

LEARNING COUNCIL MINUTES
November 18, 2016, 1:10 to 2:55 in the 4/104

Present from Learning Council: Adrienne Mitchell (Faculty Council), Claire Dannenbaum (LCCEA), Phil Martinez, Jessica Alvarado (Faculty Council Co-Chair), Christina Howard (LCCEA), Jim Salt (LCCEA), Ce Rosenow (by position), and Marleena Pearson.

Absent: Kerry Levett, Lesley Stine, Tammy Salman (by position), Dawn DeWolf, Alyse Stone, Jennifer Frei, Ian Coronado, Sean Goddard (student), and Paul Bixel (aslccsenatorseat5@gmail.com) (student).

Notetaker: Anna Kate Malliris

Guests: Anne McGrail

Item	Notes
Admin Tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review/approve agenda • November 4th minutes approved without corrections (postponed)
Invited Presentation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Program Review (McGrail) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Handout #3 – Draft website ○ Program Review is up for bargaining (along with Assessment & Center for Teaching and Learning). This has created a bit of uncertainty about where it is in the process. ○ Made a visit to Chemeketa which has a Dean and 1.0 Faculty overseeing Program Review. At Chemeketa, the outcome of Academic Program just goes to the Executive Team for review instead of feeding into resource allocation as it is at Lane. ○ 9 programs are going through Academic Program Review. There has been good engagement on a voluntary basis. ○ Anne McGrail wrote a handbook that provides a timeline, the time commitment, practical suggestions, and guidelines for Deans, etc. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Asking the questions about assessment is not a demand to engage in assessment work. ○ Concerns about departments that cannot complete their Program Review within one year. And since this is tied to funding at Lane, how do you get funding if you can't do Program Review. ○ At Board of Education meeting, Tony McCown said there was one year to act on Program Review and Assessment, and Mary Spilde said it is not optional work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review is folded into the Learning Plan.
Chair Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board meeting and policy development- Learning Assessment Policy approved. (Handout #4) • Update on Selective Admissions Policy Draft- Kuhar has taken to CTE Deans and Levett has taken to SAC.

	It is moving forward. DeWolf also working on it.
Vice Chair Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howard reviewed information as she knows it from available information on related college websites • Strategic Direction Implementation Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation Plan Draft Status- intersection with Learning Plan Development. Scheduled to be published and available on December 15th. Implementation plans are not available; pending some bargaining issues. Questions arose around feasibility December 15th publication date. ○ ATD is being led by Jennifer Frei and there is an ATD Team that she is leading. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The ATD website is out of date and it is unclear how the team members are/were asked to participate. There has not been clarity about what happens to previous participants or how faculty are chosen, how it is inclusive and how they assure appropriate disciplines are represented on the committee. ○ What is the Learning Council's/governance system's role in this committee? Should Learning Council have a representative on the ATD Core Team? Other Teams? ○ Why are we spending resource (monetary and personnel) in participating in ATD work? ○ Frei is forming a faculty team: known faculty who are included are Wendy Lighthouse (Math), Tammy Salman (IRAP), Casey Reid (Writing), and Kate Sullivan (Writing). <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howard will check in with Frei regarding ATD formation and implementation status
COPPs Subcommittee Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handout #5 • Only 44 policies (labeled) for the college. Only 3 of those → Learning Council. 297 procedures for the college. Pearson can create a new spreadsheet with information drawn out of college database on all policies and procedures and add LC subcommittee comments to the existing spreadsheet. • Policies became narrative to procedures and the policies were dropped. • Some college policies have apparently been moved to a Board Policy. • Is the removal of a policy (whether to be a Board policy or a procedure) a governance action? • Compare what policies and procedures were and what they are now. Will work with Joseph Colton on what he is doing with Faculty Council. <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howard will review COPPS committee work and updated database-fed P&P listing with Pearson and follow-up next meeting to initiate formal review and discussion • Salt will provide old/original version of P&P from his archives
Curriculum Committee Report (Salman)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite a few new and revised courses came through the committee this week. See agenda here: https://www.lanec.edu/currsched/november-15-2016-curriculum-and-degree-requirements-committee-agenda • Human relations requirement for associates degrees and certificates: There was discussion about whether

	<p>Lane's current requirements meet the needs of programs.</p> <p><i>State OAR 589-006-0050 says only this: (46) "Related instruction" means programs of study for which applied or specialized associate degrees are granted, or programs of an academic year or more in length for which certificates are granted. They must contain a recognizable body of instruction in program-related areas of communication, computation and human relations. Additional topics which should be covered as appropriate include safety, industrial safety, and environmental awareness. Related instruction areas are either embedded within the program curriculum or taught in blocks of specialized instruction.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sub-committee will be meeting to discuss the human relations requirement and will recommend changes if necessary.
<p>Assessment Team Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum mapping tool: Tammy and Kate met with Matt Danskine, Barbara Barlow Powers, and Ian Coronado about tool development. Matt should have a prototype for us to test early winter term. We discussed the need to test it and to develop support materials so that A-Team can do outreach and have conversations with faculty about this project. We want to ensure we meet faculty where they are in terms of comfort level, as not all faculty or departments/disciplines/programs are ready for curriculum mapping. • Website Development: The new assessment website navigation structure is nearly finalized, and once it is (hopefully by next week), Lori Brendan will be helping to get the new navigation in place. Then, Tammy and A-Team will work on revising or developing new content for the site. <p>Website goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop a website that offers a basic framework and tools for understanding what student learning assessment is and why it is important to academic departments and student support services ○ Include information about student learning assessment work that appeals to faculty, deans/directors, and support staff ○ Emphasize systematic student learning assessment practices throughout website ○ Offer templates and examples that are optional but help to guide thinking around assessment
<p>Learning Plan Subcommittee Reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure subcommittee - Draft (Handout #1) • Question Raising (Handout #2) • Send Howard feedback before next meeting.
<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center for Teaching and Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Salt shared proposals that LCCEA brought forward in bargaining regarding Assessment, Assessment, and Center for Teaching and Learning.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Association does not support the way that the Center for Teaching and Learning is evolving under the Administrations guidance. ○ The idea of a Center for Teaching and Learning has been a faculty lead vision since at least 2006. The proposals have been consistent across time. The interest has been there but it stalls when it is faculty lead without Administration guidance/vision. Faculty see this, not as a space, but rather a vehicle for having the discussions that result in outcomes to move teaching and learning forward. The Administration seems to see the Center as a tool for moving forward their agenda. ○ Send Mitchell and Salt questions/concerns, etc. in relation to the LCCEA bargaining proposal.
Future Agenda Items and Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finance Council Questions- Date for LC discussion- TBD ● Achieving the Dream Presentation and Discussion- TBD ● Student Retention Data: Strategic Enrollment Management Update ● Curriculum Mapping Tool presentation – Spring 2017
NEXT MEETING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● December 2nd from 1:10-2:50 p.m. in Building 4/104