



College Council MINUTES
May 28, 2009, Boardroom 1:45 – 3:45

Present: Mary Spilde, Greg Morgan, Sonya Christian, Craig Taylor, Larry Scott, Bob Baldwin, Jim Salt, Jim Lindly, James Manning

Item	Notes
Agenda review	No changes were made.
Review of Notes	Notes of February 26 and April 23 were approved with amendments that Jim Salt will send to Elizabeth Minutes of May 14 pending for next meeting.
Election of 2009-10 CC Chair	Election of Next year's Chair Nomination that Bob Baldwin to continue as a chair was presented. Motion passed unanimously
Planning Discussion	Discussion/Adoption of Policy Bob Baldwin indicated that Denise Brinkman will join the Planning subcommittee. Sonya Christian explained the considerations of by the subcommittee to prepare the working mainframe for updating the strategic plan. She mentioned that there are some areas that the subcommittee couldn't come to an agreement. Members presented the following concerns: Will the work begin at mission statement level and how will it translate to the operations of the college. Strategic Planning vs financial planning tied to the number of years of planning; planning and budget have to interrelate, one is not the driver of the other. What role will the other councils play when reviewing the plans of the planning subcommittee? Perhaps ask board of education for input, give them a 20 minute presentation and then open for discussion. Other issues presented were cost for same classes compared to other institutions such as UofO. What are the dynamics of the market? A member expressed that for him the school mission and values is like the constitution for the country, we should continue with what college founders had created. Institution is not sustainable for a long term, and a consequence there are internal conflicts. Planning at strategic level, doesn't mean to enter in detail of operations costs. We need to see strategies at large level. Do a SWOT (strengths, weakness, opportunities, treats) analysis as in the private industry. President Spilde recommendation was to have something to give Board during their retreat, such as accomplishments of strategic directions, so they can start the conversation.
Design Guidelines	Margaret Robertson, chair of Facilities Council started her presentation with the following message from FC: the policy's title is Design Guidelines, it is intended to be "must" or "should". And a reminder that they are not an operational, but planning council. Recommendations suggested have been implemented. Discussion was around: Have specific times for

	<p>revisions, maybe do it annually. Roberts indicated that suggestion should be included. President Spilde proposed to approve policy, Christian second, motion was passed unanimously.</p>
<p>Tobacco Free Policy</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Lane is different than other colleges, if we follow other places there will be a big repercussion on students in the current crisis situation; those students have lost their jobs, and when they come to Lane, and find out that can not do the only thing that gives them some release to their stress such as smoking, it is going to be really hard, even though these population is not large. Not sure if the argument of waiting for a year is strong enough. Not all policies are being fully followed, no matter how much education is given there are always going to be people breaking policies. Other community colleges are going in that direction so it is just a matter of time.</p> <p>Geographically speaking is the parking lot included in the policy? People who don't smoke are also suffering from the smoke. We are talking of a narcotic problem. Accommodating smoking is to expose non smokers to a health risk that they have not chosen. I am not sure what we mean by campus area, people will go to smoke into the county property, and that could be a problem. Pieces of information are missing, such as how many students spend the whole day here, it seems like an average student doesn't spend more than three hours at school, so to spend without cigarette can not be a major problem. Some students do spend long hours at school. Do we ask people to go cold turkey, or do they go and smoke outside campus, or we do we have a transition plan? A transition plan is a more humane way of dealing with the issue. Smokers don't have rights, institutions have rights. Smokers travel in airplanes for hours and they survive. Maybe allow smokers on campus site if they can fund a way to cover the expenses they incur for the college. Has to be some kind of consequence for violating the policy. Student rep indicated that there is a need for more information, and if Faculty union rep is going to have a survey done with faculty, he would like to do a less biased survey with students. A campus wide survey has been done already, no matter how many times it is done; the results are going to be similar. An example is that 150 campuses nation wide have gone smoke-free. Some of the smokers on whom the policy was imposed have find out that was beneficial for them afterwards. What is the cost, who is going to handle the enforcement? Council will be vote on next meeting</p>
<p>Reports: ET, Faculty Council, ASLCC, Mgnt Steering committee, LCCEF and LCCEA</p>	<p>LCCEF Roger Gamblin will be filling the vacancy for classified representation. LCCEA busy with bargaining. Is the governance system working, based on the web site agendas and minutes seems like is not working well. Faculty Council: Andy Saltzman will be the new co-chair. Next year faculty council rep for College Council will be Dennis Gilber.</p>
<p>Subcommittee's reports</p>	