



**LEARNING COUNCIL MINUTES**  
 Friday, May 24, 2019, 1:15 to 2:45 in Board Room

**Present from Learning Council:** Lee Imonen (Faculty Council Co-Chair), Edward Earl (Classified), Laura Pelletier (LCCEA Faculty, Chair), Phil Martinez (MSC), Karen Krumrey (faculty), Ian Coronado (by position), Michael Gillette (student representative), Patrick Blaine (MSC), Fatima Alshamasi (student representative), Paul Jarrell (Vice Chair), Tammy Salman (by position), Wendy Milbrat (Classified)

**Absent:** Adrienne Mitchell (LCCEA President),

**Note taker:** Phyllis Johnson

Item	Notes
Admin Tasks (Laura)	<p>A. Review / approve agenda – Motion to approve by Patrick, Seconded by Paul, approved unanimously</p> <p>B. Review / approve April 26 2019 minutes – motion to approve w/o modification by Lee seconded by Karen; unanimous vote to approve  <a href="https://drive.google.com/open?id=1v68EyGhTdX53HWwNPIbCImpowEiNAJHhjTEIPoEk9o">https://drive.google.com/open?id=1v68EyGhTdX53HWwNPIbCImpowEiNAJHhjTEIPoEk9o</a></p>
Learning Plan Update	<p>The plan was renamed to LCC Strategic Learning Framework (originally LCC Strategic Learning Plan). Discussion took place about who decided to change the title after it had gone to College Council.</p> <p>Paul started the conversation about the change in title. It was a good document, but did not include a lot of planning. It serves as a framework to develop the strategic plan.</p> <p>Lee - no disagreement with the change, but should it have gone back to LC to approve the name change prior to changing it. The reasoning behind the change is good, but the process to make the change may have been problematic as to respect for the work that councils do.</p>

	<p>Paul - there is lack of articulation of the process.</p> <p>Lee - Lack of clarity about how things are done and moved forward to College Council. Chair should not make last minute changes before going to CC.</p> <p>Paul - there was an email to LC indicating his intent as CC member to recommend the name change. CC voted to support the name change.</p> <p>Laura - CC felt it is a framework that LC drafted but not a plan. It is a framework to create the next Learning Plan.</p> <p>Paul - Part of the Governance subcommittee recommendation is that planning in councils be put on pause except for strategic plans; strategic learning plan. Other councils are working on strategic plans outside of the overall strategic plan.</p> <p>Paul - Do we want a statement made regarding process of moving out of councils and into CC. CC could have sent the Plan back to LC for revision.</p> <p>Lee - lack of clarity around decision making.</p> <p>Paul will mention to CC that LC had a concern about the process moving forward.</p>
<p>Instructor Hours - LC version versus FC version</p>	<p>Laura - the LC suggestions that went to Faculty Council did not have significant changes; added the modalities for instructors teaching credit classes; max office hours per week; not to exceed 5 hours per week; change in viewing ie not posted publicly.</p> <p>Discussion of faculty hours on campus; change from 30 to 25 per week.</p> <p>Better to keep at 30 original language.</p> <p>Availability to students and on campus engagement with the campus itself</p>

If faculty are negotiating for more pay, asking for fewer hours on campus doesn't seem correct

Discussion of number of hours during finals week

Patrick - during finals week contact hours it is better to have instructors on campus at the same level as other weeks for helping students and staff with issues that come up

Paul - original 30 hour limit was based on non-instructional hours. Need to put hour limit on the policy?

Lee - FC discussed the 30 to 25 shift and during finals week the reasonable access for students was understood. How much time was discussed vs heavy-handed mandatory hours

Discussion

There is a current discussion regarding workload hours.

Idea that the hours encourage engagement on campus with peers, etc

Hours policy has not changed and has not resulted in greater engagement.

It is not being monitored

LC and FC need to determine what is right and bargaining should not be considered; aware but should not restrict how it is perceived

Concerned about requiring that faculty still have 30 hours on campus during finals week

5 hours per week of office hours during regular week, why require 30 hours during finals week?

Paul - Issue is the expectation to have faculty on campus when many students need faculty; need wording around that expectation

Karen - peers need peers to be around for other department decisions and work during finals week

Lee - There is a need for faculty to be available during finals week; “assumed availability” at what point do we limit 24/7 availability? There may not be a one size fits all answer.

Paul - reasonable expectation; what does it mean to have “contracted work day” balance? Need policy that works for everyone; what is the expectation?

Laura - subcommittee discussed this also. It’s hard to get people to engage with campus, i.e. some teach and office hour only. If we don’t have something that states we need to be on campus more than the final and office hour, some may not be on campus.

Lee - How do we get people engaged is the bigger discussion?

Phil - the issue about heavy-handedness; the goal is not to attempt to restrict the meeting or exceeding of professional responsibility, but those who do not meet it. Even if not implemented, it is still a standard; decreased participation; faculty are contracted for specific number of days; classified are upset that faculty can extract themselves from so many hours; there is an institutional benefit from the standard; have to make it functional and not just a rule; maintain an expected faculty presence during finals week

Lee - not acceptable that faculty give final on last day of classes and take off a week early; equitable that work is getting done differently for the different bargaining units according to the responsibilities we have; need to get away from heavy-handed wording in the policy; if it’s obligatory people to be here it will not encourage engagement

Ian - Performance management - what do we give managers to help with enforcing professional expectation?

Patrick - having a policy helps us to be more consistent across campus

Paul - whether it is tied to being on campus the expectation is still missing

Ed - classified staff need faculty available during breaks; this policy will not help with that; staff need assistance with incompletes, weird bookkeeping things; classified staff need to be able to get ahold of faculty for the students

Lee - suggest it would have helped for the two workgroups from LC and FC to get together; may be a difference of opinion about roles

Phil - There is **work** that needs to be cleaned up during finals week

Lee - the two items FC changed are to exclude office hours during final exam week and the 30 hours on campus during finals week; mostly final exam week was the concern for FC

Karen - maybe this is a management contract issue; systemic issues may prevent this from being enforced

Laura - To revise the policy - more flexible modality of office hours, how office hours are held for PT faculty. Now there are issues with the changes

Patrick - office hours need to be maintained; can we list the ways that faculty can be available?

Paul - we really need the expectation to be accessible for the full 5 days to students and campus

Lee - LC has the authority over the policy. The two workgroups could sit down and discuss this issue outside of the council and bring back.

	<p>Phil - propose an interim proposal since we are running out of time for the term - offer to move in another direction and FC can pick it up next term. Propose 8-10 hours on campus during finals week and remainder of 30 hours to be available electronically</p> <p>Patrick - need buy-in</p> <p>Phil - indication to take to FC to work on number of hours and availability</p> <p>Lee - hold people to office hours and need to be available in person or electronically that week</p> <p>Ian - the official mode of communication for campus is Lane email</p> <p>Karen - if only 5 hours is stated, people will do less, a percentage of faculty will go under</p> <p>Lee - it is a cultural issue and we need a cultural change on campus</p> <p>What should be the standard?</p> <p>Patrick - 10 hours would be good</p> <p>Lee - Phil's proposal and availability meets in the middle. I support Phil's proposal</p> <p>Lee will take the proposal to FC today</p> <p>Paul - would the process be for FC workgroups to take it back to divisions?</p> <p>Lee - the workgroups</p> <p>Lee and Laura will get the two workgroups together</p>
<p>Planning for next year</p>	<p>Ian - what will governance look like?</p>

	<p>Paul - safe to assume no changes in structure; develop work plan; recommendations; planning in some councils should be put on hold, but learning plan will continue</p> <p>Ed - Credit for prior learning; CPL subcommittee; Oregon standards</p> <p>Ian - Guided Pathways</p> <p>Paul - what current policies align with Guided Pathways framework and what is absent</p> <p>Ed - CPL would help Guided Pathways on-ramping students no matter what academic history is</p> <p>Laura - Policies and procedures; what is happening with it?</p> <p>Paul - Governance task force; COPPS needs to be looked at for holes; work still needs to happen; LC makes recommendations and CC needs to charge a group to work on them</p> <p>Laura - work on actual Strategic Learning Plan</p> <p>Ed - what should the Plan look like, length, etc</p> <p>Paul - subcommittee of LC to drive the work centered around getting it off the ground. Need more student officer representation on LC</p> <p>Ian - examination of the LC charter</p> <p>Paul - the makeup of LC</p> <p>Laura will continue as Chair by unanimous agreement</p>
Other Business/ Future Items	Ongoing review of LMS

Adjourn	Motion to adjourn by Ian at 2:45. Seconded by Wendy/Ed. Approved unanimously