

College Council
February 22, 2006

Members present: Bob Baldwin, Siv Serene Barnum, Sheila Broderick, Sonya Christian, Happi Matthews, Mary Spilde by phone, Andrea Newton, Jim Salt, Craig Taylor

Unable to attend: Dan Dawson, Dan Timberlake

Guests: Mary Brau, Sarah Ulerick, Tracy Simms

Meeting notes from February 8 were approved as revised.

Reports

College Council Chair – The Finance Council, at this week's meeting, voted on a proposal to suspend meetings until College Council provides direction or until the need to meet arises. A majority favored the proposal; faculty representatives opposed the proposal; student representatives are not able to attend due to schedule conflicts. It appears at this point, despite the lack of consensus, that meetings will not occur given the majority opposition to meeting. The Finance Council chairperson added that members who voted in favor of this step agreed that the council has not been productive and that an assessment of the governance system could result in changes –a restructuring of the system or a reduction in the number of councils, for example.

ASLCC – Students were surprised by a note in *The Torch* announcing a Board of Education move to raise tuition by \$3.50 next year. [This is in line with [FY08 Budget Development Strategies](#) approved by College Council on October 12, 2006.] Student senators are in Salem today to rally for community colleges. The Oregon Community College Student Association will hold a second rally in Salem on March 8.

LCCEF – Budget reduction proposals related to contractual issues will be addressed through the labor relations process, not through the governance process.

LCCEA – Structural redesign work is moving forward. Union members are organizing support for lobbying efforts in Salem. The Oregon Education Association continues to monitor and strongly supports SB 426, the Senate bill to create state-wide insurance plans for public education employees. The OEA opposed an amendment to the bill that would undermine part-time staff access to the plans; the amendment did not move from committee.

Budget Development Subcommittee

A review of a component of the charge to the Budget Review Group cleared any misunderstanding around the distribution of the BRG recommendations. The college will follow the steps outlined in the [FY08 Budget Development Process](#). BRG will present its recommendations to the president on or about March 15. The president, in consultation with BRG and/or others in the college community, will review the recommendations. That review may or may not result in a revised set of recommendations. Both the original BRG proposals and any revisions will be presented to the Board of Education, the College Council, and the college community. The College Council will assess the proposals with regard to [FY08 Budget Development Principles and Criteria](#), in an open meeting.

Council reached unanimous agreement to revise the Budget Review Group Statement of Work. The first 8 points are unchanged. The final 3 points will read as follows:

9. The Budget Review Group will make recommendations to the president who will, in turn, make recommendations to the board. In cases where the Budget Review Group does not reach consensus or is not able to complete the work, the president will be responsible for making recommendations on those matters to the board.
10. College Council will review and assess the BRG recommendations with regard to college principles and criteria.
11. College Council, in an open meeting, will provide an opportunity for feedback from the college community.

The state revenue forecast is flat. No changes are anticipated. The new Lane County income tax may help the college in that it will ease the state financial burden. The Joint Insurance Committee reports high health insurance claims because of a few people with catastrophic health challenges. Preliminary enrollment numbers are up 2-4.6% - final numbers will be available in the next two weeks.

Interim Accreditation Report

Mary Brau and Sarah Ulerick presented draft 7. An April 30 visit from an accreditation evaluator will focus on assessment and on evaluation of part-time faculty. Brau and Ulerick asked for feedback (accuracy, omissions, tone) by March 1. The Learning Council is reviewing a Continuous Improvement policy to monitor this work in the future.

The College Council is responsible for approving all college policy; the proposed policy will be scheduled for discussion at the next council meeting.

Governance Subcommittee

Responses were invited to the draft Governance System Progress Report. This will be presented to the college by the College Council chair and vice-chair in order to communicate a history of the system. It was written primarily by the College President and former College Governance Coordinator (Ted Romoser).

Discussion Points -

- The report should not be distributed before an assessment of what and how well the governance system is doing.
- The report should include appendices to show the scope of work accomplished.
- Two of the seven councils are on hiatus. Some representatives from the remaining five councils have expressed concerns about the effectiveness of the system.
- Is the Learning Council Plan informing instructional redesign?
- Has the governance system replaced an overblown committee structure, as was intended?
- Objective, critical analysis is necessary before we proclaim success.

Future Agenda Items

Assessment

Policy approval

Budget recommendations review

Continuous Improvement Policy approval

[vote on March 8 – Christian will distribute for review via email]

Meeting adjourned: 3:00

Recorder: Mary Bolton