College System colleges' use of employee newsletters, nine of 15 colleges responded and not one of them published a newsletter with the frequency of the College. Only one college published a newsletter weekly and six other respondents published monthly or every other month and two colleges did not publish any sort of newsletter.

In 2014, *Madison College Matters* received a Gold Award from the *Higher Education Marketing Report* for the College's performance in the "New Media" and "Website and Automatic Newsletter Generator" categories.

PACE Survey – Comparative Results - Related to very direct and pertinent questions relevant to leading and communicating, the College was significantly below the national norm in five of the six questions listed in Table 15 of this report. The College's mean response was identical to the national norm for one question regarding the use of problem-solving techniques by institutional teams. Each of the College's mean responses to the questions in Table 15 was in the Collaborative range.

CATEGORY 6: SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

In each of the next three sub-categories, information is provided for the following operations: Bookstore, Disability Resource Services, and Risk Management/Environmental Health and Safety.

6R1 – Measures and results of student service processes

Bookstore - The College's Bookstore annually examines a number of metrics presented in Tables 16 and 17 related to its own past performance and compares its performance to peers.

---

[8] The Vice President of Equity, Inclusion, and Community Engagement began her service in January 2016.

Table 16

Madison College Bookstore

	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15
Madison College Sales	$6,125,375	$5,750,489	$5,630,864	$4,887,551	$4,927,612
Customer Count/In-Store Transactions	82,785	90,145	83,419	84,425	91,021
Online Sales	$607,320	$577,321	$451,963	$666,844	$1,015,127
Number of Online Orders	3,497	3,321	2,943	5,621	6,807
Financial Aid Sales	Bookcharge not offered	Bookcharge not offered	$1,139,000	$994,227	$1,377,736
Book Rental Titles	30	30	30	40	75

Table 17

Madison College Bookstore - National Comparison of Sales

	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15
Madison College Sales	$6,125,375	$5,750,489	$5,630,864	$4,887,551	$4,927,612
National Average Sales	$3,700,432	$4,243,461	$4,734,482	$4,614,482	not available

The Bookstore, based on the data it examined and discussions with students, created a process whereby students could deduct the costs of their books directly from their expected student financial aid. This ensured that the students had their books purchased in advance of the first day of class. Previously, students without other financial resources needed to receive their financial aid check, deposit it with their financial institution, and then were able to purchase textbooks. This previous process sometimes left students without text books for the first week of classes, as students did not have the available funding to purchase books.

Per the request of the Student Senate, the Bookstore has made efforts to increase the number of text book titles that are available on a rental basis. As demonstrated in the data, progress has been made with 35 additional titles being made available in FY2014-15.

Disability Resource Services - The Disability Resource Services (DRS) unit annually examines a number of internal metrics related to its performance. These include: student satisfaction, academic success of DRS students compared to non-DRS students, and total number of students served and new students served.

Table 18

Disability Resource Services Student Satisfaction

2010-11	91% strongly agreed/agreed that DRS service positively affected their chances of staying in school
2011-12	91% strongly agreed/agreed that DRS service positively affected their chances of staying in school
2012-13	84% strongly agreed/agreed that DRS service positively affected their chances of staying in school
2013-14	No data collected
2014-15	Did a focus group of 16 students - 100% rated satisfaction high w/their DRS visits

Table 19

Disability Resource Services Student Course Success

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
DRS: Disability	69.4%	70.8%	73.3%	71.1%	71.3%	72.6%
No Disability	77.8%	77.0%	77.6%	77.5%	77.9%	77.9%

- Course success is defined as credits taken with a "C" or better divided by aidable credits

Table 20

Disability Resource Services Students Served – Total and New

	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Total Served	1,349	1,288	1,294	1,410	1,598	1,296
New to DRS	380	436	469	547	561	388

Analysis of the data in Tables 18, 19, and 20, combined with other information, shapes process improvement projects. For example, based upon DRS's 2012-13 student survey, it engaged in focus groups in early 2014-15 and identified that students were not as satisfied with the quality of the note-taking services as they had been. As a result, DRS made changes to the note-taking process and are using more technology to assist with the provision of this service.

6R2 – Measures and results of administrative service processes, and

6R3 – Measures and results of organizational support service processes

<u>Risk Management/Environmental Health and Safety</u> - The Risk Management/Environmental Health & Safety unit measures its effectiveness by annually measuring the Worker's Compensation (WC) modification rate, WC claims, and property thefts.[9] Through its collaborative work with other WTCS institutions, the College can compare its efforts to peer institutions in the area of WC modification rates.

---

[9] The modification rate represents the amount of each $1 in approved WC claims that the College must pay, the balance of claims are paid by insurance.

Table 21

WTCS Worker Compensation Experience Modification Rates: FY 12-13 - FY 16-17

College	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Blackhawk	0.76	0.76	0.84	0.86	0.86
Chippewa Valley	0.77	0.78	0.88	0.85	0.83
Fox Valley	0.79	0.64	0.60	0.66	0.69
Gateway	0.74	0.85	0.92	0.91	0.85
Lakeshore	0.79	0.83	0.81	0.80	0.81
Madison	0.62	0.60	0.61	0.61	0.52
Mid-State	1.07	1.02	1.14	1.09	1.06
Milwaukee	0.68	0.72	0.88	0.88	0.96
Moraine Park	1.01	1.00	0.94	0.81	0.74
Nicolet	0.84	0.83	0.73	0.70	0.69
Northcentral	0.89	0.93	0.85	0.77	0.71
Northeast	0.77	0.71	0.77	0.75	0.76
Southwest	1.12	0.88	0.85	0.71	0.71
Waukesha County	0.73	0.76	0.93	0.93	0.86
Western	0.85	0.74	0.83	0.84	0.81
Wiscosnin Indianhead	0.88	0.83	0.76	0.69	0.89

For the most recent five-year period shown in Table 21, the College had the best WC modification rate for WC insurance in four of the five years compared to the 15 other WTCS institutions. The College's performance in this area improved due to a change in the focus of the program's administration at the College. The College began to partner with injured employees to identify what activities such an employee could accomplish, rather than defaulting to the position that the employee could not perform any tasks until completely recovered from an injury. This change reduced the period of time employees were out of work, decreased WC insurance costs, and improved the relationship between the College and the employee.

As demonstrated in Table 22, in 2013-14, the College experienced an increase in thefts. The increase in thefts was due to new facilities that opened without clear identification of which faculty and staff were responsible for securing classrooms and labs. In FY14-15, a targeted communication effort was made to those units experiencing a high volume of thefts, roles were clarified, and property losses declined the following year.

Table 22

Madison College – Technology Theft & Loss Prevention

FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
*22 / $125,201	*34 / $135,141	*15/$15.458	*39/$137,894	*15/38,157

*Number of items / total value of items

CATEGORY 7: MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

7R3 – Comparative results for performance of processes for measuring effectiveness

In 2014-15, the College initiated the Center for Operational Excellence (COE), a unit of the Institutional Research and Effectiveness department charged with advancing the College's efforts related to process improvement.[10] The creation of COE was informed, in part, by interviews with the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Administrative Process Redesign (APR) unit. The dialogue between the staff members of the College and UW-Madison provides an initial framework for understanding how to compare performance processes for measuring effectiveness with other institutions.

CATEGORY 9: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

9R3 – Comparison of performance results for building collaborative relationships

External Collaborative Relations - As part of the implementation of performance-based funding in Wisconsin, the 16 college Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) created a data depository of information regarding each institution's performance on the nine performance funding factors that are assessed. This collaborative effort led by the WTCS produces data for different comparative purposes. Available data includes a ranking of the placement of graduates in a job related to their field of study and placement of graduates in high-demand occupational fields. Based on the data in Table 23 for FY15-16, the College was awarded the second greatest amount of funding in the former category and greatest amount of funding in the latter category.

---

[10] The *2016 Highlights Report* contains a detailed discussion of the Center for Operational Excellence.

Table 23

WTCS College	Job Placement	High Demand Fields
Blackhawk	$117,592	$74,776
Chippewa Valley	$171,987	$158,031
Fox Valley	$225,120	$246,314
Gateway	$178,108	$223,519
Lakeshore	$120,694	$85,939
Madison Area	$208,602	$277,545
Mid-State	$120,726	$88,027
Milwaukee Area	-	$200,085
Moraine Park	$126,980	-
Nicolet Area	$78,337	$48,615
Northcentral	$151,940	-
Northeast Wisconsin	$184,987	$216,489
Southwest Wisconsin	$118,623	$72,646
Waukesha County	$143,641	$168,470
Western	$145,708	$129,995
Wisconsin Indianhead	$177,416	$161,440

When examining the College's placement rate of individuals in related jobs, compared to the other WTCS colleges in Table 24, the College places 15 out of 16 colleges. This is due, in part, to the fact that the College offers a robust liberal arts transfer program compared to other WTCS colleges. Liberal arts graduates typically are not moving directly into employment, but rather continue their education at a four-year institution.

Table 24

WTCS College 2011-12 to 2013-14	Number Employed	Number in Related Jobs	Related %
Blackhawk	986	797	80.8%
Chippewa Valley	2,241	1,897	84.6%
Fox Valley	4,127	3,205	77.7%
Gateway	3,388	2,358	69.6%
Lakeshore	1,306	984	75.3%
Madison Area	4,530	3,064	67.6%
Mid-State	1,163	914	78.6%
Milwaukee Area	3,794	2,624	69.2%
Moraine Park	1,365	1,064	77.9%
Nicolet Area	638	386	60.5%
Northcentral	2,313	1,702	73.6%
Northeast Wisconsin	3,012	2,335	77.5%
Southwest Wisconsin	1,149	891	77.5%
Waukesha County	1,884	1,449	76.9%
Western	1,775	1,423	80.2%
Wisconsin Indianhead	2,963	2,224	75.1%
	36,634	27,317	74.6%

WTCS colleges survey employers regarding their satisfaction with that institution's graduates. The WTCS data depository summarizes the results of these surveys, shown in Table 25, into a manner that permits comparisons between the WTCS colleges. The College's performance is minimally below the mean.

Table 25

WTCS College	WTCS College Means				
Training Satisfaction	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Blackhawk	1.47	1.48	1.50	1.48	1.49
Chippewa Valley	1.43	1.47	1.43	1.48	1.44
Fox Valley	1.44	1.39	1.43	1.46	1.41
Gateway	1.63	1.63	1.57	1.67	1.75
Lakeshore	1.27	1.47	1.54	1.48	1.54
Madison Area	1.55	1.52	1.48	1.52	1.53
Mid-State	1.54	1.56	1.56	1.42	1.44
Milwaukee Area	1.56	1.51	1.51	1.47	1.50
Moraine Park	1.55	1.58	1.46	1.54	1.49
Nicolet Area	1.33	1.37	1.46	1.43	1.35
Northcentral	1.53	1.54	1.51	1.50	1.52
Northeast Wisconsin	1.37	1.41	1.43	1.45	1.45
Southwest Wisconsin	1.42	1.41	1.42	1.41	1.45
Waukesha County	1.47	1.48	1.47	1.50	1.46
Western	1.49	1.40	1.49	1.52	1.45
Wisconsin Indianhead	1.49	1.45	1.47	1.45	1.45
WTCS Mean	1.48	1.49	1.48	1.50	1.50
Madison Difference	-0.06	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	-0.03

1 - Very Satisfied
2 - Satistied
3 - Unsatisfied
4 - Very Unsatisfied

Internal Collaborative Relations – As previously stated in this report, the College participates in the national PACE employee survey. The College last administered the survey in 2014.

The survey contains six questions that examine issues related to teamwork. The responses to the questions can be compared to the results of prior administrations of the survey by the College. Additionally, the College can compare its results to those of national participants that administer the survey at the same time.

In Table 26, the 2014 comparative results to the six questions related to teamwork showed that the College scored significantly below the national norm, while making progress on four questions compared to its past performance. The College scored in the Consultative range – the third highest of the four response ranges – in response to each of the questions in 2014.

Table 26 - PACE Survey Teamwork Questions

Madison College 2011 to 2014 Mean Comparison

Teamwork Questions	2011 Mean	2011 SD	2014 Mean	2014 SD	Change	Range
14 The extent to which my primary work team uses problem- solving techniques	3.69	1.15	3.60	1.10	-0.09	Consultative
36 The extent to which my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals	3.63	1.14	3.62	1.11	-0.01	Consultative
43 The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists in my department	3.55	1.31	3.60	1.27	0.05	Consultative
24 The extent to which there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team	3.56	1.26	3.62	1.19	0.06	Consultative
33 The extent to which my work team provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs	3.58	1.29	3.65	1.21	0.07	Consultative
3 The extent to which there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team	3.67	1.33	3.77	1.26	0.10	Consultative
Mean Total - *Teamwork questions*	**3.61**	**1.10**	**3.64**	**1.06**	0.03	**Consultative**

Comparison of 2014 Madison College Mean to NILIE Norm Base Mean

Teamwork Questions	Madison College	NILIE Norm Base	Difference	Range
14 The extent to which my primary work team uses problem- solving techniques	3.60	3.87	-0.27 *	Consultative
36 The extent to which my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals	3.62	3.86	-0.24 *	Consultative
43 The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists in my department	3.60	3.83	-0.23 *	Consultative
24 The extent to which there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team	3.62	3.79	-0.17 *	Consultative
33 The extent to which my work team provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs	3.65	3.81	-0.16 *	Consultative
3 The extent to which there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team	3.77	3.92	-0.15 *	Consultative
Mean Total - *Teamwork questions*	**3.64**	**3.84**	-0.20 *	**Consultative**

*Represents a statistically significant difference.

CORE CRITERION 2

In its response to Madison Area Technical College's *2013 Systems Portfolio*, the HLC reviewers noted that they did not identify evidence of the following components of Criterion #2: Integrity: 2.C. – Independence of the Governing Board; 2.D. – Academic Freedom; and 2.E. Responsible acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge by members of the college community. The College provides the following as evidence fulfilling the components of this criterion.

Independence of Governing Board – 2.C.

[Chapter 38.10](#) of the Wisconsin Statutes specifies the appointment process of District Board members (the "governing board"). The trustee appointment committee for the College is comprised of the county board chairs of each of the 12 counties in the College's District. The appointment committee's chair is the county board chair from the most populous county in the College's District. A quorum of the appointment committee is present when county board chairs representing 50% of the District's population are present.

The District Board required membership is: 2 employers, 2 employees, 3 additional members, 1 school district administrator, and 1 local or state elected official. The entire membership of the District Board shall reflect the distribution of women and minorities (non-Whites) in the District. Annually, the appointment committee is required to publish its intent to appoint members, including criteria for selection and the process for soliciting names and qualifications of candidates. On a rotating basis, 3 seats are annually open for appointment. This information on [District Board membership](#) is available on the College's website and in its [annual budget](#) in the section on governance.

As part of its members' education and professional development, the College's District Board is a member of the Wisconsin Technical College's District Boards Association, Inc. and the Association of Community Colleges Trustees. These associations offer conferences and other services aimed specifically at the role and responsibilities of trustees, including support in understanding governance and developing policies to meet their community's needs. Members of the College's District Board are required via the Board's policy to annually participate in at least one conference hosted by these organizations.

In 2013-14, the District Board engaged with Miriam Carver, a policy governance theorist and consultant. Through its work with Ms. Carver, the District Board re-affirmed its commitment to a policy governance framework in March 2014 when it approved revised Board End statements and other modifications to its policy governance framework. See the following for minutes and agendas:

[March 12, 2014 Minutes](#);
[March 12, 2014 Agenda](#);
[June 11, 2014 Minutes](#);
[June 11, 2014 Agenda](#);
[July 14, 2014 Minutes](#); and
[July 14, 2014 Agenda](#).

Academic Freedom – 2.D.

As part of its collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with Local 243 AFT-Wisconsin, AFT, and AFL-CIO (the full-time faculty), the College had a statement of academic freedom contained within Section I. of the agreement. This CBA was in effect at the time when the College submitted its *2013 Systems Portfolio*. The CBA with that provision expired in March 2014. After the March 2014 expiration of the CBA, under the law this type of statement was a prohibited subject of bargaining agreements (2011 Wisconsin Act 10).

In 2013-14, the contract alternative committee (CAC) identified and prioritized a number of issues that it wanted to address using the interest-based problem solving process, including academic freedom. [11]Academic freedom was not formally addressed by the CAC in 2013-14 or by its successor shared governance entities in 2014-15, as those bodies addressed other issues collectively deemed as higher priorities. In the summer of 2015, the College's Vice Provost worked with a sub-committee of the Academic Council to review the prior academic freedom statement from the CBA with the intention of affirming or modifying it.

In October of 2015, after having hosted listening sessions with faculty at the August Convocation, the Academic Council forwarded to the College Assembly a slightly modified version of the original academic freedom statement from the expired CBA. That draft statement was recommended for approval by the College Assembly and sent to the president. The president raised an issue with the draft and shared his interest with the shared governance bodies. The shared governance system is prepared to forward a revised statement on academic freedom, addressing the president's interest, to the president early in the spring semester of 2016. The adopted statement will be included in the College's employee handbook, posted at the website of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), and presented at new faculty and part-time faculty orientations. Attached as appendix 1 is a draft copy of the revised statement, with the highlighted section representing the work completed, but not yet recommended to the College Assembly, to address the president's interest in the statement.

Responsible acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge by members of the college community – 2.E.

The College has in place numerous policies, procedures, and services to assist students, faculty, and staff with appropriately engaging in the acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge.

Students – The College has in place a Student Code of Conduct and associated Academic Integrity policy, which present expected behavior related to issues of honesty and dishonesty, including cheating, in the

---

[11] The *2016 Highlights Report* contains a detailed discussion of the contract alternative committee and the interest-based problem solving process.

academic setting as well as the responsibility of students to follow copyright law. Related to the Academic Integrity policy are procedures for adjudicating any possible violations. The Academic Integrity webpage also links to resources that assist students with better understanding the issues of appropriate attribution of material from other sources.

Information regarding academic integrity is presented to students as part of new student orientation sessions, which are not mandatory. In 2014-15, 1,520 students were served by these sessions. This information is also covered in writing and research sessions presented by College library staff to many English and Written Communication classes. In 2014-15, approximately 9,000 students in 500 classes were presented with this orientation by library staff. At the beginning of the semester, individual faculty members may review these policies and associated services and guides that assist students with better understanding issues of appropriate discovery and application of knowledge. Finally, the College's syllabus template refers to the Academic Integrity policy and within the template contains a link to the Academic Integrity policy.

<u>Faculty, Staff, and Administrators</u> – The College has in place services to assist faculty with identifying issues of academic misconduct by students; provides a regulatory framework for students, faculty, staff, and administrators seeking to use College data about students; and, provides training to faculty, staff, and administrators regarding what College student data represents.

The College has an academic integrity officer affiliated with its Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. The officer conducts trainings at convocation sessions and school meetings and consults with faculty members one-on-one regarding services to refer students to for assistance with understanding academic misconduct and tools to help identify issues of academic misconduct. The academic integrity officer also explains to faculty the process for addressing misconduct, including its adjudication.

Tools available to assist students with understanding plagiarism and appropriate use include the following procured or created by the College's library:

> [Ask a Librarian](#)
> [About Copyright](#)
> [Plagiarism Video](#)
> [Copyright for Students](#)

The College maintains an [Institutional Review Board](#) (IRB) registered with the federal Office for Human Resource Protections. The IRB is administratively attached to the Office of the Vice Provost. The College provides to the College community, including students, the IRB's operating charter and procedures, FAQs regarding the process, and forms to complete for the IRB's review of research requests.

The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness supports faculty, staff, administrators, and students with requests for research and analysis. The office's services include providing training and education on existing data and analyses provided by the College as well as working to develop new research and analysis projects and conducting surveys requested via a work request form.

The College requires training about the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) for faculty, staff, and administrators that request access to student records either in the College's student information system or in another format and provides FAQ-style guides regarding FERPA.

APPENDIX 1 - STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM (DRAFT)

1. The spirit and policy of this institution, developed and sponsored under progressive administrative and faculty member leadership, encourages the teaching, investigating and publishing of findings in an atmosphere of freedom and confidence.

2. This spirit and philosophy is based on the belief that when students have the opportunity to learn and acquire knowledge from a variety of sources and opinions in an atmosphere of honest and open inquiry, they will develop greater knowledge and maturity of judgment.

3. Therefore, the freedom of each educator to present within the classroom the truth as he/she understands it in relation to his/her area of professional competence is essential to the purposes of our College and society, and shall continue to be upheld by the Board and the administration.

4. When the educator speaks or writes as a citizen, he/she shall be free from administrative and institutional censorship and discipline. However, the educator has the responsibility to clarify the fact that he/she speaks as an individual and not on behalf of the institution.

5. Visiting Lecturers and Speakers.
   a. Faculty may arrange for classroom lecturers or speakers to appear before regularly scheduled classes or groups of classes.
   b. The faculty member shall be responsible for the relevance of the lecture or speaker's subject matter to the course.

6. Members of the College have freedom to address, question, or criticize, any matter, institutional policy, or practice, whether acting as individuals, or as members of an agency of institutional governance.

7. As public employees, members of the College have a responsibility to refrain from using state resources, including paid classroom time, to engage in partisan advocacy. This does not preclude the discussion of challenging or controversial subjects, nor the discussion of political parties or candidates in the context of the curriculum. It does mean that a member of the college should not use his or her paid position with the college as a means of advancing the interests of a particular political party or candidate.

8. As an institution, the College recognizes the value of exposing students to diverse perspectives, experiences, ideologies, and belief systems. Members of the College are encouraged to value this diversity and integrate it, where appropriate, into their student interactions and instructional design.

**Note – Items 1-6 were presented to the College Assembly in October, 2015 and shared with the president. Items 7 and 8 were drafted by a sub-committee of the Academic Council in spring 2016 to respond to the president's interests to amend the October, 2015 statement.