

COLLEGE COUNCIL MINUTES

February 9, 2021
2:00–4:00 p.m.

Vice-Chair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Margaret Hamilton, President - Yes 	LCCEF (Classified 2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frankie Cocanour - Yes • Kyle Schmidt, Chair - Yes 	Managers (2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant Matthews – Yes (Joined 3:18 p.m.) • Patrick Blaine – Yes
Vice Presidents (2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Jarrell – Yes • Zach Evans - Yes 	LCCEA (Faculty 1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph Colton – Yes (for Adrienne Mitchell) 	ASLCC (Students 2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeremiah Vandagriff - No • Vacant
Chief Strategy and Planning Officer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard Plott - Yes 	Faculty Council Co-chair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachel Knighten - Yes 	Student Success Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jenn Kempka - Yes
Infrastructure Council Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meggie Wright 		Guest(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mindie Dieu • Rebecca Long

Item	Notes
Agenda Review	
Approval of prior Minutes	Minutes - Approval for January 12th Minutes Motion to approve by Blaine, seconded by Jarrell. – Motion Passes Unanimous
Announcements	Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institutional Research Board (IRB) is recruiting members. See IEC Subcommittees and Scope of Work for more information or contact Tammie Stark if interested. • At this council's last meeting there was a change made to the agenda. The chair asked for a vote on whether or not to change the vote, that procedure was wrong. It should have been seconded.
New business	Student Communications Policy – First Reading Mindie Dieu, Assoc. VP of Student Affairs Jenn Kepka, Faculty/Student Success Council Chair Rebecca Long, Director of Marketing/Strategic Communications Background: Typically this would be the second reading for this Policy as it was previously brought to this council at the end of last year for a first review. However, because that council is no longer together, we are calling this the first reading. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the information added to this policy is to help protect students. • Request was made by council to clarify which students are being told the <i>will</i> be using their college email, and which students are being told they <i>can</i> use their email address. Lane provides students (except Continuing Education students) official college email addresses. • Suggestion was made by council that all students should be issued a Lane email regardless of if they are full time, parttime, or taking continuing education classes. Paragraph two should read that continuing education students are the only students that don't receive a Lane email. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A council member responded saying that A third-party that is not part of the Banner solution is going to be retired soon since it is at the end of the life cycle. By this happening, the program in place will allow for an immediate release of an L number to a student, which allows them to receive services and an email account for Continuing Education students. • Request was made to remove College Now students as those who do not receive a Lane email when becoming a student. (Some College Now students are not able to access their

Lane email from their high school computers.) And if doing so, would Lane be prohibited from contacting them using anything other than the Lane email.

- Suggestion was made to work towards providing all students with a Lane email upon registration regardless of what class(es) they are enrolling in.

SEM Plan Adoption – First Reading

Mindie Dieu, Assoc. VP of Student Affairs

- Started with 51 Strategies which were included the last time this Council saw the SEM Plan.
- Several strategies have been pulled due to funding.
- The remaining strategies are attainable over the next five or six years and have been attached to maintenance.
- The left-over objectives and strategies that already have funding are in progress and the remaining ones will begin when funded. This plan is rolling out in a staggered format.
- The strategies that were pulled, were sent to the appropriate departments telling them to include them in their annual budget request.

Strategy 3, Sub item 1: Suggestion was made to require students to meet with a counselor prior to changing their program. Perhaps a mandated system soft touch or something that prevents students from taking further action. Or an automated message that reads “you’re dropping a class, here are some resources. You may want to see Financial Aid to see the impact on the change”.

- Response was given by Dieu that part of their holistic student support is reaching out to students that are going to drop classes.

Objective 3, Item #1 – Removed from the SEM Plan

Objective 1, Sub item 2: Suggestion was made to replace completion rates with retention, which is also mentioned in this plan. It seems that the CTE programs are moving toward an emphasis on having students continue the program.

- Reply was given that it is through increased retention and persistence and redesign into more stackable certificates.

Objective 4, Sub Items 1 & 2: Opinion was shared that the way the wording is, makes it harder to implement without more funding.

- Response was given by Dieu that there will be commitment.

Objection 4, Item 3: Suggestion was made to reword because retention and rites of passage are not necessarily related.

- Dieu suggested using, *increase retention among BIPOC students, as item #3 title*

Objective 5, Item 5

Concern was given regarding number one through number 3, they don’t seem relevant with each other.

Request was made to allow this committee to have one more week to review this document prior to voting on it.

Motion by Schmidt to convert the Governance Subcommittee meeting on February 16th, to a special meeting for College Council to vote on the SEM Plan, seconded by Richard – ***Motion Passes Unanimously***

Governance System Manual Changes – Vote for approval

Committee reviewed the Governance System Manual Changes document and with no more changes voted on approval.

Motion was made by Blaine to approve the Governance Manual Changes, seconded by Hamilton – ***Motion Passes Unanimously***

Discussion

Concern was shared that faculty Council have their own decision-making process which could possibly conflict with the governance manuals as ordained in the faculty councils

- The chair responded by saying that as part of making the faculty Council a full member of the governance system, it isn't our place to change how they operate. It says in the manual that the Faculty Council can elect to use their own decision-making process, as long as they describe what it is.

A council member suggested that everything should be standardized and under one metric as it makes it difficult when exceptions are made for some and not others.

Response was made that the Faculty Council will still be abiding by the governance manual because the manual is the one giving the authority for them to make their own process, they can't go outside of the rules. This council could set the expectation that decision making processes need to be outlined within those bodies' charter so that others are aware of what process they follow.

A comment was made that the Faculty Council is different in that they only have faculty members. This isn't a broad representative group, and the consensus model works best when you have a broad group represented and voting.

Decision Matrices

Background:

Originally when the council charters were created, there was a decision matrix associated with them.

Chair asked whether this committee feels the decision matrices are still needed; were they sufficiently described in the process for granting policy in the manual or in COPPS as it is now. Also, should the governance subcommittee create decision matrices for each of the Student Success Council and the Infrastructure Council, presently they don't have one.

Motion was made by Schmidt to task the Governance Committee with removing Decision Matrices from the manual and from various charters, seconded by Jarrell – ***Motion Passes Unanimously***

Strategic Plan

Background:

A week or two ago a group met to discuss how we could make changes to the Strategic Plan if we wanted changes made. After the chair met with President Hamilton, they would like to recommend that this committee look at the goals and determine if we can get the goals signed off.

[Strategic Plan 2021 as approved by the Board](#)

[Changes made at the meeting](#)

[Feedback document](#)

A plan was suggested by the chair in suggesting that once this committee agrees with the goals that are presently in the Strategic Plans, then they can forward them to the Board of Education. Once that is done, this committee, as a group, can review and revise the objectives if needed, over time. This committee will let the Board know when we are okay with the goals, and we will present our objectives with all of the version feedback to them.

	<p>Additionally, if this is a living document what parts are living and what is the process for changing those?</p> <p>Response was given that the living things are the strategies in how we are going to achieve the outcomes.</p> <p>In response to the claim that College Council didn't approve the information that went to the Board of Education for the Strategic Plan, a suggestion was made to change the verbiage in the manual to read, College Council approves instead of develops, it will be in place moving forward.</p> <p>Suggestion was made to take some time over the next week or two, review the feedback, update the plan, and move forward.</p> <p>Chair stated that at the next Governance Subcommittee meeting he will ask them to consider updating the College Council Charter to develop and update the college Strategic Plan to develop, update, and approve the college Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Motion was made by Schmidt to spend the next two weeks to review all the feedback that was collected and spend the February 23rd meeting developing strategies with an option to send recommendations and objective changes to the board, seconded by Jarrell – Motion Passes 10 – Yes, 1 – No, and 1 – Opposed</p> <p>Discussion – None</p> <p>Twice Monthly Schedule for April and May – Vote to Approve Since the March 23rd meeting would be during Spring Break week, a proposal was made that April and May meetings are twice per month.</p> <p>Discussion – None</p> <p>Motion made by Schmidt to send out fourth meetings for April and May, seconded by Colton. 10 – Yes, 0 – No, 1 – Abstain</p>
College Council Sub Committees Reports:	<p><u>Finance & Budget Development (BTS)</u> Adrienne / Paul / Zach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee continues to meet every Wednesday, 12 – 1:30 p.m. • Getting ready to send a campus wide email for a forum, date still to be determined. • Preparing to present a balancing framework to this council at the beginning of March. <p><u>Governance Sub Committee - Nothing to Report</u> Adrienne / Kyle / Rachel / Paul</p> <p><u>Policy Sub Committee - Nothing to Report</u> Adrienne / Kyle / Paul / Patrick</p>
Adjourn	3:43 p.m. - Motion by Schmidt, seconded by Plott - Motion carries, meeting adjourned

Recorder: Tami Hill