Date: 04/10/2019
2:00 – 4:00 p.m. Boardroom

College Council Minutes – April 10, 2019

Attendance:

X	Margaret Hamilton President- Vice-Chair	X	Jessica Alvarado - Chair Faculty Council Co-Chair	X	Grant Matthews Manager	X	Chris Rehn Manager
X	Brian Kelly VP Operations	X	Elizabeth Andrade Classified	X	Diego Wilson Student	X	Guests: Steve McQuiddy,
	Paul Jarrell VP ASA	X	Kyle Schmidt Classified				Robin Geyer, Carl Yeh
X	Craig Taylor Assoc Dean ALS	X	Adrienne Mitchell LCCEA President	X	Recorder: Donna Zmolek		

Subjects	Agreements Reached and Actions Taken
Approval of Minutes	Andrade moved to approve the minutes from the March 13, 2019, College Council meeting. Taylor seconded. Motion passed. Kelly abstained. Andrade moved to approve the March 22, 2019, special College Council meeting. Kelly seconded. Motion passed. Wilson abstained.
Current Topics	
Accreditation Leadership Team	Alvarado informed members that Tammie Stark is facilitating the Accreditation Leadership Team. Accreditation is one of the items recommended to be under the purview of College Council. The group discussed having a liaison with the leadership team to keep the council informed. Based on the group discussion Alvarado moved to appoint Paul Jarrell as liaison to the Accreditation Leadership Team and to provide a regular report to College Council. Taylor seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Alvarado asked that a list of members be brought to the next College Council meeting.

	Answer is: https://www.lanecc.edu/accreditation/team-membership-purpose-and-roles Coordinating team: Coordinating Team Membership: Jennifer Frei, Associate Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, Paul Jarrell, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Jen Steele, AVP Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, Tammie Stark, Project Manager, Faculty Technical Writer (TBD). One Faculty Council Appointment Leadership Team: Coordinating Team plus team leads.
Governance Review Update	The council reviewed the updated list of priority recommendations of the Governance Subcommittee. It was suggested that acronyms on number six be spelled out. Hamilton clarified that the section on core themes will not be included in the recommendations since they will not be a part of accreditation. A question on governance training was raised. Alvarado responded that this is something that needs an action plan to provide onboarding for members and especially council leaders. Andrade raised some concerns. The governance system was created for a large group. When the review began, a taskforce was created with representation from several areas. Then the work of the taskforce was discontinued. Andrade reports that many individuals at the college want to know why and are not satisfied with just a few individuals doing this work. That it [sic – Governance Subcommittee] is not representational. Her position is that one of the major issues is the control that the unions have on this work. Mitchell responded that the unions did not ask for the taskforce to be discontinued. The governance taskforce was disbanded outside the influence of the Governance Subcommittee. She reminded Andrade that the priorities are basic recommendations gathered from various sources regardless of the model. Alvarado agreed that the priorities are the result of the various sources of input and are not the work of a five-

person group. Geyer added that the five-person group also includes a faculty and classified member who are not union officers.

Taylor moved to approve the priorities, writing out the abbreviations and removing core themes. Motion did not receive a second.

Schmidt moved to approve the priorities and ask the Governance Subcommittee to prepare a draft work plan to bring to College Council on how it will be implemented over the next year. Rehn seconded, including the changes Alvarado has suggested on the acronyms and core themes.

Alvarado and Kelly noted that the language on number nine would change to read "appoint a representative from the Accreditation Leadership Team to update College Council on a monthly basis."

Motion results. All but three members voted for the motion - Andrade dissented. Wilson voted sideways. Hamilton abstained.

The group discussed and reviewed next steps to take when a consensus cannot be reached. Further discussion ensued in order to strive to reach consensus.

Andrade maintained that the college needs a larger group and more voices to take on the work of the governance system review. Mitchell asked for clarification on which parts of the priorities were problematic. Rehn offered that the list of priorities might have been different if there was a larger representative body.

Andrade asked why the taskforce was disbanded. Hamilton responded that it was not disbanded as much as their basic work was done. The group was charged to bring recommendations by winter term; for efficiency, the work and reviewed by the Governance Subcommittee. Mitchell added that the process was problematic and the taskforce was not functioning well. College Council has an important role at this time in reviewing the basic work. Rehn agreed that

the larger group was inefficient and dysfunctional. Some reports were not started, such as benchmarking other colleges. We should be reviewing best practices.

Andrade suggested forming another taskforce with a clear direction, a smaller number of individuals, and some level of expertise. Mitchell appreciated the idea and noted that the number of people in the taskforce does not contradict the basic recommendations. She asked Andrade and council members to consider the recommendations and determine that it is still possible to move forward on some work while separating out the process for reviewing the governance system. Matthews suggested perhaps bringing additional participants into the Governance Subcommittee for broader representation rather than duplicating the work with another taskforce.

Mitchell asked Andrade if any of the recommendations were objectionable. Andrade responded that the objection is that the work will continue as is to create a governance model. Mitchell clarified that the recommendations are important and will not drive the development of a new system.

Alvarado called for the vote on the prior motion (listed below).

(*Schmidt moved to approve the priorities and ask the governance subcommittee to prepare a draft work plan to bring back to college council for how it will be implemented over the next year. Rehn seconded, including the changes Alvarado has suggested on the acronyms and core themes.*)

Motion results. All members but four voted for the motion. Andrade dissented. Kelly and Wilson voted sideways. Hamilton abstained.

A Majority and Minority report will be sent to Hamilton as stipulated in the governance manual.

Schmidt showed an example of a governance system. This was not a model but a way to guide the work for next steps and a starting point for future

	conversations. The council was not asked to vote on this example. The example included four standing councils: Equity and Social Justice, Student Retention and Success, Classified Senate, and Faculty Senate. These councils would provide recommendations to College Council. This example included standing subcommittees: Budget and Finance, Accreditation, Policy, Campus Infrastructure. Recurring subcommittees would include: SEM, AMP, and FMP. Recommendations for membership of College Council included chairs of other councils, two vice presidents, two management, two faculty, two classified, and two students. The President would be an ex-oficio member. In this example, the role of faculty and classified senate is to put the college first rather than putting the unions first. Hamilton asked for clarification on the role of the classified senate. Schmidt and Mitchell responded that it would be an appointment body and an originating body for policy. It would fill a role akin to the peer-to-peer group and would be another means for representation. Discussion included whether to include a curriculum group in the governance system or maintain the existing curriculum body. Hamilton asked that questions be sent to Alvarado for discussion at the next governance review meeting. Rehn advocated for benchmarking best practices of other institutions.
Budget update	Mitchell updated the council on outcomes of the Budget Development Subcommittee recommendations. At the April 1 board meeting, the board adopted a $4.50 per credit tuition increase. The other recommendations that the college presented were almost entirely in line with the College Council/BDS recommendations. She appreciated everyone coming together to work on the recommendations during finals week.

Policy Review and Revision	The council reviewed the existing Freedom of Inquiry and Expression policy and proposed revision as based on the Linn Benton Community College policy and recommendations from the Bristow Square Taskforce. Council members discussed the need for revisions and the limitations they might have on free speech. Rehn expressed discomfort with the direction taken by the suggested revisions. Alvarado had concerns about marginalized populations feeling unsafe or unsupported without specific language in the policy. Kelly noted that he would like to see Lane approach the policy with the intention of creating a safe environment for disagreement and discussion rather than squelching disagreement. It was suggested to send the policy to legal counsel for review, but the council agreed that a more polished version should be developed before sending it to legal. Schmidt proposed several grammatical and syntactic revisions.
Decision Making Protocol	This item was not discussed as Andrade, Mitchell and Matthews have not been able to meet to develop recommendations regarding the review of the decision-making chart and governance manual wording and possible proposed changes.
Travel Policies	Schmidt informed the council that Student Affairs had questions and concerns regarding the lack of a student travel policy. Liability is a big concern, as is the safety and wellbeing of students. Each department or area has its own practices when dealing with student travel. Andrade noted that Donyel Hill recently provided examples of student travel, but Schmidt noted that those are procedural. The council agreed that faculty falls under the area of academic affairs, not student affairs. Andrade moved to assign it to Vice President Paul Jarrell and Donyel Hill, Director of Student Engagement, to research the liability issues and bring it back to College Council if necessary. Taylor seconded.

	Motion passed unanimously.
Progress on College Council Work Plan	Council members reviewed the College Council work plan. 1) Review COPPS – Matthews/Andrade; Review of policy vs. procedure in its current definition – Matthews/Andrade; Policy subcommittee or task force will work to develop standards for website and college practices regarding COPPS. Also working to determine which policies should be under which governing council. 2) Evaluate the role of College Council within the governance system – Governance Sub Committee 3) Intensive Governance Training for Chairs/Vice-Chairs, governance Profession Development for al council members. Need to identify responsible parties. 4) Review governance system and recommendations for changes – Governance Sub Committee – in progress 5) Budget process – Budget Development Subcommittee – in progress 6) Review the work plan from 2017-18 to see what was accomplished – IEC report – Alvarado - done
Reports	Wilson reported that there is an ASLCCSG senate meeting on April 11. The priority is the student activity fee recommendation. ASLCCSG was satisfied with the results of the Board of Education vote on tuition, although the feeling is bittersweet. ASLCCSG Nick Keough will be joining College Council. Schmidt reported that Donyel Hill has been added to the Student Affairs Council. The council looks forward to working with the Technology Council on the communication policy. Andrade reported that LCCEF is in bargaining and not advancing much. Mitchell reported that CTE faculty are involved in a letter writing campaign to advocate for additional community college funding from the state. LCCEA is collaborating with ASLCC on an op ed to the Register Guard advocating for community college funding. Alvarado reported that it has been a productive year for Faculty Council. A survey was sent regarding

	hiring and faculty experiences. They will be hosting a forum at the spring conference regarding the faculty chair concept. The non-standard grading committee moved to eliminate the NC grading mark. A session will be held at the spring conference on grading options, GPA, and the academic alert system. There have been a number of appointments to fill vacant positions on committees. Kelly reported that the budget team met with managers and peer to peer to distribute budgets for FY20 to talk about reductions in M&S budgets. The snow week was impactful in many ways – with facilities but also in delaying some meetings regarding the master plan. KLCC is doing an on air fundraising drive.
Next Meeting: Chairs/Vice chairs – will be an all Council members meetings 2:00 to 3:30 with Chairs/Vice Chairs providing reports and updates.	An all council meeting will be held April 17 from 2 to 3:30 in Building 4, Room 106
Next Meeting: College Council	May 8, 2:00 p.m. Boardroom