College Council

December 15, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Present: Bob Kratochvil, Jeff Baker, Todd Steffan, Sarah Thompson, Elizabeth Hopkins, Richard Grow, Melissa Korber, Jan Noble, Renee Pegues, Scott Miner, Angela Amaya, Mike Ansell, Jennifer Adams

---

1. **Review & Approval of Minutes**
   The Council members reviewed the minutes from the meetings in October and November 2011.

   Motion: *To approve the minutes from the meeting held on October 20, 2011.*
   MSC: *Miner/Steffan*
   Vote: *Approved (with one abstention; Noble)*

   Motion: *To approve the minutes from the meeting held on November 17, 2011.*
   MSC: *Miner/Korber*
   Vote: *Approved (with two abstentions; Noble, Miner)*

2. **Old Business**
   a. **Institutional Planning & Effectiveness**
      i. **Accreditation – Update on the Midterm Report**
      Vice President Noble (Accreditation Liaison Officer) reported that the Accreditation Teams held a kick-off meeting on December 7. She distributed an updated version of the Midterm Report timeline; she also thanked Marge Maloney and Sarah Thompson for their work thus far and their offer to help with the process next semester. Vice President Noble distributed a copy of the list of the Accreditation/Midterm Report team members for each of the Recommendations, and will follow up to provide the names of each groups' team leaders. She is recommending that each team meet during the 2nd hour of Town Meeting to keep work on track. Scott Vigallon and John Gonder have been asked to set up the Wiki and document repository, so that the College can once again utilize that technology to develop responses and gather evidence. Vice President Noble reviewed the Planning Agenda items and the Council members received a copy of those items "assigned" to their committee.

      ii. **Review of the Mission Statement**
      (see below; discussion combined with agenda item 2.a.iii.)

      iii. **Review of the Strategic Goals**
      The Council members combined their discussion about reviewing the Mission Statement and the Strategic Goals, as the items are interconnected. President Walthers asked Sarah Thompson to expand on the Academic Senate's request to have College Council revisit the Strategic Goals. Ms. Thompson explained that the Academic Senate felt the goals need to: 1) have students as the primary focus; and 2) align with Mission Statement. The Council then reviewed/discussed the sample documents and model from Santa Rosa Junior College, which seems to have a well-articulated approach to linking the Mission and Goals to planning, decision-making, and resource allocation. President Walthers and others in attendance expressed the importance of aligning our efforts toward integrating these elements, particularly with multiple discussions occurring simultaneously (e.g., Program Review, institutional effectiveness, institutional indicators, District Educational Master Plan, Accreditation, etc…). Ms. Thompson suggested having a sub-group (of College Council) explore this further. President Walthers stated that he will spend additional time reviewing the Strategic Plan and look at possible areas to refine and update it (into "Strategic Plan 2.0").

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

December 15, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

3. New Business

a. CCN Memo Re: Campus-wide Emails

Elizabeth Hopkins distributed and reviewed the Campus Change Network (CCN) memo regarding campus-wide emails. Sarah Thompson wondered if, instead of (or in addition to?) developing a policy/set of guidelines, this issue could be addressed through professional development activities and/or Flex Day workshops. Ms. Hopkins felt that CCN has already been doing that sort of work, and that it would be more effective to have something in place from an institutional level. She offered that people who may not understand or have exposure to the issue wouldn't seek such a session, therefore such trainings can only be so effective (i.e., "people who need the training don't show up for the seminar").

Melissa Korber recalled that, when she and Todd Steffan were Senate Presidents, there was an email policy that went through the system and was brought forward to Chancellor's Council; she believes it "hit a wall" when it got to the District level, but can't remember exactly why it didn't move forward. President Walthers referenced a recent Cabinet Meeting discussion related to the same issue; there were some who felt strongly that there not be an administrative "top-down" policy, as the leadership doesn't want to infringe upon (or be perceived as infringing upon) free speech/academic freedom/etc… He suggested that, rather than a policy, perhaps a "values statement" (about campus-wide communication/email) could be developed – with a focus on how people (constructively) react/respond to such messages. Ms. Hopkins understood those concerns, but felt it should fall to the entire campus community to determine what is/isn't acceptable, and the environment we want to have on campus; CCN often gets frustrated, as they are expected to be the (only) group to handle these issues.

Scott Miner noted that, in the CCN memo, there seem to be two different issues addressed in each of the bullets: the first seems more straightforward and easier to implement, as it's fairly clear to determine whether or not something is work-related; the second may be less simple. One suggestion from the group was to eliminate the "Everyone" group, so that people can't blast messages so easily, and limit access to the "LPC" group. Several people disagreed, however, noting that those large email groups serve an important purpose for lots of situations (meetings, construction updates, program announcements, student awards/highlights, fundraising, etc…). Jennifer Adams displayed Board Policy 2311, which appears to address some of what the group is discussed; perhaps that could be a good starting point. President Walthers recommended that CCN draft a "values statement" that they bring to the Senates for endorsement, and then back to College Council.

b. Joint Proposals from the Sustainability & Technology Committees:

i. Electronic Signatures on Forms

Dr. Mike Ansell provided an overview of the recommendation to College Council. The Sustainability and Technology Committees have sent forward a request to use electronic signatures on forms used here at the LPC campus.

Motion: To support the Sustainability & Technology Committees' recommendation that LPC adopt a college policy to accept electronic signatures.
MSC: Korber/Thompson
Vote: Approved unanimously

President Walthers expressed his support for the recommendation and will now take it forward to Chancellor's Council, as it has District-wide implications for the Banner system, forms, etc…

ii. Mailing Pay Stubs

Angela Amaya and Dr. Ansell provided an overview of the recommendation to eliminate the mailing of pay stubs. If the District stopped mailing pay stubs it would save money, conserve paper, etc… Payroll could print one set and/or print to PDF, in case people need printed version for banks, loans, and other purposes. Apparently the Social Security Administration and military branches have already made such a switch. It was noted that this suggestion has been discussed/recommended at DBSG multiple times; if/when this change goes forward, the College/District need to be able to address counterarguments (from people who either aren't comfortable with computers, not used to going without a hard copy, etc…). The Council members expressed their support for the recommendation to eliminate pay stub mailings.

Motion: To support the Sustainability & Technology Committees' recommendation that the District adopt a policy to cease printing, processing, and mailing paper pay stubs.
MSC: Korber/Thompson
Vote: Approved unanimously

4. Coordination of Information

a. Academic Services

Dr. Noble reported that she will move into Building 100B at the beginning of January, and that the College will move forward with plans to hire an Interim Dean for the BCATSS Division.

b. Administrative Services

No report.

c. Student Services

Vice President Baker shared that the Student Services team is ramping up for the Welcome Center, which will be open January 9 – 20 in the Reading Room.

d. Academic Senate

Sarah Thompson distributed an outline of plans for moving forward with the Student Success Task Force recommendations in the Spring.

e. Classified Senate

No report.

f. Student Senate

No report.

g. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)

No representative present.

h. Facilities Committee

Vice President Kratochvil reported that, at its last meeting, the Committee received updates on two construction projects.

i. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)

Vice President Kratochvil reported that the IEC used its last meeting to focus on developing a Midterm Report response to Recommendation 1A.

j. **Planning & Budget Committee (PBC)**
Vice President Kratochvil reported that, at its last meeting, PBC reviewed instructional equipment requests.

k. **Staff Development Committee**
No representative present.

l. **Sustainability Committee**
No report.

m. **Faculty Association (FA)**
No representative present.

n. **SEIU**
No representative present.

5. **Next Steps**
The Council members agreed to tentatively keep the next meeting date (January 19) as a "hold," in the event there are items to discuss/address. They would also like to have "Accreditation" as a standing agenda item during the work on the Midterm Report, and take time at the next meeting to review/discuss the Planning Agenda items (particularly those "assigned" to College Council).

6. **Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions**

a. **How did the decisions we made impact various members of our community? Consider matters such as equitable distribution of resources, student access to services, barriers related to language, economic status, transportation, and literacy level, etc…**

The Council members felt that the campus-wide email discussion and decision (or lack thereof) had an impact on members of the campus community, as the group presenting the recommendation didn't seem to get the response they were hoping for. CCN was seeking another solution, and hoping that College Council/ would take on the issue and/or write policy – and provide an institution-level perspective and position.

b. **In what ways has the meeting process been equitable? Were all constituencies heard from? Were there voices that were not considered?**

The Council members felt that the meeting had been equitable.

c. **Do we need more information or support related to this dialogue? What additional information or support is needed to assist the decision-making process?**

Not at this time.

7. **Adjournment**