



College Council MINUTES

May 14, 2009, Boardroom 1:45 – 3:45

Present: Mary Spilde, Greg Morgan, Sonya Christian, Craig Taylor, Larry Scott , Bob Baldwin, Jim Salt, Jim Lindly, Jonathan Morton, Jim Manney

Item	Notes
Agenda review	Item regarding Planning was made by President Spilde
Review of Notes	May 12 minutes were approved. Minutes for Feb 26 and April 23 need some corrections. Elizabeth will take care of corrections.
Energy Conservation Policy	Second reading: First reading was done in January, CC recommended Jennifer Hayward to prepare a policy draft. Policy draft (attached) was presented and reviewed by CC. Motion presented: To approve policy. Motion passed unanimously.
No-smoking policy	<p>On behalf of Wendy Simmons who is on sabbatical, Stephanie Young-Peterson from Lane County Public Health made a power point presentation on the Smoking Free Task Force Group recommendation.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>An unintended consequence is the breaking of smoking social groups; the longer we drag this the more painful it becomes. We are not being trend setters on tobacco-free campus, we are behind the curve. The Lane core value of maintaining healthy systems does not reconcile with current reality. Chair of CC asked the two minority members of the task force present if they have comments, one replied that he has come only to listen and didn't have anything prepared, but will send something in writing; and the other had requested a copy of this power point presentation and never received any response, he stated that this presentation doesn't represent the entire Task Force Group. The faculty union representative gave a brief history of how this item has been processed by CC so far, and that Task group has not followed the process agreed. He also made a clarification that Faculty Council is not part of the governance system. There was a proposal to hear all voices and asked the Task Force to present minority reports at the next CC meeting on May 28 and then vote. Sonya Christian replied that she was under the impression that task force was unanimous on the recommendation, obviously there is discrepancy. She requested to have the other perspective as well, and a clarification on what is that CC is voting on May 28.</p> <p>Faculty Council representative responded that Task force was meant to present a draft policy. Faculty and Classified unions requested to see something more substantial than the document presented. Maybe have another group help on the policy language. Members agreed. Task force will bring minority reports and policy draft.</p> <p>Since public comments are not a practice of CC, Chair asked for member's agreement to allow public comments in this case. Members agreed.</p>

Planning	<p>President Spilde said that there have been several requests on strategic planning during the last months; she asked the CC to develop a process and work on a document that will frame the main issues. The document will be presented to the board during their July retreat. She asked the CC Planning sub-committee to come with a process. Current members of planning committee are Craig Taylor, Sonya Christian, Bob Baldwin and Larry Scott. Last strategic plan was developed by a task force.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>President's proposal makes sense only if there is full representation. Larry Scott will represent faculty council, Jim Manning will represent the students, Bob Baldwin or someone will represent classified staff.</p> <p>President Spilde was asked for a clarification on what will be the charge and purpose of this committee. Are we moving the mission and values, or just the strategic directions? The direction we are going has to be spelled out. The planning committee is a standing committee, and there is no need for a charter of responsibilities. Clarification on the scope of responsibilities is needed. President clarified that they need to move at strategic direction level because that is how the budget will be driven. Board is having a retreat in July and wants to engage in the strategic direction that the college is going.</p> <p>Agreement was to look at calendar and schedule two meetings.</p>
Design Guidelines	<p>Second reading:</p> <p>Margaret Robertson chair of Facilities Council presented the final draft of the policy that all external consultants will be guided by. She explained that FC has done extensive research including other campus' policies, other college councils input, as well as pertinent areas.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Some of the policies such the one on page 8 related to specific piece of property would be harder to implement. Robertson clarified that the reason for 100 feet is the ecological response. Faculty union rep congratulated Facilities Council for the excellent work they have done in putting this document together. Staff should be able to work in spaces that are not interrupted by noises; internal function should be more useful factor than esthetics. Faculty council has not finished discussing policy's feedback; some of the responses of their members were read, they need more time for their recommendation.</p> <p>Policy on page 8 could be a constraint for future decision's that board may want to make on that piece of land. Robertson explained to the council that they were hoping that CC vote today, because bond construction has started.</p> <p>A recommendation to get a straw poll to see how everyone feels was presented so based on that have a preliminary vote. Faculty council rep opposed explaining that they are not ready to vote on this policy yet. Bob Baldwin opposed putting purchasing criteria under design policy. Greg Morgan agreed.</p> <p>Chair of CC recommended that Facilities C and Faculty C work together separately and bring the policy draft to next CC meeting (May 28) for voting. CC member's agreed.</p>
Reports: ET, Faculty Council, ASLCC, Mgnt Senate, LCCEF and LCCEA	There was no time for reports