Campus & Site Services
SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

External Review
Conducted March 5, 2025, through March 7, 2025

Final report submitted on April 7, 2025

Reviewers:

Dr. Anne Suzuki
Vice President of Student Affairs
Paradise Valley Community College

Dr. Daniel K. Cairo
Project Director for Operational Excellence
University of Utah

Jacob Van den Akker
Director of Statewide Academic Advising
Utah State University

Richard A. Díaz
Sr. Director for Orientation and Student Success
Salt Lake Community College

External Review Report

Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) conducts a five-year review of its functions, adhering to the Northwest Commission on College and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation standards. The Campus and Site Services department, led by Dr. Taunya Dressler and Javon Southwell, recruited four reviewers to provide feedback on their services and structure. Reviewers received a self-study before their three-day visit, during which they interviewed over 60 stakeholders (see Appendix A) and toured various campus locations in the North and South SLCC regions.

What follows is a summary of the reviewer's observations and recommendations for improvement. Recommendations are organized in a spectrum ranging from short-term solutions to suggestions requiring a significant shift to implement, the latter of which requires substantial support for viability.

Section 1: Clarify the Department's Purpose and Scope

The review team aimed to assess and provide recommendations on the department's mission and scope, addressing the accumulation of misaligned responsibilities. The goal was to identify core functions and areas for divestment, ensuring resource allocation aligns with college objectives.

Through this review process, it was clear that staff are dedicated to supporting student questions and needs, demonstrating a strong commitment to providing essential resources and services. They are aware of the specific demands of students and faculty and propose creative solutions for improvements. Furthermore, staff are in-house experts for each site and go above and beyond to meet the unique needs of each campus. There is a demonstrated commitment to the core mission of supporting faculty, students, and academics.

On the other hand, campus partners face communication challenges due to unclear terminology and a lack of understanding of departmental services. A lack of campus-specific strategies or a comprehensive strategic plan for the sites results in inconsistent procedures and responsibilities. Resource limitations and underfunding exacerbate these issues. Responsibilities for event support are ambiguous, leading to service quality and staffing inconsistencies. Similarly, the faculty support functions of the department are egregiously misaligned and would be better housed in Academic Affairs. A sentiment faculty leadership also supported. Lastly, incongruences between Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Business Services and inefficient processes hinder departmental operations and communication.

The review team also noted external factors that could impact the recommendations' progress. First, limited resources may prevent the department from effectively fulfilling its purpose and scope. This, coupled with a lack of clear accountability, can lead to inefficiencies, poor service delivery, and disgruntled staff. Additionally, a culture of negativity and apathy could undermine any change management efforts, strategic initiatives, and overall employee satisfaction. Lastly, external pressures, such as changing student demographics, technological advancements, and impending budget changes, may further challenge the department's purpose and scope, necessitating proactive and adaptive strategies to mitigate these threats.

Recommendations:

Theme	Suggested Actions
Define, map, and communicate campus services	**Short-term:** • Develop a website for each SLCC region. Include Campus and Site Services staff information, FAQs for each region, campus profiles, and links to departments represented in each location. **Long-term:** • Map the services available or needed at each campus, clearly outlining the departments responsible for the service (i.e., an elevator is broken at the South City Campus who should someone call). Address gaps in service delivery and inform campus partners of who is responsible for what service widely. • Clearly define the ideal services associated with each campus and/or site and the rationale behind why a consistent service is needed. The rationale should be tied to enrollment trends, location, and/or purpose of the site/campus.
Realign faculty support structures	**Short-term:** • Have adjunct faculty use their own laptops and work with OIT to teach them how to use SLCC's Virtual Private Network. **Long-term:** • Transfer the laptop check-out process for adjunct faculty to academic departments under the purview of associate deans. • If the above is not feasible, explore the possibility of transferring faculty support responsibilities to the Faculty Development department or another relevant academic unit. Alternatively, explore the possibility of combining faculty support with classroom support, establishing a single point of contact at each campus. • Eliminate the entire adjunct faculty laptop checkout process.
Standardize policies and optimize resources	**Short-term:** • Ensure processes and guidelines mirror each other across regions to "tune" services across the two Campus and Site Services departments (e.g., regular cross-regional meetings,

	operational guidelines, event set up guidelines, laptop checkouts, etc.). • Establish a baseline of services, resources, and expectations to be consistently available at every location (e.g., front desks able to print transcripts, help set up appointments, provide coffee and snacks for students, etc.). **Long-term:** • Conduct a job description, position and competency assessment for service delivery and fit in the operational unit. • Empower local campuses to identify and implement specific resources and services that cater to their unique needs, building on the established baseline services, resources, and expectations (e.g., soft sleep surfaces at Westpointe, communication radios for staff managing multiple buildings in Jordan, etc.). • Invest in professional development for full-time professionals, especially Campus Site and Services managers, to enhance their leadership skills in decision-making, delegation, and empowerment. This will ensure they have the autonomy to stay mission-focused and resource-conscious. • Conduct a comprehensive skills gap assessment, identifying strengths and areas for development in both hard and soft skills, ensure employees' strengths align with the role maximizing their contributions.
Clarify expectations and streamline operations	**Short-term:** • Reduce or eliminate "rotational" in-person services at each site in favor of full-time in-person presence or virtual opportunities to serve students at the sites (see Section 4 for ideas). • Empower front-desk staff at the sites to effectively triage students and to communicate effectively with campus partners. • Create standard operating procedures for common questions and referrals. • Seek regular student and campus partner input to align departmental service delivery with expectations. Addressing myths as necessary.

	Long-term:
	• Create a clear scope of what the Campus Site and Services department is expected to provide. Expectations and perceptions might differ from functionality and authority. Examples of misaligned expectations include conflicts with facilities, classroom support, OIT, event services, and with processes owned by Student Affairs.
	• Shed or embrace expectations. If shedding expectations is the decision, consolidation and awareness of who those expectations fall to must be clarified. If embracing expectations, then coordination from a point of authority needs to be initiated by the department.

Section 2: Refine the Department's Organizational Structure

The review team evaluated the organizational structure of the department. The review team's evaluation and inquiry centered on redefining leadership roles, clarifying lines of authority, and redistributing responsibilities.

The review team noted strengths such as campus and site managers having operational titles that align with institutional expectations for leadership. The team acknowledges that these positions were recently upgraded and validates the efforts that went into this process. The current operational structure also allows for some level of decentralized operations to address the unique needs of each SLCC campus.

However, the team observed weaknesses within the current structure. The relationships and trust placed in the previous regional directors were crucial for their work, and their departure (along with changes from the pandemic) led to challenges for new directors who lacked those relationships and influence. The difficulty in adapting to changes in organizational structure, compounded by the reliance on relationships as the foundation, has impeded progress, and this has contributed to inconsistencies in the services offered at each site, which has been attributed to a lack of structure rather than intentional omissions. Left unexamined, this tension will make it significantly harder for individuals and teams to move towards any new model. Moreover, the assistant dean role given to the directors inadequately supports the Dean of Students and complicates everyone's workload. The placement of Faculty Support within Student Affairs is misaligned, as their work is primarily a function of Academic Affairs. Additionally, siloing between departments hinders communication and collaboration, and unclear authority, overlapping responsibilities (especially for event support), undefined roles, and resistance to change efforts risk director burnout.

Recommendations:

Theme	Suggested Actions
Empower leadership and redefine authority at each region	**Short-term:** • Empower directors with the authority to approve or deny operational suggestions from site managers, removing the need to defer decisions to the AVP or executive cabinet. Site managers often have the best ideas because they are directly engaged with the day-to-day operations and are grounded in the experiences they encounter on the front line. Directors should be able to leverage these insights and have the autonomy to act on them without unnecessary delays or perceived blockages from senior leadership. • Remove assistant dean responsibilities from the director role. If these responsibilities must remain, then we suggest expanding the work to site managers instead of solely the directors. **Long-term:** • Establish defined lines of authority, clear decision-making responsibilities, and communicate a structure where relationships support the work of the department. This contrasts with the current expectation that relationships *are* the structure through which the department operates. • Consider new titles for regional directors to better reflect their roles. • Include directors in strategic decision-making meetings to ensure front-line insights from the sites are represented, and as way to give leadership at the sites clarity on how to move forward. Ensure and invest in directors' ability to engage properly in these discussions. • Create career ladders and opportunities for advancement and growth for part-time staff. For example, you can differentiate between specialists 1, 2, and 3, and create a program associate position to serve as a team lead with additional responsibilities and authority. • Consolidate leadership by having one director oversee both regions while empowering site managers to lead at the sites — possibly promoting two managers to assistant directors.

	Reassigning the second director to supporting the Dean of Students' case load.
Optimize organizational alignment and communication	**Short-term:** • Create cross-functional teams to address specific issues or projects at the region that require interdepartmental collaboration. • Establish clear communication channels between units (i.e., event support, classroom support, OIT, faculty development, facilities, etc.) to facilitate collaboration and strong partnerships. **Long-term:** • Remove event support responsibilities from Campus and Site Services' scope of work. Consider creating a stand-alone and centralized event support department reporting through Business Services. • Narrow non-Student Affairs responsibilities to reduce confusion among roles and partners. Begin by reassessing the placement of faculty support, as it may be more effective outside the current department given the reporting lines for classroom support, OIT, and facilities (see Section 1 for ideas).

Section 3: Develop Clear Metrics for the Department

The third task of the review team was to assist department leaders in developing clear metrics for their area. The review team's inquiry focused on developing clear departmental metrics to assess service effectiveness and inform strategic resource allocation.

The department's dedication to student success is a core strength, as shown by its desire to use data. However, undefined metrics result in inconsistent data and reactive reporting, hindering performance assessment and impact demonstration. Without data, there's no evidence of meaningful influence. Data resistance impedes progress. Opportunities exist to implement data-driven strategies, but threats like data inaccuracy and resistance to change must be addressed. Therefore, aligning data collection and analysis with the division's strategic goals and the college's overall institutional strategy is essential for demonstrating the department's contributions to student success and ensuring its efforts drive the institution forward.

Failure to address data deficiencies will undermine the department's mission. The current lack of data integrity foreshadows a future plagued by resource mismanagement, operational inefficiencies, and a growing disconnect between strategic goals and actual outcomes. Building a

robust data infrastructure and overcoming resistance is essential to realize the department's potential and ensure long-term viability. Immediate, decisive action is required to mitigate these threats.

Recommendations:

Theme	Suggested Actions
Align performance metrics for strategic growth	**Short-term:** • Establish a consistent set of metrics for tracking key performance indicators (KPIs) across all regions. • Develop regular reporting systems to provide timely insights into key performance areas. **Long-term:** • Develop a strategic growth plan for each campus.
Cultivate data-driven decision making	**Short-term:** • Standardize data collection through defined metrics and consistent measurement as a way to enable targeted interventions aligned with strategic goals. • Provide basic staff training on data importance. • Use data to inform decisions about resource allocation, such as staffing levels and equipment purchases. **Long-term:** • Invest in advanced data analytics tools and training. • Foster a data-driven culture.
Enhance service quality through continuous assessment	**Short-term:** • Establish feedback loops. Develop formalized methods for collecting student feedback on how they perceive the service at each campus. Regular reviews of these metrics and feedback will ensure that services are meeting student needs and expectations. • Begin a targeted needs assessment. • Include Net Promoter Score (NPS) tracking in every campus event to establish baseline data for student satisfaction

	• Conduct an environmental impact report and consider conducting a financial impact study.
	
	• Develop service availability and accessibility metrics. These are designed to track how easily students can access resources at different campuses. This includes understanding service hours, availability of staff (virtual or physical), and how well students are connected to the services they need (using virtual or physical means). Other considerations include:
	
	    ○ Response time to student inquiries (both virtual and in-person)
	    ○ Student satisfaction ratings on services (via surveys)
	    ○ Number of services provided in-person vs. virtually
	    ○ Success rate of resolving student issues via triage or remote services
	    ○ Frequency of services offered (e.g., "two in-person support days per campus each month")
	
	Long-term
	
	• Incorporate a comprehensive assessment model into the onboarding process to establish assessment as a core responsibility for all employees.

Section 4: Strengthen Cross-Departmental Collaborations

Most of the on-site visit was spent interviewing departmental partners to provide leadership with recommendations on how to strengthen their cross-departmental and divisional collaborations. The review team's questions focused on ways to enhance communication between departments and streamline services across the regions.

Challenges observed by the reviewing team include confusion among Student Affairs directors regarding regional director roles, with some viewing them as extensions of their offices. This misalignment between expectations and the realities of what the department is empowered to do leads to inefficiencies. Additionally, a lack of consistent communication across departments results in missed opportunities for collaboration, with some departments working together effectively while others struggle due to the absence of formal structures or processes. Furthermore, there are indications of a divisive attitude between some departments hindering partnerships. Lastly, overlapping responsibilities further contribute to confusion and a lack of accountability.

The following threats were noted during the review team's visit. A persistent siloed mentality from staff will prevent effective partnerships and lead to inefficiencies. Resistance to collaboration will hinder efforts to improve teamwork and must be addressed. Finally, conflicting priorities between departments and a lack of motivation from leadership for cross-collaboration will further challenge the ability to partner effectively. Addressing these threats will require a concerted effort to foster a culture of cooperation and alignment across the division and institution. Support from the AVP and VP will be essential to implement these recommendations and mitigate these threats.

Recommendations:

Theme	Suggested Actions
Strengthen collaboration and communication structures	**Short-term:** • Support site managers in their role as liaisons to key departments impacting site operations. Be sure to clearly articulate the rationale for this initiative as a way to gather buy-in from campus partners. • Establish formal structures and processes to facilitate cross-departmental collaboration. This could take the form of regular campus meetings, joint committees, or shared projects. • Improve communication channels with campus partners by implementing clear communication protocols, using shared technology platforms, and promoting open communication and regular feedback on services. **Long-term:** • Explore more structure for campus partners at the sites through MOUs or written agreements/guidelines that are revisited as needed. This recommendation will also support succession planning and reduce dependence on established relationships to facilitate business. • Clearly define roles and responsibilities of the Campus Site and Services department (see Section 1 for ideas) to eliminate overlap and improve employee accountability, fostering better collaboration. • Promote a culture of collaboration at each site by emphasizing the importance of teamwork, recognizing collaborative efforts, and providing training for all partners on how to work together.

Formalize regional director involvement and strengthen decision-making	**Short-term:** • Invite regional directors to attend Enrollment Management and Student Success unit meetings on a frequent basis to provide input and stay aligned with institutional goals. A standing agenda item for both of these meetings could focus on the growth and health of the sites. • Include regional directors in the process of giving feedback around the class schedule for each site, formalizing their presence in currently established feedback mechanisms. • Empower site managers to host (monthly or quarterly) meetings to facilitate communication at each of the campuses, build community, and break down silos. Explore other opportunities to connect in between meetings to sustain these relationships. • Encourage (or ask directors to agree) to include a representative from Campus Site and Services in search committees when replacing employees stationed at the sites or making staffing decisions that could impact the site. This is designed to support new employees in understanding the intricacies of the site, establish key relationships early, and share replacement timelines. **Long-term:** • Engage Student Affairs directors in ongoing conversations and professional development centered on best practices for working in multi-campus systems. This will assist in establishing a shared philosophy and facilitate buy-in for other recommendations.
Enhance service delivery and student support services at the sites	**Short-term:** • Ensure that all Information Desks, including the one at the Taylorsville Redwood Campus, follow the same processes for supporting and triaging students to maintain consistency and efficiency across all campuses. For example, some front-line staff scan *and* notify relevant offices that a document was submitted, while others just scan the document. The lack of notification creates a lapse in how quickly a process is completed. See Section 1 recommendation on "tuning" services across regions.

	Long-term:
	• Create a virtual and synchronous walk-in process for student services at the sites. This will allow students to meet with resources on a walk-in basis even if they are not physically present at the site. This could be done by leveraging technology (i.e., Zoom, Teams, or MySuccess) by creating a walk-in virtual kiosk that is coordinated by front desk staff at the sites and used by front-facing departments like Academic Advising, Financial Aid, or Career Services. • Collaborate with student government to strengthen their presence in advocating for the needs and representing the voices of students at the sites. Leverage the insights from staff in Campus Site and Services to document and communicate student concerns to elected student leaders.

Section 5: Focus on Transfer Student Success (Herriman)

SLCC and the University of Utah (U of U) have a thriving partnership to meet student needs. Staff from both institutions work together positively and complementarily, creating a seamless student transfer experience. Discussions with the review team reveal no distinction between a U of U student and an SLCC student; both institutions view transfer students as shared individuals, aiming to ensure their success. One important takeaway is that while the right people are in place at both institutions, senior leadership needs to provide more precise direction and guidance for future initiatives. A lack of clear identity and direction will lead to an obsolete campus regardless of the population increase in the Herriman Valley.

SLCC and U of U staff have expressed uncertainty about the future academic programs and delivery methods offered at SLCC. There is a need for a clear timeline that specifies which programs will be available, when they will be provided, and whether they will be online or in-person. Since SLCC staff often don't have control over the types of programs offered, this can lead to misalignment. This is complicated by the diversity of intent in enrolling at this campus. In contrast, some students enroll at SLCC to transfer to a U of U program, and others because the Herriman campus location is convenient. Despite these challenges, the partnership between the University and the Herriman community can become a model for the nation. At the same time, there is a caution that if the campus focus becomes too unique, it may become disconnected from the broader SLCC mission. The team emphasized that Campus Sites and Services led the vision and work at Herriman. However, most importantly, an organically formed leadership team was crucial in turning the former SLCC President's vision for the Herriman campus into reality. Credit is due to this team for successfully advancing the project during a leadership transition and a tight timeline to establish the new campus.

Recommendations:

Theme	Suggested Actions
Clarify academic and budgetary decisions	**Short-term:** • Request clear communication from both institutions' presidents about leadership transitions and their impact on the campus' vision. • Determine whether to update the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or continue with the current agreement, ensuring it reflects the current leadership's vision and goals. **Long-term:** • Seek transparency from both SLCC and the U of U regarding academic programs and budget allocations affecting the Herriman Campus.
Increase marketing efforts for Herriman Campus	**Short-term:** • Develop targeted marketing campaigns to inform potential students about the seamless transfer opportunities available at the Herriman Campus. • Continue to invite U of U and SLCC staff to the Herriman Campus as a way to foster collaboration and increase awareness of the opportunities it offers students. **Long-term:** • Allocate resources to promote the Herriman Campus, highlighting its unique partnership between SLCC and U of U.
Empower local leadership for program development	**Long-term:** • Foster agility in program development to respond to evolving educational demands and student needs. • Enable leaders at the campus to proactively create and adapt programs tailored to transfer students' needs. • Encourage collaboration between SLCC and U of U faculty and staff to ensure curriculum alignment and support student success.

Section 6: Redefine Community Engagement (West Valley)

SLCC's West Valley Center serves as a vibrant educational and community hub, offering General Education, English as a Second Language (ESL), workforce, college readiness classes, and various academic and cultural events designed to enrich and engage students and community members. The center houses the Dream Center, which is dedicated to supporting undocumented students, and the Center for Community Knowledge. Situated in one of Utah's most diverse and rapidly growing communities, the West Valley Center embodies, like no other initiative, SLCC's commitment to inclusivity and community engagement.

The Center thrives under the leadership of a visionary, problem-solving site manager who thinks outside the box to address challenges and create opportunities. All the staff at the center are deeply connected to the community it serves, including immigrant and refugee populations. The center strongly focuses on community education and actively cultivates meaningful partnerships. The dedicated staff brings expertise in culturally relevant programming, particularly in supporting Latinx students and their families, ensuring that services reflect the needs and values of the community. Their unwavering commitment to the institutional mission and values is matched by an incredible work ethic and a powerful vision for what the campus can become: a model for innovation and community engagement.

However, the center faces several challenges. A notable concern is operational ambiguity, characterized by a lack of detailed information on how daily programs align with the division's and the college's strategic goals. This includes unclear scopes, metrics, and resource allocation strategies, leading to scattered efforts that serve the community without a well-defined central mission. Additionally, while the center engages with the community, there is an absence of a clearly defined assessment of specific needs, which hampers the ability to tailor programs effectively. Communication issues further compound these challenges, with unclear reporting purposes and technological hurdles hindering the effective dissemination of the center's successes. Financial constraints also pose a significant obstacle, as insufficient funding to sustain programs leads to potential mission creep and confusion with the work of the Community Relations unit in the Government and Community Relations division. Furthermore, class scheduling could be optimized for broader student access and space utilization.

The West Valley Center's growth faces significant threats. A primary concern is its heavy reliance on the manager for critical execution and oversight, creating a single point of failure. This dependence makes the setup fragile and susceptible to disruption if the manager transitions to a new role. Additionally, there is a noticeable shift in primary activities away from the day-to-day operations that Campus and Site Services manage at other locations, adding to the confusion regarding the department's scope of work. The center also follows a "lone wolf" philosophy that feels deeper than being siloed, where the preservation of differences has become the strategy adopted by staff. Compounding these issues, the center operates out of a leased building with substantial underutilized space. While this presents expansion opportunities, it also poses financial and logistical challenges. Lastly, the center's proximity to the Taylorsville Redwood Campus may lead to overlapping services and resource competition, potentially hindering its distinct identity and growth.

Recommendations:

Theme	Suggested Actions
Strengthen data-driven decision making and strategic alignment	**Short-term:** • Invest in staff training for data-driven assessment to improve their proficiency in data collection, analysis, reporting on metrics, and making data-driven decisions. Training should start at the director level and permeate throughout the department. **Long-term:** • Strengthen staff capabilities in data analysis and assessment. See Section 3 for ideas. • Develop a clear strategic plan for the center aligned with SLCC goals, using data and feedback for informed decision-making. • Utilize data and institutional metrics to identify improvement areas and demonstrate impact.
Optimize organizational structure and community engagement	**Short-term:** • Leverage attendance at high-profile West Valley Center events to advertise future programs and collect information on the future needs of attendees. • Collect participant information and create a communication campaign as a way to sustain partnerships with the community. **Long-term:** • Consider moving the supervision of the Center for Community Knowledge to the Community Relations unit. Alternatively, have the manager report to the Community Relations unit and elevate a specialist in the Center to support the day-to-day operations at West Valley. This may assist in better aligning the community-focused work to a unit whose mission is community engagement and has the resources and expertise to move it forward.

Appendix A: List of Interviewees

Student Affairs Leadership Team (SALT)
- Dr. Brett Perozzi, VP of Student Affairs
- Curt Larsen, Assistant VP of Student Services
- Candida Mumford, Dean of Students
- Shannon McWilliams, Senior Director of Planning and Implementation

Campus and Site Services North Region Leadership Team
- Javon Southwell, Director, Campus & Site Services/Asst Dean of Students
- Gina Alfred, Manager, Campus & Site Services (Westpointe)
- Cheer Mackay, Manager, Campus & Site Services (South City)
- Erika Maness, Manager, Faculty & Event Support (South City)
- Idolina Quijada, Manager, Campus & Site Services (West Valley)
- Angelee Hope, Administrative Assistant (both North & South groups)

Campus & Site Services South Region Leadership Team
- Taunya Dressler, Director, Campus & Site Services/Asst Dean of Students
- Susie Garcia, Assistant Director, Campus & Site Services (Herriman)
- Nate Chrysler, Manager, Faculty Support & Site Services (Redwood)
- Ashley Noble, Manager, Campus & Site Services (Miller/Jordan)
- Allison Putnam, Manager, Campus & Site Services (Jordan)

Student Success, Enrollment Management, Dean of Student Units
- Ella Aho, Director, Career Services
- Kate Gildea-Broderick, Senior Director of Admissions
- Ologa Iopu, Registrar
- Brandi Mair, Director, Contact Center
- Anni Tedder, Senior Director of Academic Advising
- Jody Katz, Senior Director of Accessibility and Disability Services[1]

Public Safety, Events, & Facilities
- Josh Sylvester, Associate VP, Facilities Services
- MJ Thompson, Senior Director, Facilities
- Heather Lynes, Coordinator, Event Scheduling

Academic Affairs
- David Brower, Director of Scheduling

---

[1] Provided comments to the review team via email

- Alia Criddle, Interim Director for Faculty Development
- Kristin Morley, Assistant Director for Faculty Development
- ESL representative

South City Tour & Conversation
- Josh Elstein, Director, Center for Arts & Media
- Representative from ADS

Jordan Tour & Conversation
- Ahmad Varedi, Director, Student Centers
- Sarah Mata, Advisor, College Recruitment Admissions
- Fernando Alzerreca, Assistant Director, Financial Aid
- Cynthia Bonsall, Assistant Director, Academic Advising
- Nancy Giraldo, Coordinator, Orientation & Student Success
- Miriam Caine, Specialist, Scheduling & Events

Herriman Leadership Team
- Mike Young, Associate Dean, General Education (SLCC)
- Susie Garcia, Assistant Director, Campus & Site Services (SLCC)
- Leilani Clegg, Director, Transfer Articulation (SLCC)
- David Brower, Director, Scheduling (SLCC)
- Jason Taylor, Assistant Dean, Transfer Student Success (U of U)
- Devon Darland, Director, Herriman Campus (U of U)

SLCC & U of U Teams
- Eric Christensen, Student Services Specialist (SLCC)
- Victor Zamorano, Faculty & Event Support Specialist (SLCC)
- Lauren Lowther, Career Services Advisor (SLCC)
- Kathi Beecher, Financial Aid Advisor (SLCC)
- Luz Gamarra, Academic Advisor (SLCC)
- KT Finney, Community Engagement (U of U)
- Jose Morales Diaz, Student Affairs (U of U)

West Valley Campus Internal Campus Partners
- Idolina Quijada, Manager Campus & Site Services
- Olga Hernandez-Favela, Coordinator, Community Engagement
- Brenda Santoyo, Manager, Dream Center
- Chris

West Valley Community Engagement Partnerships | WVC 105/107
- Connie Yengich, Women's Business Center, SLC Chamber of Commerce
- Gloria Arredondo, Victims Advocate/Mexican Consulate
- Crystal Griffin, Real Estate Agent
- Kimberly Padilla, Cyprus Credit Union

- A representative from the Mexican Consulate

North/South Region Part-Time Staff
- Brandon Quist, Student Services Specialist (Westpointe)
- Sandy Aeschilman, Student Services Specialist (Westpointe)
- Emily Carhuaricra, Student Services Specialist (West Valley)
- Ray Jewell, Student Support Specialist (South City)
- Nate Richie, Faculty Support Specialist (South City)
- Lindsey Bell, Faculty Support Specialist (Redwood)
- Daniel Pittam, Student Services Specialist (Jordan)
- Ashlyn Arvizu, Faculty Support Specialist (Jordan)
- Sarah Bangerter, Student Services Specialist (Miller)
- Tiffany Ballard, Faculty Support Specialist (Herriman)