

College Council Agenda

March 11, 2010, Boardroom 2:00 – 4:00

Present: Bob Baldwin, Jim Salt, James Manning, Mary Spilde (on the phone), Melissa Richards, Jim Lindly, Albert Pooth, Sonya Christian, Rodger Gamblin, Grag Morgan, Craig Taylor

| Item | Objective and Notes |
|--|---|
| Agenda review | No changes |
| Minutes from previous meeting | |
| Space Allocation Policy Bob Baldwin | <p><u>Either approval or referral back to Facilities Council</u></p> <p>Members of Facilities Council have Motion to send back to them, approved unanimously.</p> |
| Budget Development Sonya Christian Greg Morgan | <p><u>Report from Budget Development Sub-committee</u></p> <p>A draft document was distributed to council members. Sonya Christian gave an overview of the layout of the document and asked the council to approve.</p> <p>Discussion included: A new principle will be added later to the current 13 principles. Principle #14 should be included in document to be dealt in the same fashion. Reminder that these are only principles and the document needs to be passed today. Members agreed to vote on each part of the document separately. Concerns that document has weakened, is less specific, it shows that instead of improving from previous years, we are going backwards.</p> <p><u>Principles:</u> Principle #5 protects students vs. principle #10: Staff has not been protected in the past; students are always protected, whether we reduce insurance costs or salaries that are only the instrument. It seems like the unions are comparing these two issues every year that there is economical re-openings. Lane tuition is already the highest in the state, there should be a distinction between paying tuition and getting a salary increase. Cost of living increase is not a salary increase; failure to give to employees is a salary decrease. Whether is called increase or not, it has to be reflected in the budget. Realistically no one is keeping up with inflation state wide. Question if tuition will be a deciding factor for to approve principles? These principles are political factors only, the board always protects tuition. Students don't have any voice/right to defend themselves; the board decides for them, students don't get in the negotiations. Both issues are not comparable. Would like to see a principle that says we are going to work hard to get state funding is needed. The only thing we have control is the tuition, every household in the country is being hit by inflation and the economical situation. Since an agreement on principle #5 was not reached, there was a suggestion to take off principle #10 since was the first time it to be included in this document. Our response shouldn't be to decrease our aspirations we cannot accomplish something, we should do the opposite. Principle #5 is very weak, and vague, we should make sure that we keep the institution running and we share the burden</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>equally. We need to keep an eye on the MSN item of the budget and look for savings there. Suggestion to add a principle that puts the issue on increasing the staff productivity. We cannot say protect compensation and avoid layoff, it has to be one or the other.</p> <p>Christian's motion to move on and approve principles. Not passed (three thumbs down) Spilde's motion: adopt principles after deleting #10 and not adding #14. Not passed (6 thumbs down) Morgan's motion: adopt principles as written. Not passed (3 thumbs down) Salt's motion: adopt principles after deleting principles # 5,8,9,10,11, 14. Not passed (3 thumbs down) Lindly's motion: change language of principle #10 from "Avoid involuntary layoffs" to "Strive to protect employee compensation with inflation and provide professional development". Not passed (1 thumb down)</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Language doesn't speak about classified positions. Christian's motion: to adopt Assumptions as written. Not passed (1 thumb down)</p> <p><u>Priorities:</u> Motion: to adopt Priorities. Not passed (2 thumbs down)</p> <p><u>Strategies:</u> Motion: to adopt strategies. Not passed (1 thumb down)</p> <p>Christian explained that Appendixes are data analysis to backup the document and it is not subject to voting. Classified representative clarified that it was never agreed to move away from data analysis in order to adopt the budget, and it should be included for review.</p> |
| <p>Strategic Directions Sonya Christian</p> | <p><u>Report from Planning committee and work on Strategic Directions</u></p> <p>Christian explained that the final version of the document has been polished by faculty member Anne McGrail. And there has been a discussion of removing the last part of the document "Suggested implementation/actions " She presented the motion to adopt the final version of the Strategic Directions, with the agreement of removing the suggested implementation/actions document. Discussion included: Concern that still there is no language that indicates how the outcomes will be measured; where do we go from the vague generalities to the specific implementation. The polished version have changed the content, it no longer represents the spirit of the SD on "Safety". Concern that these directions -if approved and passed to the board of education- are so vague that implementation can be anything. A new motion to pass the document as is, but with the condition of changing language was presented. Not passed (2 thumbs down).</p> |
| <p>Adjourn</p> | <p>At 4:05pm. March 25th meeting is canceled due to Spring break.</p> |