

COLLEGE COUNCIL MINUTES
January 26, 2012 meeting

Item	Notes
Present:	Craig Taylor, Susan Carkin, Sonya Christian, Jim Salt, Dennis Gilbert, Bob Baldwin, Rodger Gambling, Merriam Weatherhead, Mary Spilde (on the phone)
Absent:	Greg Morgan, Barbara Delansky, Mario Parker-Milligan
Agenda review	No changes
Approval of prior Minutes	Tabled for next meeting
Reinstatement of Finance Council	<p><i>Decide whether to assign the Finance Council duties to the BDSC</i></p> <p>Last meeting the decision to move the duties of the Finance Council to the College Council's Budget Subcommittee since the majorities of this subcommittee will be part of the FC according to its chart. BDSC has voted to make this change, and there was a consensus to have the final consideration done by CC. BDCS proposes that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Move the duties of the FC to BDSC 2) Next year, evaluate the work of this year. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Support this proposal if the BDSC had the same structure that the FC would have had, meaning the same rights & responsibilities for the chair and vice-chair as given to the councils. -Support last change with few changes in the language. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – I'm concerned because the FC has a broader role; i.e. the BDSC developed a Long Range Financial Plan that deals w/ financial issues but says nothing about the academic plan of the college, so there's a life of the college, that's not considered, therefore I'm not convinced it's good to shift responsibilities to BDSC - FC failed to put a financial plan, and it was basically due to the lack of commitment. My large concern moving it is the total amount of meeting time, because the BDSC will have to accomplish the work for the financial planning, plus the other regular duties that the FC should have. However the BDSC can always redefine their work later and if it is not working then move back to CF. - I support the last statement, also makes sense that the roles of the chair and vice-chair follow the same guidelines of the council's chair and vice-chair. And we should also broaden the role of the BDSC to include the charter of the FC. Regarding the lack of commitment we should revise if the work is being accomplished. - But there is still no plan. There are many failures in creating different "plans" – eg., LRFP, Learning Plan, .. the work that has gone into current plans is dominated by administration - We need a decision, as long as we don't make it, and start working on the financial plan, the decision will be made by the administration. Regardless of how we call the group we should focus on the work, so we're the ones making the decisions. - I agree in part, except that in some cases the admin wants to do the work along. I propose that we look the new structure of the BDSC then I can volunteer to draft a plan. - My experience is that the councils have collectively hit in on us. Some have done

amazing work some not. Lane is an administratively-led institution that operates with a collective bargaining framework. We need agreements on a conceptual level of the work and how to do it and then also work on detail level of accomplishing the work. The college's decisions are not made by faculty or the classified group. It is a management decision ruled.

- That was well said, and I reject the form of the college structure. So no matter what the proposal is, I'll oppose it because conceptually I'm opposed.

- To move the discussion to a solution I propose that the CC consider to expand the scope of the BDCS as follows:

- 1) Change the name of the group to Finance and Budget Development Subcommittee
- 2) The chair and vice chair should model same responsibilities of other councils.
- 3) Members will volunteer to write the scope of responsibilities of the new constituted subcommittee.
- 4) We reevaluated the effectiveness of its work at the end of this year and next year again.

Proposal was seconded.

Discussion:

- I support proposal adding that the work of the FC becomes responsibility of the FBDS, so we can immediately pick up the FC work, for instance the development of the Long Range Financial Plan.

- Is the LRFP "the Board's Plan" or is it a plan that needs to be owned by the Gov Sys?

- I don't support it; I'll vote against, these are just formalities. I think the BDCS should continue the work they are doing now.

- I think your opposition is irresponsible; we all are trying to get to the same place, which is not have only management making financial decisions.

- I'm concerned about the amount of work we can accomplish looking at the meeting dates ahead.

Voting: 7 thumbs up; 1 down

-When we cannot reach consensus, the person(s) blocking need to explain their position and what it will take to change their position.

-The work of the LRFP has to take place on this campus; it has to be in a much open way where the whole college community participates, that is why I differ from this particular model, And I believe this is not going to be accomplished in several weeks or months, because there are deep disagreements. So what I'm not against to is to a group outside the BDCS structure to develop this plan. And I don't oppose that CC facilitates the process. i.e. Discussions at each division.

At this point several members tried to convince opposing member via a long discussion and clarifications.

-I have different mental model of the management leadership of this college, and does not have a credible commitment to include the campus community. I need some credible commitment to move in this direction, and I don't get that from all the people at this table. Based on past experiences I don't think we are there. We need to make things different.

-As my last attempt to reach consensus, I propose to make an amendment to my previous proposal:

Add a 5th piece, which is to consider a comprehensive and rigorous process in the next year and a half to engage the campus community in the long range financial plan. This addendum will not nullify the integrity of the LRFP document approved by the Board of Education.

	<p>Final amended proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change the name of the group to Finance and Budget Development Subcommittee 2) The chair and vice chair should model same responsibilities of other councils. 3) Members will volunteer to write the scope of responsibilities of the new constituted subcommittee. 4) We reevaluated the effectiveness of its work at the end of this year and next year again. 5) Consider a comprehensive and rigorous process in the next year and a half to engage the campus community in the LRFP. This addendum will not nullify the integrity of the LRFP document approved by the Board of Education <p>Voting: 8 thumbs up, CONSENSUS REACHED!!!!</p>
<p>Budget Development</p>	<p>(Standing item on the agenda to update on progress of work done) No time for report</p>
<p>Achievement Compact</p>	<p>Update on assessment requirements</p> <p>President Spilde reported that the Oregon Education Investment Board will meet this evening at the CML, and the latest legislative proposal to be introduced next week by the Governor’s Office is to have ACs with each school district and each community college district. There has been some discrepancies regarding what the ACs should look like, the latest version is to include both 4 year colleges and community colleges. There is some draft on how it should look, but they are still receiving recommendations. The summary of the all campus meeting last week will be available soon.</p> <p>Sonya Christian informed that there was some interest coming out of that meeting – Ben, Jim, Bob, Sarah, want to work on a document of the essence as we translate it, of the needs of Oregonians in trying to achieve more credentialed individuals; one issue that came up in our small group discussion was; is this more a focus on K-12 that won’t really focus HE, and what’s the best strategy for engaging in the work? Keep a low profile? If OEIB is responsible for educational achievement of Oregonians, then how do we engage in a discussion with them to achieve it? So, Part 1. How can we get more funding for education in OR? Taxpayers? Grants? Part 2. Our current funding formula might change to address completions. These two things are issues out there.</p> <p>Members commented on their concerns, issues’ interpretation, hopes, etc. There were neither conclusions nor actions to follow.</p>
<p>Reports:</p>	<p>There were no time for reports ASLCC MSC ET LCCEA FACULTY COUNCIL LCCEF</p>
<p>Adjourn</p>	<p>4:05 next meeting February 9</p>