

Learning Council

Meeting Notes from October 22, 2004

ATTENDANCE:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BOB BARBER | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> JUDY MCKENZIE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KATE BARRY | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KEN MURDOFF |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MARY BRAU | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAMARA PINKAS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SARA SUMNER | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ALBERT POOTH |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LIDA HERBURGER | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CATHERINE RESCHKE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PATRICK LANNING | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KEN ZIMMERMAN |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SABRINA DAVIS | <input type="checkbox"/> SONYA CHRISTIAN |

OUTCOMES:

DISCUSSION:

AGENDA:

1. Review Learning Plan Draft Discussion:

Discussion:

- Logistics:
 - The 1st page of the bulletin board has been changed in response to feedback on the formatting.
 - The last day for comment is May 24th.
 - There have been a limited number of comments made on the bulletin board.
- Steps to get increased feedback:
 - At Faculty Council and Diversity Council, direction to the bulletin board and requested feedback.
 - Will run information in the Daily again and ask for feedback giving the link to the bulletin board
 - Will contact managers and peer-to-peer by email to solicit feedback
 - Will visit Facilities and Student Affairs Council and will send link to ASLCC President with request to forward to Student Senate members
- Preliminary Feedback
 - Diversity Council responded with their opinion that diversity should be infused in the whole Learning Plan and not as a separate section. There was disagreement on whether the Learning Plan should address diversity generally or whether it should focus on specific groups.
 - Kate Barry will provide the Learning Council with a complete summary of the discussion.
- A small group is forming to review the comments and integrate them into the plan. A revised version will be ready for the Learning Council to review on June 3rd and to give to College Council on June 10th.

2. Review of Committees' Relationship to Learning Council:

Discussion:

Agreement to the following was reached as to the relationship between some committees and the Learning Council as follows:

- Academic Council: No relationship.
- American with Disabilities Act Committee: No relationship. There is an instructional representative assigned by Faculty Council

Decision: Learning Council will recommend to College Council that the "Recommended Relation" given by College Council be modified as follows:

OUTCOMES:	DISCUSSION:
<p>Provides Reports be changed to Provides Reports and Recommendations (PR→PRR)</p> <p>Recommends Policies/Plans to Council be changed to Policy Approval (RPP→PR)</p> <p>A relationship be added: Have Council member on the Committee (REP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal Support Committee: No relationship • Art Works Committee: No relationship • Assessment Committee: Make a subcommittee of Learning Council (SC) • Curriculum Approval, Curriculum Development Funding and Degree Requirements Review Committees: Recommend a process to discuss and clarify the relationship to Learning Council & appointment of members which Learning Council would lead in conjunction with Faculty Council. • Professional Technical Education Coordinating Committee: Provides Reports and Recommendations (PRR) • Space Assignment Committee: Relationship pending information about status with respect to Facilities Council • Success and Goal Attainment (SAGA): Explore relationship with SAGA • Sustainability Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilities Part: No relationship ○ Curriculum Part: Learning Council, Technology Council and College Council need to study and reorganize how technology fees are spent (REP) • Unit Planning Process Review Task Force: Learning Council needs to be directly involved in the design and use of Unit Plans • Web Site Steering Committee: No relationship
<p>3. <u>Technology Plan:</u></p> <p><u>NEXT MEETING:</u> June 3, 1-3 in PE 206</p> <p>ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary of work this year and proposed next steps 2. Scheduling for next year 3. Assessment (6/3) 4. Talloires Declaration (6/3) 5. RTEC-Information Sharing/Laurie Swanson Gribskov <p>FALL AGENDA ITEMS: Communication with other Councils.</p>	<p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Technology Plan was designed around curriculum objectives, communication objectives and institutional capacity objectives • The Technology Plan was sent to Technology, Learning and Faculty Councils for feedback before being sent out for community/campus discussion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technology Council has approved it for discussion ○ Faculty Council sent it out for email discussion and reached agreement that it could be sent for discussion prior to approval by Faculty Council ○ Learning Council needs to lead in facilitating community/campus discussion and getting approval. Learning Council will send it out via email for review and ask that responses be sent to the Learning Council Mailbox