

College Council
October 31, 2013

Members attending:

Anayeli Jimenez, Mary Spilde, Jim Salt, Rodger Gamblin, Bob Baldwin, Susan Carkin, Barbara Delansky, Brian Kelly, Russell Shitabata and Collette Buchanan.

AGENDA REVIEW

Objection on having the Professional Cultural Competency Education Policy on the agenda: Diversity council has no consensus. Acting on own behalf. Has been dispatched to the task force subcommittee at the last meeting. Should be through task force not full committee.

Similar the spirit of proposal come together and work together. There are minor differences. Build trust and good faith instrumental to come to agreement. Not well served by spending additional time. Council spent an hour last time hearing the audience.

This would be the first time we had refused to hear the audience. It will set a terrible precedent.

Council did not get agreement on a timeline last time. In disagreement, the president can set timeline. Without timeline does not fit in with how we agreed to do it. Silencing people is the wrong thing to do.

Objects – we have heard from people, asking Mary Spilde to be forthcoming that she is running the governance system from top down, and dictatorial fashion, if you want to do top down, do so. This is the first time you have imposed a timeline. I found president's actions political disingenuous. How many hours are we going to spend getting the same information. Contested observation that it isn't finished because you weren't on prevailing side.

Dread coming to these meetings and having to sit through these comments. Accusing people to have come out on wrong side being disingenuous, that's what happened last May. Enough political agendas in this room without singling out. Tired of attacks, misrepresentation. Has to stop. We can't even get past the agenda review.

Disagree with leading governance documents. Don't have authority there. More to the point our common commitment to move forward the misrepresentation is different. Came in good faith, made proposal, appointed representatives. Let task force meet. Will come forth with document by January and we will all be happy about it. Counterproductive to all of our interests.

You do not represent my motivation. My intent is to serve the value, "promoting diversity . . . capacity to understand issues of difference." Not to do with politics; also

Cultural Competency piece is implementation part of the plan submitted to the board; Implementation goals speak to developing a policy to build a policy. And for you the language stated in the governance manual: "board college, president, or responsible administrator, will develop a timeline as early as possible..." this conversation was taken up by the diversity team 10 years ago. Last Spring the policy came to us. Then you raised the timeline issues and then refuse to set one. Not acceptable.

Member read his statement: *"The purpose of our consensus governance is to prevent a majority from effectively silencing a minority. Today I find myself in the position of having a minority opinion about the Professional Cultural Competency Education policy presented by the Diversity Council and now there is an attempt going on to silence my minority view. I find it disingenuous of the people who, when in the minority were strong advocates of our consensus governance system, but now that they find themselves in the majority are now in favor of using majority and minority reports to move this topic forward without consensus.*

Unlike my colleges I have substantive issues with the policy that came out of the Diversity Council. Despite the name it appears to me that the diversity council is a group of likeminded people who have a very narrow view of the world and are intolerant of differences. An example, my view of a safe environment is one where any person can express their beliefs and views without fear of being retaliated against even if others find their ideas scary. Another view of a safe environment is one where people want to be free from hearing differing points of view that they are afraid of and are willing to be punitive against those who express those contrary ideas.

My constituencies are the classified employees of the college and we come from diverse backgrounds and were raised in different time periods with different sensibilities. We often don't hold main stream views of cultural competency so I don't want training that is designed to change people's point of view to something considered more politically correct. All people should be allowed to hold whatever silly ideas they want to. What we do need is training about how to treat one another around the issue of cultural competency. My concern is that the training coming out of the diversity council will be aimed at telling people what they should think more than training about how to behave with each other and we'll be punitive with people who don't share a particular view of the world. These are the reasons I'm not willing to put a time line on this policy and I can't imagine myself ever supporting anything that doesn't allow free expression of ideas. At this point I will deal with any straw man or ad hominem attacks"

Is this request for information or actionable? From my perspective, I was one unanimous to instruct faculty council rep to vote as he did last May. Would be happy to hear what people have to say. Will work to build something together. Don't see a problem with giving people space to speak.

Was asked by diversity council chair to speak on history as well as concerns.

Up to taskforce to decide. Issue is the timeline. Want to be clear about that. We're grossly exaggerating differences. The issue is that if the taskforce doesn't succeed why should we facilitate the interests of some people in that process that would come out of administration. Why facilitate that? Were here to work together. Why facilitate the vision and failure? Let's support the taskforce.

One of the ways we hold people accountable is by setting timelines. Or else this work can go for another 10 years.

We put a timeline: January. Why define defeat now.

I would like to support what RS said. Don't know why we are afraid to hear from people. If it were faculty or classified, we'd be hearing them. It is unconscionable to not allow people to speak – it was on the agenda and information might contribute to the work of the taskforce.

Appreciate JS taking on taskforce. Puzzled about imposing timeline assumes it's going to fail. When are we going to get to the end of the work? In previous discussion you objected to going ahead with Majority/minority reports because there had not been a timeline set. It seems like we are going to go thru the same process again with the TF. Your logical feels inconsistent. Hopefully we can come to agreement. What happens when we get to this point next year and we don't have consensus again. If January is it, good, we move forward, if we don't something needs to happen. Need to establish one from the beginning.

Would like to support RS premise. We are following the governance system manual. More voices good for the process. Should spend time on agenda instead of this discussion. Presupposing a timeline and predicting failure is not what this is about. It's about process, and validation of process. Using governance manual and tools in that process.

Don't think anyone is afraid to hear from anybody. Nothing to fear already voted for. My objection is that diversity council chair had no right to make this request. It represents one individual's request.

We should be working together. If we fail, then we will turn to our documents, and we will follow it. We need to address options that are available at that point. May be developments that can't be anticipated. We will decide next step if timeline isn't met. Not necessarily administration. Spent time this weekend. This is not a recipe for success, recipe for failure. Faculty, students, admin, classified want to see this move forward. Support the process we agree to.

Can we amend to say... Diversity council chair requested time to discussion on taskforce January timeline. Does that help to get closer moving on?

Can we just do the right thing and hear people? This is our community we should listen to them. I am so embarrassed at what is going on. Stunning and shocking. The chair requested on behalf of others. Let's hear them.

Don't find it embarrassing. We just have a different opinion.

10 year long issue. Talking about moving forward. We have students that complain that they are hearing things and begin treated inappropriate for lack of cultural understanding. And since the students are the reason that staff gets their salaries we should allow them to talk, I look forward to hearing them.

This is great example of why we need the policy. Not giving people the right to speak. It is frustrating that this work has gone on for so long. Have worked tirelessly on implementing this policy and we are still trying to figure out if we should be hearing people. It is embarrassing from my point of view. We have to reach the 40-40-20 at campus level, if we want to reach that goal; we need to think about our campus, what we change, what policies we we will pass to shape the environment that reach that goal? Think this policy is the way to move forward and reach that goal on our campus?

To accomplish we need more participation. Taking another shot to amend the agenda I propose: to hear from the chair of the div council and the discussion on the January timeline. And since more is better, we agree that whatever sequence then we hear from faculty, classified staff, and managers. And in future council meetings, if we're going to be working on it, the more input the better off we'll be. I don't want to presume - I want to hear from others.

I like the proposal, but we should limit the time to 15 minutes to listen the public input. Noting objections on way it came to us. At completion of 15 minutes we move on and follow the rest of the agenda.

Friendly amendment:

Happy to hear what people want to see out of the proposal rather than process differences in structure of organization.

Voting: agreement motion passes.

Audience presentations:

Chair of Diversity Council explained that requested this time because at the last meeting of the college council, the policy was an item of the agenda. She was present due to her job responsibilities, but not representing the council. She had witnesses all the political maneuvers to avoid the moving forward with the process, misinterpreting the governance manual. The governance manual is poorly written, it has a lot of inconsistencies. Diversity council had no representation at the meeting, so no one could talk on its behalf. Tried to talk but told to be quiet. "If I am present at a discussion about this topic, and I'm the Div Council chair, it is my job to defend the council and their decisions. For that reason I requested time at this meeting and informed the

diversity council members so they can come today to talk” Also college council was not clear what taskforce guidance is regarding the policy, at the last meeting the voting for the creation of the taskforce was done really fast with a lot of contradictions. Next she asked the other members of the diversity council and students to present their observations.

The observation were supposed to be what we want to see on the policy.

Germaine to introduce why on the agenda

Trust and good faith between all of us working on the policy. College Council has failed on follow own procedures and mostly all the Robert Rules. The moment the minority report was not given. Students are held to assignments. Majority report was given within the first week. That was first breach. Why policy is needed: anything to change my beliefs. Don't need to change beliefs, just how to treat people appropriately. To have it undermined and called silly – don't know how address that. How much time we are going to waste?? Until January? Bureaucratic rules being used to delay this project. All have been gone through in the last 10 years. Now looking at repeating the process. Referring to another taskforce to do it all over again. “if all else fails, responsible administrator,” I call to the college president to enact that portion. Debating policy to protect students and using delaying tactics, shameful. We have a written policy that was close to passing. Now we are looking at a timeline when we have a policy that works. Think it's being manipulated to hold policy back. This one good working document, the conversation should be over and the president should vote on it.

Point of order please. Ask people to speak consistently with agreement of this body.

Incorrect statements. Unanimous decision had one abstention. There is no common commitment to see this go forward. Support idea to hear from all groups. Obvious that people who say they are representing everyone in groups respectfully disagree. There is no reason for a taskforce, disrespectful to members of diversity council. There is no reason. Not about a timeline, about the policy itself. Maybe time for administration unilateral action.

Sat here for 45 minutes waiting for cc allow people to speak. Talked about experience in Science class over the summer where student wouldn't sit next to a person of color. Person of color didn't come back to the class for a week. Want to see a policy that teach the instructor how to be comfortable guiding students on this type of situations.

Ready for change. Was a student 10 years ago. Love this campus and would like to see trust that diversity council address issues of diversity. Hear a lot about what students are going through. Great professionals that can address issues and are open to hear ideas that the rest of us have. Create a path for students to feel like there is some closure in the process. We don't know what happens with complaints. It is important for students to know what happens in the process.

It is not about racism, it is about understanding all kinds of people on campus. None of us like to be told what to think. That is not what the policy is for. Rather not label. About us presenting ourselves to each other. Taking opportunity to witness more in the world. Read different newspapers. Give staff opportunity to witness what students are coming from. Presenting self and community to you. Help us all grow. Helpful if students can do that. Giving back to the faculty.

Trainings need to be mandatory, because staff who are creating unsafe spaces don't go to voluntary trainings. Don't see how a TF is going to make a decision on this. Committee where people spoke last year didn't feel safe. This space needs to be safe and open. Needs to move quicker, and happen soon. You cannot push it off until students are no longer here to push forward. I'll be moving to UofO and others will leave too, can't postpone until you don't have anyone here to defend it and put forth a different policy to hide behind.

I was misquoted on "silly" ideas. People in my constituency may have ideas that are now considering silly (60s and 70s), I want to protect them. Need education, not punitive behavior.

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES

Pending minutes for approval: April 25th, May 23rd, and October 17th

Rules we established for the minutes are not being followed closely. Minutes will list key subjects discussed, agreements reached, and actions taken. Current minutes have too many notes of discussion; frequently have referred to who made comments.

Also saw those guidelines regarding minutes. I read on another councils were transparency are useful. We should take a look of those rules. It doesn't have to be another fight. It should be more transparent.

Proposal:

Table the minutes not yet approved because of inconsistencies with guidelines for our minutes.

Voting: approved

WORKPLAN

- Policy work done by December
- Cultural policy, open sessions to college staff by group, invite them separate (15 minutes each). BB asked if that will be paid time, because he is afraid that managers will say not approve attendance. Hearing of constituencies for each group, include chairs and vice-chairs will be done by January
- Guidelines for meeting minutes
- Assessment of the governance system
- Accreditation to be included at the next meeting

- Review policies that council is responsible for
- Finance and budget work for the year

POLICY WORK

A list of policies that Nadine Williams and Mary Glenn have worked on has been sent to members of cc.

The template for policies has been sent to members of cc

Nadine W. and Mary G. have asked to work on Drafts of policies that need cc review.

There are only a handful of policies that belong to CC; the other policies are for the councils.

Suggestion was made that the vocabulary should not use corporate words, i.e. students vs. costumers; best practices; etc.

SUBCOMMITTES

How frequently should the meetings be?

Depends, let's do it every two weeks.

ISSUES AT STUDENT AFFAIRS COUNCIL AND LEARNING COUNCIL

Student Affairs Council: administrator cannot be chairs of a council; the new Executive Dean of Student Affairs Kerry Levett has nominated herself as chair of the council. Someone needs to let her know how the governance system works. President Spilde offered to talk to her.

Learning Council: Phil Martinez chair of this council (faculty) has taken the position of interim management in Social Sciences, leaving the chair position vacant. The qualified members for this position have not accepted the nomination. Therefore the council doesn't have someone who has the qualifications to fill the chair position. Phil Martinez is willing to continue as chair, if there is an approval for this exception.

Proposal:

Allow Phil to be chair if he gets elected, the exception will be due to extreme circumstances, but will not set precedent.

Voting: All in favor

REPORTS

ASLCC: Will attend OSAC conference in November. They are done with the surveys that totaled 2,306 students.

MSC: the group is moving along. Representative expressed her appreciation to member Russell Shitabata for helping the council move along with the initial item in the agenda.

ET: working on budget, accreditation, vacant positions, center building central plan, bond, etc.

Members asked what are the college's plan regarding the enrollment reduction, which will create a deficit in the current budget. President Spilde responded that we are at 8.18%. A 10% creates a 2 million deficit; we have not finalized a plan yet, but the directions from the board are to look at: capital outlet, part time classified staff, and part time faculty staff.

LCCEA: no report

Faculty council: we are picking work unfinished, charter revision, and participating in the taskforce group for the Professional Cultural Competency Education policy.

LCCEF: no report

Adjourn: at 3:50 pm

DRAFT - COUNCIL APPROVAL PENDING -