

College Council Minutes
May 12, 2011, Boardroom 2:00 – 4:00

Item	Objective
Agenda review	No changes
Review of Notes	Approval of the Apr 14 notes, previously emailed Approved April 28 approved with amendment (Add that cc should consider to have budget as regular agenda item)
Election of Chair for next year	This is our last full meeting of the year. Salt nominated Baldwin to continue as chair. Approved unanimously
Report on Long Range Planning	<p>Report from Bob on MPTF process</p> <p>Reminded everyone of how many meetings have been held on this topic. He open the discussion based on the notes sent ahead to members.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Misalignment between the language between the 2011 Report and the sustainability report. We are asking cc to support the continuation of the work next year taking in consideration the environmental work including all the input received. - I have heard from faculty members: environmental concerns; ensure that the academic needs are taking in consideration; embracing the entrepreneurialism as strategy for the college profit. - There are different technologies to be used to value frames to optimize. - Environment might be an attraction for students who love nature and can't get that in other colleges. We should aim for mid end housing rather than low end housing. Maybe hotel model maybe a better model, a marketing analysis should be done; there is a lot to be done yet. -There is input for the board to decided on 1) is there financial support for long range planning, and 2) was is the working plan and 3) who will be in charge of that work, will facilities council, etc. - What a heck are we doing getting entrepreneurial? It is something that we haven't thought about much. Privatizing education is something that 4 year schools are doing. - The information we got from facilities council such as requests, recommendations etc. it is that going to be part of the report. Is the 2011 report going to be changed? The 2011 report will be changed on the environmental part only (one paragraph only). <p>Motion to recommend that the board of education adopt the 2011 report presented and recommend the following steps for next year. Motion approved unanimously.</p>

<p>Report on Honors College</p>	<p>Report from Sonya Introduce two members of the team, Mary Brau and Kattie Rosen-Gramm and they gave an overview of the program. Q & A Q- We are building the bridges as we crossed, this feels like we are on the very edge. What we are not seeing is how the structure is going to be and what the faculty role is in it. What is the criteria, what is the framework? I like the idea but there is lots of questions that need answers. A-the team will be dealing with those; we thought that this model will be a good to start an accommodate Lane's culture, instead of using an elitist way. Q- what is the pay off? we need that in order to promote. A- Students who have more challenged classes in high school will be interested in this model i.e. IHS programs, this program has a better articulation.</p> <p>They explained that no action is needed by CC this is just a report tied to the strategic directions.</p>
<p>Core Themes - Accreditation Issue By Sonya Christian and members of the team</p>	<p>Report on the Core Themes development for Accreditation.</p> <p>We recommend that the cc meets with the accreditation team to focus on the indicators of achievement. The group brought a pragmatic approach to define this core teams. The core themes had been presented to the Board of Education, and Bob Ackerman has point out that diversity is no longer in there.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the term learning center, for some of our folks I don't see how it fits. You can fit but you can work at It, perhaps you should bring someone from enrollment services to the group. Something feels a little odd but I can't tell what it is. - recommendation to invite Siv Serene to be part of the team - regarding the definition of team, these are not teams, these are programs, I'm not familiar with accreditation. 2) the repetition of language is not clear on what we are trying to produce 3) reducing the ksa's is a gross reduction of what the college produce ksa is business language. I'm sorry but I don't like any of the document, I don't know what we are trying to accomplish with this. - accreditation says you got to choose your mission, but once it is decided it becomes quantum leap. We all do different things, but this is not what individuals do. I'm not going to address the languages on how they come up with this. The concept and the intent was to broke up the mission into components, and that is what we are intending with the core teams. The ksa we can take that information back to the team and see if we can choose different language. - maybe I'm missing something but seems like in addition to accreditation this is what we do and how we do it, we know we are moving into an assessment base system. Those assessment techniques and tools come from the business world, is that what we are aiming to? We are not going to the winning side if we only count degrees and diplomas. Using the mile stone approach we can attain what we are aiming for. - my concern is not shifting from counting numbers by ksas. The goals I have for my classes is not limited to ksas, we have to be very careful on what are we switching, we need to measure what we are trying to accomplish and not focus only on ksas. - we must master this mostly for survival

	<p>- the language is is not very exciting to me, I agree with the other members, this is the face of our mission, the what the core team are supposed to be. I wonder if we should include what we do in student affairs, because that is what we do. I don't like to call it core teams, but that is the accreditation language. It is not looking at the process rather to the outcomes. If we create a core value for services, then we have to create a matrix to measure that, i.e. students don't come to lane to get counseling.</p> <p>- accreditation, yes we need it and we have to do it, but we can do better than that, we owe to ourselves. If accreditation is all we want to do, then becomes a routine.</p> <p>- four year institutions don't aim for ksa's and that is the sad state of education, to have this in our college gives a step ahead.</p> <p>- what is the urgency to approve it today? Is there harm in waiting?</p> <p>Motion to approve document, it was seconded but not vote on.</p> <p>Motion to table it, not seconded</p> <p>Motion to approve only the four titles with no language, seconded, approved unanimously.</p>
<p>Reports: ET, Faculty Council, ASLCC, Mgnt Senate, LCCEF and LCCEA</p>	<p>Relay pertinent information for the good of CC</p> <p>ET: nothing to report</p> <p>Faculty council: nothing to report</p> <p>ASLCC: nothing to report</p> <p>Management Senate: continue to track health insurance issues.</p> <p>LCCF: There is one vacancy in Learning Council</p> <p>LCCEA: we are working on budget balanced, and hope administration can do the same.</p>