COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
April 12, 2023

Members present:
- College President ***Stephanie Bulger***, Vice-Chair *(left early)*
- Vice Presidents (2): ***Shelley Tinkham***
- Associate V.P. for Institutional Effectiveness: ***Patrick Blaine***
- LCCEF (Classified - 2): ***Frankie Cocanour***, ***Kyle Schmidt*** (chair)
- LCCEA (Faculty - 1): ***Adrienne Mitchell***
- Faculty Council co-chairs: ***Kevin Steeves*** / Paul Bunson
- Managers (2): ***Mandie Pritchard / Jenn Kepka***
- ASLCC (Students - 2): ***Nikhar Ramlakhan*** (arrived late) / Amaya Carricaburu
- Diversity Council Chair (by position): ***Anna Scott***
- Infrastructure Council Chair (by position): ***Meggie Wright***
- Student Success Council Chair (by position): Laura Pelletier ***/ Gina Szabady***

Members absent: Laura Pelletier
Guest Presenters: Ian Coronado
Minutes: Tami Hill
Guests: Cathy Thomas, Pri Srinivasa, Lisa Rupp, and Nikki Li

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS - None
ANNOUNCEMENTS - None
APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MARCH 8, 2023
Motion by Patrick Blaine to approve the March 8 Minutes, seconded by Shelley Tinkham. – ***Motion Passed*** Yes – 8, No – 0, 4 – Abstentions

AGENDA CHANGES/MODIFICATIONS/APPROVAL
Adrienne Mitchell requested to add the Additional BDS Balanced Proposal to the agenda, seconded by Anna Scott. – Shelley Tinkham expressed concerns about the invitation list, which were acknowledged. Item will be added to the agenda.

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE (BDS)/COLLEGE COUNCIL – Questions regarding the tuition proposal in the presentation to the Board of Education.
At the April 4th board meeting, a 5% tuition increase was recommended to the Board of Education. The Budget Development Subcommittee (BDS) and the College Council approved budget scenarios with 2% and 3.5% tuition increases. Explanation is requested

The BDS is looking for explanations for the following: The BDS felt that the budget proposal presented to the Board of Education at the April 4 board meeting included a 5% tuition increase recommendation when the BDS and College Council had approved scenarios with 2% and 5% tuition increases. Additionally, the notes in the presentation to the Board specified that the 5% recommendation was developed based on the recommendation from the BDS.

The process of the governance system came into question. President Bulger referenced BP 325, College Governance System, the guidance for shared governance here at LCC. Shelley Tinkham raised point of order concerns.

Motion by Jenn Kepka to take decision-making off the table, have that discussion, and save 20 minutes at the end of the meeting to discuss the BDS Balanced Proposal, seconded by Kevin Steeves.

Discussion
Adrienne Mitchell does not favor Jenn Kepka's motion unless the order of items is placed differently.

Patrick Blaine made a friendly motion to reorder the motion items in that the BDS Balanced Proposal is discussed for the next 20 minutes.

The chair called the question all in favor of taking the role of the president off the table and discussing it with a time limit of 3 p.m. – ***MOTION PASSED***
Y – 10, 0 – No, 1 – Abstain

Discussion Resumed
- Anna Scott asked for clarification of when the College Council and the BDS are notified when there is a divergence from a recommendation.
    - President Bulger responded by saying that there is no time. Additionally, she asked if the College Council members believe that what is submitted to the president as a recommendation is acted upon.
  - Adrienne Mitchell explained that the purpose of this discussion is related to the general decision-making and an unresolved disagreement regarding the role of governance on this campus and the presentation to the board.
  - Adrienne Mitchel shared that in the past, when there was a divergence from a College Council consensus past item, it usually only occurred when there was a majority and minority report where the president would explain the rationale based on the review of the majority and minority reports.
  - Kevin Steeves released a statement on shared governance and how they view it, which is that they view it as shared governance.

The role of the Budget Development Subcommittee regarding the budget is to present balanced budget recommendations to the College Council in alignment with the Board of Education and Legal Budget Development Timeline.

Discussion on the role of the president was postponed for discussion at the May 10 meeting.

B. Additional BDS Balanced Proposal
This proposal is based on the co-chairs of the Ways and Means Committee of the Legislatures' suggested allocation for community colleges.
FY24 BDS Copy

Strategies to balance the budget with the $744.9 million scenario (actual amount unknown).
State funding changes: Approximately $600K less than LCC would receive per year under the co-chairs with no additional funding.

- The scenario is based on a 5% increase in tuition.
- Differential fees are automatically increased by the same percentage as tuition, 5%.
- Reduction in an additional $750K from M&S.
- 5% rounded to the nearest fifty cents.

Motion by Kyle Schmidt to approve the recommendation from the BDS, seconded by Adrienne Mitchell. ***Motion Failed***

Y – 4, N – 4, Abstain – 2, Sideways – 2

Discussion:
Anna Scott asked for clarification on what prompted the additional BDS proposal.

- Adrienne Mitchell responded that the budget process is a bit complicated due to the changes in staffing and specific positions that remain open. Also, new information was given about the co-chairs' funding level, which is lower than the BDS had previously considered.

C. Technology Fee Policy
Presented by Meggie Wright / Ian Coronado

- The technology fee has been dispersed with the oversight of a committee i~~mplemented for almost~~ 20 years but didn't happen last year; nobody seems to know why.
- Although the technology fee disbursement/allocation procedure sounds like a procedure, Infrastructure Council would like a policy that requires a clear and transparent approach affiliated with the fee.
- It's a significant amount of money. Infrastructure wants to ensure the funds are disbursed in a clear, transparent, and fair process.

Discussion

- Anna Scott suggested that this request illustrates how administrative rules would better fit this request to avoid conflation between policy and procedure.
- Kevin Steeves reported that Faculty Council fully supports creating the Technology Fee Policy.
- Shelley Tinkham read that regarding policies, the governance work must be at the planning policy level, not the operational or implementational level. Operations and implementation will be the responsibility of managers and administrators.
- Kyle Schmidt, chair, shared that College Council does not need to approve before developing a policy; therefore, no vote is required at this time.

D. Strategic Planning Process Diagram – Seeking Feedback
Presented by Kyle Schmidt, Chair

Kyle Schmidt, chair, was asked to create a diagram showing the Strategic Plan's process to share with the board members clarifying the roles of the Board of Education and governance.

Discussion

- Patrick Blain requested sharing the final form with the Institutional Effectiveness Commission and Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (IEC) offices.
- Adrienne Mitchell shared that the diagram is not aligned with the current governance manual.
- Anna Scott asked if this council hasn't had time to get to know the board members and potentially assist with setting initial goals.
- Kyle Schmidt suggested the final diagram be somewhere on the website, i.e., governance, board, or strategic planning.
- Anna Scott suggested that "working with the stakeholder of institutional research ensures alignment with the MFI indicators and planned objectives" needs to be redefined in the sense that it is one specific thing that you take back to IEC.
- Adrienne Mitchell stated that a step is missing where College Council approves and moves forward with the Strategic Plan draft before it has developed mission fulfillment indicators and plan objectives.

- Adrienne Mitchell suggested that the board members do not set the initial goals and that the board gets involved when the Task Force brings them to them.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Budget Development Subcommittee (BDS)
   - A forum will be held on May 10.
2. Policy
   - Created and set up a five-year review cycle for policies related to College Council.
   - Moved forward the College Address and Letterhead for Personal Correspondence Policy.
3. Governance Subcommittee - None

STAKEHOLDER GROUP REPORTS

1. College Council Chair – None
2. Executive Team – None
3. Management Senate (MSC)
   - In February, we began working on the EA contract training.
   - We will have an open position on BDS and hope to have it filled before the end of the fiscal year.
4. ASLCC
   - Next week, elections will be in session.
   - Working on a new food insecurity project – Giving 100 students a $25 gift card to see how it makes a difference in combating food insecurity.
   - The Senate is currently working on two significant events 1. End of the year extravaganza, and 2. Spring Carnaval in Bristol Square

COUNCIL REPORTS

1. Student Success – No Report
2. Infrastructure – No Report
3. Faculty – No Report
4. LCCEA – No Report
5. LCCEF
   - Bargaining the full contract with the college has begun.
6. Diversity
   - Issues in working collaboratively on policies with other councils. Assigning policies to two separate councils to one policy would eliminate the issue.

The meeting Adjourned at 4 p.m.
Motion by Anna Scott to adjourn the meeting.