

COLLEGE COUNCIL MINUTES

February 9, 2012 meeting

Item	NOTES
Present	Mario Parker-Milligan, Susan Carkin, Jim Salt, Dennis Gilbert, Rodger Gambling, Greg Morgan, Merriam Weatherhead, Barbara Delansky, Craig Taylor
Absent	Sonya Christian, Mary Spilde, Bob Baldwin
Agenda review	No changes
Approval of prior Minutes	Tabled for next meeting
Accreditation report Presented by Mary Brau	<p>Mary Brau gave an overview of the Accreditation process; she explained the requirements of previous years and the changes done recently. Accreditation is a reviewing tool used by the government to allocate funds. The review used to be every 10 years; therefore the amount of documentation required was very large. Currently it is done in a short cycle of 4 years. The reviewing is done on core teams, this year we have to report on the standards. A group of representatives from the states participating in this commission will be visiting us. She passed a form asking CC participation.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would think that cc will have a saying on how the college needs to respond to this. i.e. last time we had this review (8 yrs ago), we had themes, and each one had a committee, we met quite a lot and give a lot of information. It seems now this work is handling to members of the administration and they are the ones making the decisions, it is ironic that now that we have a governance system, we are not involved. - We are starting this work, cc can be involved, staff has been asked but there is no interest. If you have ideas on how to make it democratic they are welcome. Anne Mc grail has been recruited to coordinate this. - Even on a volunteer basis it seems like is not how it should be, cc should be the leading group of this work. - This questions our culture, I'm having hard time getting around, and how do we recruit people? Is there a process? If it is, recruiting people for what? We all heard last time's Bob characterization of what the governance system is. This is a hoop we have to jump. And lets other people do it. I see accreditation as a key of the life of the college if is done property. Just because we have governance system doesn't means that is shared governance. - Disagree with the democratic characterization given. - The people leading this work has had training and expertise, even thought the feeling is that is not a democratic process, there is the need of some expertise. It is a practical response in a large organization. - We have a governance system, and maybe there is more input from staff because last time we didn't have the governance system. But at least the councils should be considered. We should be more proactive. In my ideal world, we should have CC coordinating the process, and inviting the committees to work on it. The issue is if we have a governance system we should have a role in coordinating this. - I think having skillful people is necessary, but I don't buy the argument that it has to be done by a small group. I'll suggest that you write up what you said and bring to the next CC meeting, the skeleton of what you proposed is something we should start working on. But it requires plan and clarity. - That is the process we used in 2004, and this is exactly how we plan to do it this time, Sonya Christian has the deadlines, I was under the impression she shared that with CC. Staff working on the standards right now is soliciting feedback from everyone. <p>Jim Salt asked Mary Bray to continue the conversation after the meeting</p>
Budget Development Continuing Item on CC agendas, update on BDSC progress	<p><i>Revised charter of the Budget Finance Committee</i> *(Informal conversation)</p> <p>Jim Salt presented a document with the responsibilities of the new committee and explained it was done on the same base of the governance system structure. He also presented a summary of the work of budget subcommittee, and the plan items that</p>

	<p>still need to be address.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -According with the governance system there was a certain amount of independence between the budget subcommittee and the finance council. In merging both we are we losing something. Budget subcommittee had dependence of the college council in its traditional role of the spoke person to the board We no longer have strategic plan, now we have strategic directions, if we are having a long range financial plan it is important to have a strategic plan. -I agree with Denis, but I think this change will clean up the overlap that existed. - This summary brings a concrete issue of what I have addressed; this shows that the budget subcommittee took decisions. - The BS was not intended to steal the role of the cc in the decision making. - The BS brought the information to cc for final decision. -Regarding budget is good & bad news, we will probably see no change, depending on some issues that we have no control we might take a hit over the last year of the biennium. Agreements were made based on the funds we were supposed to get, but the appropriations haven't been done. We'll have to make some hard decision to manage that short. - The board has been consistent with the BS recommendations. - The board never took advise from the BS, the administration brings CC recommendation to them. i.e. regarding the tuition, the president suggest changes to the governance councils and then she brings to the board. We have never had a consensus of the budget recommendation for the board, as far as I remember. Mary presents the recommendations to the board, explaining the position of the administration, the discussions with the governance system and the position of the minority. -Mary has directions from the board. The governance system would like more robust conversations, delineating the pros and cons, but the issues are govern by contracts or agreements, that is why is difficult to have those conversations, and they rather have a chilling effect. - A way out of it is 1) open the discussion wider so all the players are at the table 2) not be naïve about the train wreck sitting there. - Not quite sure were this conversation is going, but just for the heck of it, the administration has all the authority and it is not willing to share. <p>At this point some of the absent members had arrived and complete the quorum, the meeting started officially.</p>
<p>Achievement Compact Update on assessment requirements</p> <p>Presented by Jim Salt</p>	<p>Jim Salt informed that a group of faculty has put a document together and presented to the board last night. The Bill has been passed to the Ways & Means committee, and it is pretty clear that this is going forward. He encouraged members to write the governor. CC members had a lengthy discussion regarding the reasons behind the assessment requirements.</p>
<p>Reports: ASLCC; MSC; ET; LCCEA; Faculty Council; LCCEF.</p>	<p>ASLCC: Working on the institutionalization plan for VOTE.</p> <p>MSC: Surveying membership for revision of current working agreement with college and language on guidelines of professional development disbursement.</p> <p>LCCEA: will be attending to the quarterly OEA meeting this weekend, a conversation about the achievement compacts is planned.</p> <p>Faculty council: working on principles of College Now, expecting to wrap-up best practices in tomorrow's meeting.</p> <p>LCCEF: have been in the middle of two arbitrations, leaving not much time for other items.</p>
<p>Adjourn</p>	<p>4:05, next meeting Feb-23</p>

*** NOTE: Jim Salt was acting-chair for this meeting. By 3:15 CC had not met quorum requirements; he started an informal conversation regarding the item on the agenda under "Budget Development".**