Item	Notes
Present	Merriam, Greg, Craig, Mary (phone), Jim, Sonya, Dennis, Bob
Absent	Susan, Rodger, Barbara
Agenda review	No changes
Approval of prior Minutes	Approved
Policy Promulgation By Thwing Havens	Thwing brought his presentation in written and read to the council: ~First of all, I would like to apologize to the members of College Council for taking up their valuable time with this issue. And I would like to apologize to anyone who I have hurt or angered with any decisions I have made or actions I have taken. I know now that what I did may not have been the best way to handle things, and their anger is totally justified. What did I do? Well, I altered a policy statement that was approved by the College Governance system before publishing on COPPS. What was I thinking?!? "Synopsis" **1999** the College Online Policy and Procedure System is created, bringing existing policies and procedures from the Office of Instruction Administrative Procedures Manual, the Business Operations Manual, the Student Services Manual , and others, into a new online environment. In 2003, a Space Assignment procedure was included in COPPS. This procedure referenced a decision-making body called the Space Assignment Committee. **Sept 2006** Space Request Form is revised (routing to Bob Mention). **April 2010** Sonya McKean updates a "Space Assignment Process Overview" document, posted on the Facilities Management and Planning web pages, which references a decision-making body called the Space Implementation Advisory Team. **June 2010** Facilities Council and College Council approve of a new Space Assignment Policy. A "Draft" document is prepared. A portion of this policy proposes to create a new decision-making body called the Space Assignment Advisory Team. No coordination with the COPPS team occurs at this time, and apparently little or no review of what was currently published on COPPS at that time. **November 2010** Dave Willis submits to Tracy Simms the "Draft" document for publishing on COPPS. I reviewed the document and suggested some updates so as to resolve conflicts with existing procedural documentation. Dave Willis did not open my emails, or if he did, he replied saying only that he had this on his to-do list. I received a response from Tamara Pinkas indicating that Facilities Council was quite happy with the policy, regardless of conflicts with other COPPS documents, and that I would have to take it up with College Council. Through Bob Baldwin, I attempted to get on College Council's agenda, and that too failed. **June 2011** Since a year had passed since initial approval, I decided to go ahead and publish with the offending bulleted item removed. I notified Dave, Dennis Carr, and Tracy of my actions.

April 2012 The discrepancy between the approved policy document and what was published on COPPS is discovered by someone else. Bob communicates this with me. Elizabeth Andrade, Margaret Robertson and I exchange emails about the situation, resulting in this discussion today, and resulting in the resolution of the primary conflict (by changing the name of the work-group reference in the Space Assignment procedure to SAAT).

"Moving Forwards"
Would it have been better if I had refused to publish any portion of the new policy, back in November 2010? Perhaps, but we still would have wound up here.   I made a decision that the act of putting up the conflicting statements would cause more harm than not putting them up. But the work-group name conflict is not the only problem: The controversial statement proposing to establish the SAAT is procedural language, not policy (see the Art on Campus policy and procedure for a good example of splitting out the language). We have around nine of these policy/procedure pairs on COPPS. Also, the use of future tense is questionable in a policy statement. If we never actually convene the work-group, we will never be in violation, because it just says "We will", but it doesn't specify when.   Like the on-going problem of lack of resources for review of COPPS pages, this proposed formation of a new work-group has no enforcement provisions. I believe the Governance system can come up with better solutions than just saying "Let's form another committee". If there were problems with the Space Assignment process in the past, they won't be solved by simply making a name change. Basically, the controversial statement is not up to COPPS standards.
Clearly, others do not see COPPS the way I do. I would offer this suggestion to Governance Councils who are creating documents to be published on COPPS: PLEASE do a subject matter search and ensure that your new language does not introduce conflicts. If you are not going to perform a review to ensure compliance with established COPPS standards, then please be prepared to accept suggestions that will bring your work into compliance. If the Governance system is going to be respectful and inclusive, there has to be a pathway to provide feedback that will be accepted as part of the policy development process.

COMMENTS:
-A member commended for the spirit of the document, and apologized in the name of the council for the angry communications, even though it wasn't Thwing's responsibility to ensure that the policy language was being implemented. The governance subcommittee should see into it.
- A member mentioned an example of a grading policy. He agreed with last paragraph of Thwing's document, and he understood why the chair of the Facilities Council was feeling this way. He also recognized that this shouldn't be Thwings' role.
- A member thanked for the presentation, for the honesty and for raising the issue in a future tense. Mentioned that the council needs to look closely at COOPS since it relates to accreditation. However made emphasis that the language of policies reside in the governance system, and it is not Thwing's responsibility.
-A guess of the public who was part of the old Policy Language Implementation Committee gave a quick history of how and why the recommendations were created. And these recommendations have won recognition at state level.
- A member recommended that council use Thwing as a resource for advice and guidance.
- A member recommended that the governance system should create a policy that puts this in clear.
-There was consensus that the Governance sub-committee of College Council take charge of resolving this issue.
- Sonya Christian let the council know that she has asked Nadine Williams and

	Mary Glenn (retirees) to work on reviewing COOPS. And asked that the Governance sub-committee meet with them. - A member commented that he will like a transparent process.
Budget Development (Standing item to update BDF work progress	Greg Morgan informed that the budget was discussed at the board meeting the night before, and the majority of college council members were present at that meeting. The budget document presented was new, and it is expected that the Budget Committee will approve it because there is not significant opposition. Other members added: -Ideally this body should have endorsed it. Is the second time we are in this position, we have had consensus, but now we have some members that are proposing changes to that proposal. We need to talk about those changes. My recommendation is that we will oppose any changes in support of the proposal as it went forward. -As a member of the budget subcommittee, and after talking with ASLCC students, and now looking back I wonder if College Council would have had supported the motion if presented to them before going to the Budget Committee. Right now the students feel that they didn't have the time to play at the same level field of the staff. However they didn't want to block the process, so they vote to move it forward. I completely endorse the process of engagement that we went true, but no constituency group should have to act under pressure. So if we pushed to vote this in CC my vote will be no. -I'm not quite sure if agree that we didn't have consensus. We must realize that this is no longer our process; the Budget Committee is an independent group of citizen and they will can ideas about it. We have to let them do their own decisions. If we mess it up now it will put the process in a delicate balance. -I'm hearing two things, increase of stabilization fund, and the other, a group with a couple of different ways to change things. We should let the Budget committee know how this body reached consensus, and the consequences of changing it. - I feel awkward telling an independent group how to do things, it seems inappropriate. Plus they have a statutory statement. - The issue is how we respond to any proposals to modify it. I agree that we should present to the BC respectfully explaining that there was a series of compromises. - We are talking with the difference in power that the reps of the council have, and the students the less. -Then there is no point of having CC, the administration is always going to have more power, the reps seating in this council should have the same skills to deal with this. We have known always that each group has different powers. -I don't agree with your statement. - I propose that revisit the consensus decision of the Finance and Budget

committee's proposal.

-My feeling is that if we go back in and start with our consensus the whole thing will fall apart. Also unravel at the Board and Budget commit level. And there will be line cuts that nobody wants to see. If we want to have a conversation, given the information request we got from the budget committee last night, should be on how CC is going to present that information. But if we are not going to do that then I'll have to vote against.

Voting: 2 favor, 3 against , 2 sideway

-My proposal stands. In my opinion the process of consensus is hollow; it is my ethical dilemma because I saw how the students struggle with it.

-If we reopen how will this look?

-Maybe we could use the stabilization fund, because it is not going to grow as I thought.

-I'm happy to come up with some scenarios, and if we can build consensus about some of them it will be amazing.

-You are raising important issues, but the alternatives are worse, one of them is like the students don't be part of the governance system. I'm not saying that I want that, but that brings out to the positions we are in. I hope next year there will be a larger discussion. But I don't know what the alternative is.

-It seems to me that there is the possibility that consensus will fall apart.

-Being someone removed from the entire process, because I'm not part of the student group working with the budget you will see me quiet, even though I represent the students. And the current president Mario is not here. It will be helpful to have another meeting on Friday, because today I can't provide any context to the information. Regarding what I'm hearing of removing the student voice, I totally opposed since we are the larger stakeholder, we should be part of the governance system.

- Chair open the proposal to have a budget committee on Friday afternoon

Discussion:

-It is inappropriate to change supported positions agreed by consensus. This an the Non-smoking policy has been the only two victories accomplished by the governance system in 6 years, and if we opened, we should have lost one.

- I don't share your opinion that this is a victory of the governance system, it was a hollow decision. If some of the people involved in the process feel pressured and are in a vulnerable place, I don't see that as the Lane principles of transparency. I would feel better if you bit me up if I made the decision in my role with the school. But when we are talking of the students then I have to do what is right.

-Is there a possibility to meet on Monday 12- 2 p.m. or re-scheduling the meeting on Wednesday?

	-My argument when it comes to agreements is that it is immoral to change your mind, if you are operating with the rules agreed to work with, it is ok, but this is not the case. -As a practical matter this is going to confuse the budget committee. -Maybe it is not a bad idea to try this between our own work group only. -I appreciate your comment, because big words have been throwing such as un-ethical, and immoral. We are humans and slips happen, but when we see that a group is struggling and feeling oppressed and voted only for solidarity with the process of the larger group, I'm not quite sure un-ethical is the word. The discussion ended with the agreement that there will be a meeting on Monday, May 14th, 12-2 p.m.
Achievement Compacts By Sonya Christian	The recent updates were presented at board meeting. All the present members today were also at that meeting, so it doesn't seem necessary to repeat the information already known. Learning council hasn't been able to reach consensus and has deferred this discussion to College Council. A member responded to the last statement that there should be no illusion that there will be agreement to work this out, when in fact is opposition.
Reports:	There were no time for reports **ASLCC:** **MSC:** **ET:** **LCCEA:** **FACULTY COUNCIL:** **LCCEF:**
Adjurn	[A1]