College Council Minutes
June 13, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Boardroom

Present: Chris Rehn, Brian Kelly, Margaret Hamilton, Jim Salt, Pat Griffin, Craig Taylor, Wilgen Brown, Jessica Alvarado, & Elizabeth Andrade

Minutes: Tami Hill

TOPIC	SPEAKER(S)
Agenda Review/Approval	Council
Prior Minutes Approval • 4/11/18 • 4/25/18 • 5/9/18 • 5/23/18 Proposal: Table for the first meeting in the fall. - **PASSED** Previous meeting minute taker will work with current meeting minute taker over the summer to put the minutes in the right format and bring the corrected versions to the fall meeting.	Council
IEC UPDATE IEC is drafting their first Mission Fulfillment & Institutional Effectiveness Report. Part I The first part discussing the college's core themes and the work with the indicators, criteria, and threshold we established for each of the objectives. There's a summary of findings and connection to plans for improvement from our existing strategic plan, enrollment growth plan, and other areas. At the end we have a quantitative assessment as to whether we've achieved or mission and we haven't yet met our mission's expectations. This is going to be an annual / continuous process for us. Issues identified through this process: Indicators themselves, messiness, questions about data, and also how we identify good thresholds and criteria, so we'll have a process for the coming year. As we work through this we'll be in really good shape for the year 7 accreditation visit. And, hopefully by then we'll be able to say that we're meeting our mission expectations. Part II The Institutional Effectiveness Report is an assessment of our institutional effectiveness and planning systems and structures. We're	Steele

evaluating ourselves 3 ways:

1. Progress towards core theme achievement with the understanding that if we have effective systems and structures we should be achieving or making progress towards our core themes.

2. Developed a rubric based on new que's, some rubrics they provided to us, and also California AJC… and seeing how there's four levels from initial awareness to development or merging systems and structures, to proficiency & sustainable continuous quality improvement.

3. Feedback from system input. So, all the reports that came to the IEC, progress on plans and their outcomes, and a section where there were suggestions for improvement. Then the final are going be some findings and recommendations that we'll share with you, we'll share with the governance task force, and others who are involved in the conversation about our systems and structures.

IEC has two more (optional) meetings this term. I should have a draft available and I'll send it out in *The Weekly* if anyone wants to come and take a look at it. We will present it to the Board at their July meeting and it might be in the work session or a discussion item, and then we'll post it on-line.

Discussion / Comments:

This structurally is highest part, correct? That committee is looking at all the work of the Institutional Effectiveness work, correct? So those are the institutional effectiveness indicators…

Core themes indicators.

That's a deeper dive. We need to make sure that at the highest level we have the highest institutional level first, then the core theme indicators; Retention and enrollment is at the highest level when the team comes here. Then how we get there is the core themes.

Institutional effectiveness indicators aren't desegregated at the highest level they represent the whole.

We don't have that as an established summary construct, that could be one of the recommendations that comes forward is that we build that in – we just have the core themed indicators.

I would like to commend the core theme teams, the groups of 6 to 8

people from across the college, who worked really hard this year with their indicator, their core themes, and their own objectives in each of the indicators. They worked very hard.

When there's a recommendation for us to do something, where does that go?

That's an excellent question. Initially it's going to the Board for conversation and some of the recommendations are related to our planning systems and structures, so that's part of CC, Governance Task Force, Cabinet, and Executive Team conversations. | |
| Learning Plan – Christina Howard, Chair of Learning Plan Development Subcommittee.

Follow-up on an earlier request wherein we didn't have a chance to respond. Learning Council is asking us to make a series of either decisions or provisions and advice.

Learning Council has spent at least the last 3 years trying to create a learning plan. Not only create a plan but also to evaluate its effectiveness which led to some resources to what is the learning plan and how will it serve Lane in the interim of the strategic plan that was brought forth by the college.

Research was done and we looked at the intent of the plan, we have some institutional indicators that drive the work. What we arrived at is that we are going to look at a learning plan, some places it's called an academic master plan. We chose not to call it that because we wanted to be mindful of the non-credit side of learning at Lane.

We came up with: If we're all working towards quality teaching at lane, if that's what drives the learning plan, then the learning plan is the means by which guides the implementation of strategies that leads us to those schools.

Facilities Council and Technology Council we saying we have a plan too that we need to do too, but we're not really comfortable moving forward until we know what the Learning Council is going to do because it doesn't make sense for us to make plans on infrastructure, buildings, technology, on-line education support; we don't know what directions the learning plan. – Then there was talk about how we need to have a shared vision, but how do we do it.

This structure has evolved over time. Where the Learning Plan is strategic in its language and in its prioritization, operations, etc. It will analyze and access the effectiveness of the Learning Plan – which is great but also sounds like college level work and not necessarily in the | Howard / Steele |

Learning Council as we are currently structured, and now we're talking about how governance is structured.

Concerns about this are:
- Faculty voice
- How we envision things and how we prioritize our work.
- Having a Learning Plan and we have this position of privacy and what does that do to the other governance councils? Does it make them invisible? How do they get to influence that?
- If the Learning Plan is in charge of the Learning Council, and we have this type of lineal arrangement, what happens to those other groups?

Other concerns:
- Institutional effectiveness (that body) and what do they do, how do they make a decision? How do they make recommendations?
- How does it go to governance?
- How does it go to the Learning Council?
- It's supposed to go to CC but how does it get disseminated to other groups? Are those decisions to be voted on and implemented by council?

This type of vision, we support as a Learning Council. Where our concerns are is that the guiding principal that we developed around it, that those might get lost or co-opted or shifted if it gets elevated to a college level plan into a structure where right now there is a distinctively less faculty voice.

Also, if this is the way it goes, what would be the role of the Learning Council? If this is in-fact a structure we adopt, then what would the Learning Council be and how would it effect the arrangement of the other groups?

The other point is that we do have a strategic plan and there's some good content here that we don't want to ignore. Through our research we've gotten lots of feedback and a lot of enrollment by having a more simplified structure for vision and pushing work down. We don't want to get ahead of Governance Task Force. Another thing to consider, Moorpark CC, we've found their Master Accountability (?) Plan. We really like that format and it resonates with the members of the Learning Council and are expanding conversations.

One option to pursue is to continue to work on developing that model for Lane. We need an academic plan or millennial plan. We can continue working on building out that structure and then be ready to see what evolves with the Governance Task Force and then we'd still be

positioned to have an Academic Plan working with V.P., ASA, and then see what makes sense as to how it fits in.

Comments/Questions:

What makes this strategic plan work and others didn't? What makes this different?

Response: I believe this is the strategic plan. I believe this should be the model for the strategic plan, and what your noticing is that cycles work within governance councils and having those plans not really lead to implementation, access, or assessment, was a major barrier to the institution. The strategic plan got college-wide input but in terms of governance roles and developing that plan, and developing strategies, actions and assessments around that plan, was very limited.

Was what motivated the Learning Plan development due to the fact that it was viewed as a way to carry out some of the strategic plan initiatives, or was it in response to a lack of a functional plan in which case the efforts really need to be invested in overarching strategic plan making that whole workable plan?

The later. The last Learning Plan was 2006 and was largely by exploring and was never referenced or assessed as an issuance to move forward particularly on the academic side. I can't tell if the Learning Council from that time had decided on any indicators and were looking at those exploratory goals and assessing whether or not the plan was driving those strategies.

In response to question one, **do you support continuing with the expanded vision of the Learning Plan**? While we have emerging conversations with what's going on in governance to define the roles as it relates to the core themes and the core them indicators, my preference would be to move the Learning Council more into an academic master plan and have them complete that work.

And on question number two, **should CC commission the Learning Council to work on an overarching strategic plan for the college?** I'm therefore implying no. I'd love to see a master plan that we could make seamlessly with the work that's going on.

Comment: It's hard to have this type of discussion when the agenda is sent to late. I would like to have more time and bring fresh information. At this point I don't remember exactly what the plan contains.

Second, this plan has been presented to all the councils however, I don't think it's another presentation of the stuff that we have here at the schools buying into the product. We have about 1,000 employees I

believe, and only 100 employees have seen this. That's not even 1% of the school. We need to present it to more people.

Third, informal controversy, in some of the other councils and other people outside, don't think that this is a master plan; it needs more components. This is a plan for the Learning Council but not the overreaching all the college.

Fourth, I agree with Christine that the previous plans and the councils haven't taken us to any consistent work that guides the college. We should ask for strategic plans from each of the councils and then put together all those plans in a large strategic plan for the college, but we should start next year with this idea.

My answer to the questions are: **[We need information as to the items being referenced]**
#1 – Needs more information.
#2 – No at this point, I don't think we are ready.
#3 – Yes, we need to expand it so VP of ASA has more time to inform himself.
#4 – No. I think it's time for us to be more transparent and develop some criteria for every group that we want to have do some work. Every time that we need to create a group there needs to be a criteria and a system of bringing back the information back to the people we're representing.

The idea of an educational institute having it's strategies dictated by a Learning Plan is worth exploring and I would be interested in seeing the Learning Council continue their work and bringing that information, and how that might impact, to the governance Task Force and see how me might adjust things. It's definitely worth pursuing.

Process points. We've been asked to for advice as council not as individual members and the goal therefore should be to make a decision. Short of a decision, we should bring this up at the next meeting.

The college council isn't ready to make a decision about this today therefore we may need to table it until the fall. I also don't think the college was ready for it. I think that it was presented to a lot of people and got a lot of feedback, but there are many questions.

Learning Council could come back to CC in the fall with an idea and a timeline of how we can continue moving forward with adopting some of those things that really work with the Moorpark concept which aren't in any dis-alignment with the themes and visions that are emerging.   One idea we can do is to think about how we might continue moving forward with the work in a structured way that would

help us stay on track.

They aren't mutually exclusive and we owe it to our students and institution to work towards a plan. If we can't have a plan then we're going to be ineffective at reaching our mission. That work must continue and if the process somehow becomes inconsistent then we reevaluate the system.

In the interest of wrapping up, formal invite proposals:

Proposal: Look at question 3 and extend the timeline.
Further discussion on the proposal? FAILED

Amended question: Should Learning Council we come back to you in the fall with a proposed timeline, scope of work, and work plan, for the coming academic year that's mindful of this conversation and the parallel work that's happening?

Expanded vison of the learning plan has to be reined in to look more like an academic master plan and I don't believe that Learning Council should be empowered by CC to develop a new overarching strategic plan. I also believe that this work has to coordinate and be developed at the same time as IEC and the Governance Task Force.

Proposal: The Learning Council coordinate their efforts to develop a learning plan that aligns with an academic master plan model and that the college council direct the learning council not to create an overarching strategic plan. Also propose that we align this work concurrently with IEC and the Governance Task Force work.

Discussion/Comments

First, most of us are sitting in the middle. We need to tease it out. With #2, we commission them to develop an overarching strategic plan – No. We need to talk about this more.

The second thing is there's a practicality in these decisions. There's a basic need to have an academic vision within the overarching vision which is why I'm a little concerned that we keep putting it off. Learning Council needs to focus on the learning, what are we going to spend our money on and our resources and build our buildings for support.

What was expectation for it to go into effect?

1 year ago.

I definitely don't want a facilities master plan driving our academic master plan.

What are you using to develop this plan?

We've had deadlines two years in a row and we've made no progress. This should be an academically driven learning plan. In the absence of that plan for the past 3 or 4 years what does the rest of the college do? That's an excellent question.

If we're going proceed both trying to address some of the questions we need to address maybe narrowing it in some way so it doesn't have to address questions it doesn't need to address, moving it forward in ways where it's the minimum and maximum version of it so that at a minimum we can identify what can move forward with unproblematic outcomes, then identify those things the group wants to move forward that require more attention to other moving parts, then it seems to me that that's the best we can do at this point.

In our charter for the Learning Council it says that we are chartered to create a learning plan and assess its effectiveness. We were getting stuck at what does the Learning Plan represent in the grander structure of the college. If we got the direction to right-size it for the coming year, if could identify that the writing plan in this context is the academic master plan then the is Learning Council would be continuing to do its work to drafting ideas around that plan as the work that it does, it's within its charter, its faculty work and also be mindful of being looped in to these conversations with the governance, CC, and IEC as to what do we call the final product? If we call the final product something and within that there's an academic master plan component, or maybe it does elevate to what you saw in the diagram, it doesn't need to be decided now. But, if we can frame it as academic and focus on the academic side of that plan in the next year then I don't know that there is a decision other than we won't be leading these conversations around what the Learning Council represents structurally, and continue to work on academic master plans developments.

Amendment to the Proposal: Break it down to each component and vote on each item. **PASSED**

That's where I was struggling. It sounded like there were 3 or 4 big decisions being made and one proposal.

Further discussion – None

1st Part of the Proposal: The College Council to instruct the Learning Council to align the Learning Plan to look like an academic master plan. **PASSED**

<u>Discussion</u>

Academic master plan doesn't preclude us from looking at all areas of the college reaches with regards to education, so I don't think that's inconsistent with the angle. In fact, we would have to look at the continuing education and extended learning pieces.

2nd Part of the Proposal:
CC would instruct Learning Council not to develop the overarching strategic plan which we have so that we can look at a timeline within that proposal.

<u>Discussion</u>

Restate what we're talking about, I'm sorry.

We're looking at limiting the scope of work and setting a timeline for the Learning Council as we have other concurrent plans working: Facilities Master Plan, long range financial plans, IEC, Governments Task Force, etc. My advice is sooner is better but we also need to give them the time they need.

I do believe that the Learning Council shouldn't proceed with the developing this overall vision until they have been instructed to do so, but I'm also no comfortable with telling them not to do something and ultimately they don't have the authority to enact something like that.

The forum of the discussion of those conversations, is it right here only, is it within CC only, and is it in all of the councils, the whole community?

This council has the authority but we would need to have a broad conversation, before we would feel comfortable making a decision.

It seems like there's going to be a fair amount of transition with membership in the Learning Council, so it doesn't make sense that they need a turnaround real quickly.

Spring wouldn't be a bad deadline, if everyone would like a deadline for this proposal.

Just to reiterate our offer to come back to you fall term with a work plan, timeline, and scope of work aligned with new direction, it likely will be spring.

Call for vote on proposal: FAILED

PROPOSAL: Instruct the Learning Council to align their work with the

Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Governance Task Force. Proposal to table above proposal: PASSED Proposal: To accept the invitation from Christina Howard and Jen Steele to bring further process proposal early in the fall. **PASSED**	
EVENT PLANNING: 5/23/18 *All Council Meeting* Debrief Attendance was decent. Council reports were impressive. First, we can't educate ourselves enough. Whatever our governance system is we need to know what it is. We need to make sure that every council does a review. Second, make sure everyone understands were not out of the woods. Enrollment Growth Plan is a live document and every single council needs to own it and to council needs to see how their council fits. Everyone has a part in it. Lastly, we better understand the system we live in. We'll follow-up with the committee chairs to turn in their reports in writing per the president's request. CC should consider aligning that work with IEC because all the councils provided progress reports and their goals in areas of focus in November.	Council
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS **Governance Subcommittee** What started out as a subcommittee became a Task Force. It's gone above the scope of a subcommittee We still have a governance subcommittee which follows the governance but in addition one theme that kept coming-out as a subcommittee is that we need to be more inclusive and it then became that we need to invite a Task Force. The Sub Committee is a regularly meeting body its semi-permanent department, the Task Force we've used as a group we've established for a specific purpose, its temporary, and when it completes its work it's done. Both are subcommittees of CC who also approves the membership which is my primary consideration today. I want to be clear, this remains a government task force of CC – Correct? The subcommittee is charged to do the evaluation but even amongst the subcommittee members themselves, there seems to be some	Council

consensus that we need more information but once you do that you're not subcommittee anymore – that's my understanding. It becomes a Task Force that informing the recommendations that comes to them.

So, to be clear, this Task Force is working within the alignment with subcommittees, it is not the president's Task Force.

That was my confusion as well because at the last meeting it was my understanding that the president Task Force. It started as a government Task Force and now it's the president's Task Force and CC has members representing in the Task Force and we aren't guiding it, it's being guided by the president's office – that was my understanding and the decision making protocol is going to be decided outside of the governance system.

I didn't' see it that way so let's review. We have a subcommittee that will still meet and they'll reflect what's going on in the Task Force. They'll sit on the Task Force and they'll guide when we were going to meet, what we're going to do next, and hopefully guide the agenda. But the larger Task Force is a task force approved by the subcommittee. I don't see that Task Force as a decision making body, the Task Force is to get information and make sure we are truly being inclusive whether it's surveys, forums, or whatever.

Originally an email we received said that the president has the authority guided by the college policy and that if we are going to fix a governance system problem, we cannot be the body fixing a problem that this body has. If you want to do it outside the governance system to fix the governance system then I'm okay with that. It's just been confusing.

Will you articulate what would be less confusing?

What I heard you say was that this remains a governance subcommittee Task Force that reports to the governance subcommittee that reports to CC.

Who is actually on the governance subcommittee?

I'll need to go back and look.

The language that talks about this is Board Policy 325. It talks about the role of the governance system, the Board, the president to make the decisions. The language reads that every effort will be made to consensus acceptable to all stake holders.

Just since I've been involved in helping facilitate, the conversation we had and my understanding is that this group is commissioned by the

president, the Board has delegated responsibilities through Board policy in that it does operate independently but in concert with the subcommittee. That's not consistent with what the president of the college has said, it's not consistent with the governance system rules and I don't recognize that anyone has the authority to challenge that. I want to do what's best for the college and what's best for the college is to recognize the work of the governance subcommittee and we moved a major mountain by having these Task Force because now we're to the inclusiveness that we need. In Closing: The Policy Subcommittee is simply a note that the committee establishes here and then moves forward in that work and the CC needs to make that a priority at the beginning of this coming year regardless of any changes that are made in the system in the future.	
BRISTOW SQUARE TASK FORCE FOLLOW UP: POLICY PROPOSAL: **USE OF PUBLIC SPACE — 1ST READING** Quick background is that is all started with the anti-abortion event on campus almost a year ago. It was very disturbing to a lot of people, myself included. We knew we had to be better prepared for this type of event. CC is in the best to look at everything related to having outside booths on campus, analyze it and see where we were and where there are any concrete recommendations. What we found was a lot of documents related but nothing that gave us direction on procedures and possibly policies. Our task force did a good job but at the end of the day it was really, now what? We have all this research. What we found was that we understand that freedom of expression is at the top of spectrum and we have to respect freedom of expression but, we equally want to balance the individual rights to and respect the individual rights. So we said that first, any permits that you can get on this campus need to be neutral in content. Second, we need to get away from calling this "freedom of speech" to "use of public spaces". That's what they're doing, using public space. So, at the end of the day someone's going to request to use our space and we need to have procedures in place to do it. First, requests by the non-college sponsored groups will be monitored by an appointed administrator to work with these requests. This means we make sure we have an appointed person who has enough responsibility and works with a higher level executive so we don't miss these types of groups coming on campus – we need to know they're	Hamilton

coming.

Number two, these groups using public spaces will be required to fill out a specific form that asks all the relevant questions, we're calling it a *Facilities Use Permit*, at least 2 weeks prior to the event. The space that's requested on the form will be the only space they will use. It's the process not the content that were approving.

What happened last time is that they changed the date and because they changed the date the right people weren't informed so changing of the date will be addressed in the process. It will read that you can request to change the date but there's no guarantee that you'll get that date. If the date isn't available then they must resubmit and start the process all over again.

There will be a non-refundable deposit because if you trash our square and we have to pay for it then they certainly won't get their deposit back. Now can that be waived for non-profit? Of course but that would be up to the discretion of the administrator but also, in the *Facilities Use Permit* it's going to say that if the college incurs cost whether it be damage, use of public security, etc. with you being here, your group will be invoiced. We may even have preset fees.
Then there was the Inspire issue with communication. The communication statements were basically that we have to go above and beyond, use multiple platforms to inform the college community that a groups going to be on college campus and that's where we inform what the content is so they have time to prepare.

The VP of ASA will appoint a committee. We don't have a group right now that includes student government, counseling, career, gender equity, etc. that will advise us of these decision of appointed groups coming on campus. Public Affairs will establish a website location where outside organizations can access the form and read the criteria. Of course after a controversial visit we would debrief.

Discussions/Comments

Just with the definition of public spaces, I think of public spaces as the classroom as opposed to outside.

Linn Benton had different definitions, one was public spaces, modified public spaces; intentional use spaces, or something like that. They had 3 different categories.

Free speech is one thing but obscene speech is another.

Typically it's very hard to defend against policies that indicate places of free speech as opposed to policies that exclude places of free speech.

Typically a public institution is all free speech except for areas that interfere with our ability to deliver our mission.	
I would look into time places, etc. Hate speech is a protected speech, etc.	
First, what constitutes a college sponsored faculty group? We need some clarity on that term. We don't want this policy to get in the way of the things we do want to have happen on campus.	
Secondly, what about demonstrations? This shouldn't limit them. Public safety shouldn't come and escort them off campus.	
Thirdly, if a group wants to change within 2 weeks, can they decline within the two weeks without being charged? Additionally, we need to define what can and can't be charged.	
Under recommendations about physical and emotional safety, there's a lot to embrace in terms of emotional safety. I'm a firm believer that college should change people and that people should be subjected to ideas that they were unfamiliar with when they got here – I believe that's our mission. I don't believe our mission is to protect people's emotional safety, fundamentally. Foremost, I believe there are limits. We should drop this is the first time in our documents that we have quantified emotional safety.	
Regarding subcommittee, I'd like to recommend that VP of ASA puts together a subcommittee; a group of related people that can be people from the Career Center, Public Safety, etc. these are the people that have the expertise to deal with this stuff and bring forth future modifications. Adding faculty to the group is fine.	
What would be the next steps for *Facilities Use Permit* for approval?	
Bring it back for a second reading in the first meeting in the fall.	
And put it in the language of a policy.	
Focus on the content first at the reading, but also focus on if there's any policy on it. I agree that most of it is procedure.	
Proposal: Bring it back in the fall for 2nd reading – All agreed.	

COLLEGE COUNCIL 2018-2019 CHAIR ELECTION
 	
Eligibility:
   1. Be a member of classified staff, student, or faculty.
   2. Served on the council for one year.
	Council

Nomination: Jessica Alvarado for both criteria. Accepted nomination – Yes Vote: Approved/Unanimously Elected	
MEMBER REPORTS Jim Salt has been on CC since 2004, and this is his last College Council meeting. - THANK YOU JIM!	Council
Adjourned: 4:02 p.m.	Council

Summary/Highlights and Decisions:

1. Approval of minutes past tabled until Fall.

2. Institutional Effectiveness update and plans provided.

3. Learning Plan direction and concerns were presented. Learning Council is seeking direction. Should the learning plan be elevated to a college level plan?

- Moorpark Academic Plan – reviewed by Learning Council is seen as a strong example of what could be considered for Lane. And, this is an option being considered by Learning Council.
- Options being considered –1) Move the Learning Plan into an overall Master Academic Plan? 2) Should College Council commission the Learning Council to work on an overarching strategic plan for the college? Need a copy of the 4 questions that were presented.
- Further discussion of the proposal by Learning Council – was proposed and the motion failed.
- **Proposal:** The Learning Council coordinate their efforts to develop a learning plan that aligns with an academic master plan model and that the college council direct the learning council not to create an overarching strategic plan. Also propose that we align this work concurrently with IEC and the Governance Task Force work.

4. Learning Council Proposals – broken down into 4 parts.

- 1st Part of the Proposal: The College Council to instruct the Learning Council to align the Learning Plan to look like an academic master plan. **PASSED**
- 2nd Part of the Proposal: CC would instruct Learning Council not to develop the overarching strategic plan which we have so that we can look at a timeline within that proposal. Call for vote on proposal: **FAILED**
- 3rd Part of the Proposal: PROPOSAL: Instruct the Learning Council to align their work with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Governance Task Force. Proposal to table above proposal: **PASSED**
- 4th PROPOSAL: Instruct the Learning Council to align their work with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Governance Task Force. Proposal to table above proposal: PASSED

- <u>Proposal:</u> To accept the invitation from Christina Howard and Jen Steele to bring further process proposal early in the fall. **PASSED**

5. All Council meeting debrief:

- Council reports were impressive.
- First, we can't educate ourselves enough. Whatever our governance system is we need to know what it is. We need to make sure that every council does a review.
- Second, make sure everyone understands were not out of the woods. Enrollment Growth Plan is a live document and every single council needs to own it and to council needs to see how their council fits. Everyone has a part in it.
- Lastly, we better understand the system we live in.
- We'll follow-up with the committee chairs to turn in their reports in writing per the president's request.
- CC should consider aligning that work with IEC because all the councils provided progress reports and their goals in areas of focus in November.

6. Governance Sub Committee versus Task Force

- The sub committee – is a semi permanent part of College Council
- The Task Force has been charged with specific responsibilities and is temporary
- Summary – the Task Force reports to the Subcommittee and this committee reports to College Council.

7. Bristow Square Task Force – two conclusions:

- What we found was that we understand that freedom of expression is at the top of spectrum and we have to respect freedom of expression but, we equally want to balance the individual rights to and respect the individual rights. So we said that first, any permits that you can get on this campus need to be neutral in content.
- Second, we need to get away from calling this "freedom of speech" to "use of public spaces". That's what they're doing, using public space. So, at the end of the day someone's going to request to use our space and we need to have procedures in place to do it.
- Action step - requests by the non-college sponsored groups will be monitored by an appointed administrator to work with these requests. This means we make sure we have an appointed person who has enough responsibility and works with a higher level executive so we don't miss these types of groups coming on campus – we need to know they're coming.
- Next directive- these groups using public spaces will be required to fill out a specific form that asks all the relevant questions, we're calling it a *Facilities Use Permit*, at least 2 weeks prior to the event. The space that's requested on the form will be the only space they will use. It's the process not the content that were approving.
- Regarding subcommittee, I'd like to recommend that VP of ASA puts together a subcommittee; a group of related people that can be people from the Career Center, Public Safety, etc. these are the people that have the expertise to deal with this stuff and bring forth future modifications. Adding faculty to the group is fine.
- Bring back in the Fall policy proposal – all agreed.

COLLEGE COUNCIL 2018-2019 CHAIR ELECTION Vote: Jessica Alvarado nominated, accepted and Approved/Unanimously Elected