Lane Community College

COLLEGE COUNCIL MINUTES
January 12, 2022
2:00–4:00 p.m.

Vice-Chair: • Margaret Hamilton, President - **Yes**	**LCCEF** (Classified 2)**:** • Frankie Cocanour - **Yes** • Kyle Schmidt, Chair - **Yes**	**Managers** (2)**:** • Grant Matthews – **Yes** • Patrick Blaine – **Yes**
Vice Presidents (2) • Paul Jarrell – **Yes** (left early) • Zach Evans - **Yes**	**LCCEA** (Faculty 1)**:** • Adrienne Mitchell - **Yes**	**ASLCC** (Students 2): • Jeremiah Vandagrift - ***No*** • Vacant
Chief Strategy and Planning Officer • Richard Plott - ***No***	**Faculty Council Co-chair:** • Sam Gibeau - **Yes** (for Rachel Knighten)	**Student Success Council:** • Jenn Kempka - **Yes**

Item	Notes
Agenda Review	**Chair moves to move SEM Plan Adoption to February meeting**. **Hamilton moves to add Governance Meeting Minute Format Discussion** Motion by Schmidt to make changes to the agenda, seconded by Blaine 10-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain – ***Motion Passes***
Approval of prior Minutes	**Minutes - Approval for November Special Minutes and December Minutes** Motion to approve as a package by Blaine, seconded by Matthews Abstain – Mitchell, Kepka, Jarrell, and Gibeau 7 – Yes, 0-No, 4 – Abstain - ***Motion Passes***
New business	<u>**SEM Plan Adoption – Moved to February 9th Meeting**</u> Tabled until February 2022 meeting. An updated plan will be shared when it becomes available. <u>**Strategic Plan as Approved by the Board**</u> Concern was shared by a council member that the feedback given to the board from the many councils, were not incorporated into the final Strategic Plan. Furthermore, the board should receive a document in a final draft form which has been vetted through the governance system. It was recommended that the council incorporate the feedback, thoroughly examine the suggestions, and vote on an actual plan prior to going to the board. Council member mentioned that the board reviewed and considered the recommendations made by all of the councils prior to finalizing the Strategic Plan. Council member commented that there was a missing step in the process in that this council should have provided the board a completed draft after it was vetted, voted on, and approved by council. It was recommended that this council takes time today to discuss how we can rectify this. Or, if there is a subgroup that is working on revisions or drafting of the Strategic Plan, that subgroup can submit it to this council's meeting on February 9th and we can vote to adopt it and forward the amended document to the board. Motion by Mitchell to have this council deliberate and vote on the Strategic Plan after consideration of the feedback and then send that adopted Strategic Plan to the board as amended, seconded by Schmidt 3 – Yes, 4 – No, 3 – Abstain – ***Motion Fails*** <u>Discussion</u> Question was asked by a council member if there are particular items missing in the feedback justifying lengthening the process. Response was given that the starting point would specifically be all of the feedback that College Council unanimously voted on where this council would review and incorporate the feedback.

Council member commented that in previous meetings this council reviewed and approved the recommendations with the understanding that the next step would be to forward them to the board. There were no previous conversations regarding the creation of a new Strategic Plan to submit to the board. The board did consider all comments and incorporated what they felt should be incorporated.

Response was given by council member that they were not aware that the next step would be to send the changes form to the board. Also, feels that there wouldn't be substantial harm in creating an amended version to be presented to the board at February's board meeting.

President Hamilton offered to meet with the board members to discuss the need to revisit the draft. Offering that it would be a good opportunity for College Council to combine all of the comments, vote on it, then resubmit it to the board.

Concern was shared that if this council was to start over, it would be substantively different than what we have today. There was a lot of work and effort that went into this document by a lot of people, and by starting over there may be several issues that arise.

Request was made that if this council chooses to start over, that a timeframe is put in place to avoid taking a long time to come to an agreement, and then moving it on to the board.

Council member reiterated that they aren't sure what the benefits of starting over are and that this conversation should have taken place months ago. It was clear that at the last meeting that everyone was aware that the changes were going to the board as they were written and that the board asked for all the original feedback from the councils without editing. It was asked what happens if the board ignores the suggestions of the revised changes, do we go through the entire process again?

Council member responded by saying that by starting over it would provide credibility and integrity to the governance system. It was suggested that the Council needs to vote on the Strategic Plan, per the instructions of the Charter. At the November meeting it was discussed that this council needs to vote on the Strategic Plan.This member did understand that the feedback was going to the board, but what wasn't understood was that the board was simultaneously voting on the draft that didn't incorporate the feedback. It is the responsibility of this council to develop and update the plan, which hasn't been done.

Council member commented that the changes submitted to the board were not unanimously approved, there was a no-vote.

Request was made by council member that if this council votes to start over, that all chairs and vice chairs of Lane's councils attend that meeting.

Clarification was made by council member if a new plan was to come out of College Council, it would first go to the president for consideration, then to the board, not directly to the board. Additionally, the vote taken on the changes document was voted on to move it forward to the board. It wasn't a vote for approval to put directly in the Strategic Plan.

Council member suggested that this council can still approve the Strategic Plan as presented and approved by the board. We haven't neglected that duty.

Again, that vote was a vote to submit the feedback to the board, not a vote of the approval of the feedback. To suggest or imply that the feedback is council approved to incorporate into the Strategic Plan is misleading of what was voted on.

Council member commented saying that an Ad Hoc committee is supposed to bring a draft to the College Council for approval, that's what our governance system provides for. Therefore, if a step is missed in the process, then the situation needs to be rectified. And when the board is involved, they need to be informed of the proper process in place, which is one of the reasons for submitting an amended version,

Council member commented that at the previous board meeting there was a motion to include some of the comments that came from the Changes document that was submitted by this council, some of them were defeated by the board. The extent of which the board is familiar with College Council's procedures is questionable.

Council member commented that the reasons given at the previous board meeting for not making additional changes based on the feedback given to them was that the board was looking at a draft provided as an official document, provided and recommended by the administration. It was a recommended motion by the administration to adopt the draft without incorporation of any specific feedback.

Motion to the existing motion by Schmidt to ask President Hamilton to check-in with the board and if it appears this council will have another pass at incorporating all of the council's feedback into one document, that we convene on January 26, for approval by College Council to present the new copy to the board, no seconds.

Council member confirmed that the board is aware that it is College Council and the governance's duty to develop a plan, that is exactly what this committee did by establishing an Ad Hoc committee. The board worked with administration to appoint an inclusive Steering Committee to develop this plan and requested to see the original work of the Steering Committee- along with the feedback of all the councils- with no editing.

Discussion Following Failed Vote
Council member requested that the council members who voted against following the College Council Charter and ensuring that College Council fulfills its role to approve the Strategic Plan, to really think it through if the way they voted is really what they want to do.

Council member responded by saying that they do want to ensure that the process is followed accurately however, the reason for voting no is that at this point at which this conversation should have happened was several months ago. The board has been very clear about their role in establishing this.

Council member asked, how can we participate in a governance system where feedback is solicited, time is spent, and none of that is incorporated or even considered in a vote. It isn't a vote to guarantee that all feedback will be incorporated, even the feedback voted on by this council for consideration hasn't been incorporated. Why should there be a governance system if the most basic steps of the Charter are not followed.

Council member stated that at the previous meeting when voting on the Changes document, the opposition vote was based on what they believed to be a procedural misconduct; procedural misstep in what was being voted on. This concern was brought up very early on. The characterization is a mischaracterization of the "no" votes. Furthermore, changing a process because feedback isn't incorporated is different from changing a process because feedback isn't heard, there hasn't been any evidence of that.

Council member stated that this council has yet to have a conversation to determine what to incorporate or not in the Strategic Plan.

Council member asked another council member who was standing-in for a regular member, if they were willing to vote yes on behalf of Faculty Council to honor the governance system therefore, giving College Council the opportunity to review, amend, and vote on the Strategic Plan.

Council member responded by saying that it is unacceptable for someone to pressure another person on this committee to vote in a particular direction.

Council member responded by apologizing and stating there was no intention of pressuring or making anyone uncomfortable. They were simply inviting a committee member to vote since they hadn't had an opportunity to do so.

Council member shared that sitting in this meeting today listening to a member of this committee threaten or intimidate the way someone should vote, that is what is going to destroy this governance process. That is what is going to cause this to fall apart.

	Council member Hamilton intends to have a conversation with the board.chair and vice chair about points made. It is important they hear the frustration in everybody's voices. Recommendation to meet on January 26th to further for feedback from her conversation with the board members. **<u>Revising Governance Manual</u>** Per the request at the last meeting, the Faculty Council has been added as a regular council. Request to make some updated changes in the history section to bring the information up to date. A few sentences regarding the governance redesign and some of the changes that have been made. Prior to the GSC meeting to review and propose to the full council changes to the manual, we should do a first pass with GSC, and then have GSC bring it forward to College Council. Additionally, BDS is not listed. Previous items that were previously not considered to be on the GIT will also be considered by that group to bring back to College Council. **<u>Governance Meeting Minutes Format</u>** A support person has been assigned to all of the Governance Councils. Parts of that role are to take the minutes for all of the councils and get them in order, support the council's work, and maintain the website. Since all of the councils take minutes differently, should we move more towards *Robert's Rules* type minutes like we try to use in the board meetings, action-oriented minutes versus narrative and verbiage? The reasoning for this suggestion is that we now place recordings on the website. <u>Comments/Suggestions:</u> ● Presently the recordings disappear after a year however there is a way to adjust that time. ● Use the transcription function from the recordings. ● Concern that when recordings are stored in the cloud that quality is compromised. ● Minutes are not intended as summaries. ● College committee meeting minutes and notes are subject to a five-year record retention.
College Council Sub Committees Reports:	<u>Finance & Budget Development (BTS)</u> Adrienne / Paul / Zach ● Have received preliminary information regarding the budget deficit projection for next year. The full projection will be available once it is available for the board to review. ● Retroactively applied HERF funds to last year's budget therefore having a n increase of more than $5 million in the general fund ending balance ● All Campus Budget Forum is Friday, February 23rd, 11 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. ● BTS goal is to bring to the College Council a consensus budget proposal by February 23rd. <u>Governance Sub Committee - Nothing to Report</u> Adrienne / Kyle / Rachel / Paul <u>Policy Sub Committee - Nothing to Report</u> Adrienne / Kyle / Paul / Patrick <u>Infrastructure Committee</u> Richard - Absent
Adjourn	3:25 p.m. - Motion by Hamilton, seconded by Schmidt - Motion carries, meeting adjourned

Recorder: Tami Hill