

College Council Agenda

May 26, 2016 Boardroom 2:00 – 4:00

Item	Objective
Present	Jim Salt, Brian Kelly, Bob Baldwin, Mariana Paredones, Lori Wamsley, Dawn DeWolf, Joseph Colton, Mary Spilde, Sara Fox
Agenda review	No changes
Approval of prior Minutes	Minutes of the following dates need approval: 4/28, 5/12 and 5/25
Enrollment Services redesign	<p>Kerry Levett, Executive Dean of Students Affairs gave a quick synopsis about this redesign, she explained that the decision is not official yet, and the parties involved should be the first ones to know how the redesign is going to look. The rationale behind this redesign was timeliness due to management vacancies, connection to core themes/ strategic plan, and feedback of ECHO consultant, video A Beautiful Constraint, feedback from meetings, anonymous surveys. The proposal is to have few models to play figuring out which part works better. The redesign draft has been shared with the president Spilde and two vice-presidents a week ago. She will get feedback about this proposed final model on June 7. Final redesign will not be implemented right away. There will be an implementation team and the implementation will be done gradually.</p> <p>Q&A: Q: This information does not provide any substance, it only about the process on how to get there. A: Redesign is focused on student experience, and their success. How to create a structure that create relations and it is not only a transaction. Q: Can you give an example? A: Looking the work of: advisors, transfer team, and the enrollment support team, create an opportunity to discuss their work. A: Bringing more recruiters. Q: Translating your high level language, will we, at some point, have something that is done meaning an action? A: Some is embedded in our strategic directions. Track changes for students for completion. Hesitate to say something before we have our final meeting. Q: How are you defining completion: degrees, certificates, something else? A: Answer is under the strategic directions. Completion is that the students have completed the initial relation with the institution. i.e. a student who enroll only to take a couple of classes in order to transfer to the UofO, that is completion. Q: If we have students who don't have a decision yet, in order to understand the system, we need people who analyses that. How many staff do you think it will take to review all of the reports from all the students constituting a full time equivalence? A: Is challenging to see how we are doing our work. I understand what you are saying, not every student is the same.</p>
Planning sub-com report	Report on Strategic Planning process Jen Steele. Presented an updated document of the Strategic Plan that reflects to the best ability the feedback received up to date. Invited cc

	<p>members to review and approve. Review discussion: What is the definition of social justice? Include links. What is a strategy, concept is vague. Equity lens sounds like a list of questions to ask when making a decision. Since document was presented at this meeting, a suggestion was to give time for review the document. Members will send their feedback electronically.</p>
<p>Governance Sub Com Report</p>	<p>The subcommittee presented again the document regarding the protocol for decision making on instances when consensus is not reached. This update was based on previous conversations about this topic. Last proposal had Robert Rules of Order for Voting and that was a little confusing. This document is more about the process if we cannot reach consensus represented in a graphic Proposal: to accept this process. Seconded. Discussion: This doesn't cover ambiguous process, such as work plan. i.e. the Learning council spent a lot of time years ago discussing faculty vacancies. Primary driver is consensus. We are looking for a way to move the work forward. Amendment to proposal: add examples of substantive issues Voting: all in favor for the amendment.</p> <p>Proposal: Provide a clear pathway to decision on substantive decisions. The responsible administrator will make the decision based on the majority /minority reports as the board policy indicates. Seconded.</p> <p>Discussion What constitutes timeliness? i.e. Annual college budget. In those cases there is no objection. Concern is that if we have one party deciding the needs of what needs to be done, then we have a built-in structure. The issue is that the work is not brought to the councils. The work plans should have timelines. The accreditation report is not how you are describing; it was about roles and responsibilities of the faculty. And that is the concern of the board as well. I have no clue how a decision making occurs in the college, because certainly it is not done at the governance system. It is done out there somewhere. Member mentioned all the large projects that have come to the council for approval. The existing language in the manual gives a laundry list of possible solutions; we only have put it into a graphic to make it more understandable. It is not a deviation. It is a form to understand how to follow the rules, at what point is determined that is enough for phase II. Rather than coming up with a graphic, leave it as language because there is a value of being vague.</p> <p>Voting: Proposal does not pass. 2 no, 1 sideways</p>

	<p>It was suggested that when adding the graphic changes in the governance manual that the written list be modified to align with the suggested phases. Jim Salt will send a draft to Joseph Colton to update the “Optional Resolution Steps” graphic.</p>
<p>Reports:</p>	<p>ASLCC: New student elected and will take office on Tuesday next week.</p> <p>MSC: Have been meeting to look at insurance options</p> <p>ET: nothing to report</p> <p>LCCEA: It was reported the IP28 signatures have been met and will be on the ballot. Jim Salt encouraged everyone to get involved in educational efforts.</p> <p>Faculty Council: Electing a faculty council co-chair- Vote close Friday. Student Course evaluations are open.</p> <p>LCCEF: nothing to report</p>
<p>Adjourn</p>	<p>3:45 pm</p>