

**LEARNING COUNCIL MINUTES**  
April 25, 2018, 1:00 to 2:50 in Board Room

**Present from Learning Council:** Aryn Bartley (Faculty), Kerry Levett (ASA), Claire Dannenbaum (LCCEA), Ian Coronado (by position), Phil Martinez (MSC), Christina Howard (LCCEA), Patrick Blaine (MSC), Jennifer Frei (ASA), Wendy Milbrat (LCCEF)

**Absent:** Adrienne Mitchell (Faculty Council), and Marleena Pearson (LCCEF), Jim Salt (LCCEA), Victoria Rodriguez (ASLCC), Tammy Salman (by position), Keely Blyleven (ASLCC)

**Note taker:** Elizabeth Andrade

Item	Notes
Admin Tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Agenda- Approved with no changes.</li> <li>● Minutes: Minutes from 3-9-2018 meeting approved Minutes from 4-13-2018 meeting approved</li> </ul>
Chair Report (Christina Howard)	<p>Christina Howard, chair reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Vice- chair role, will be occupied by Jennifer Frei</li> <li>B. Governance updates, Governance subcommittee is working on questions for an afternoon workshop during the Spring conference.</li> </ul> <p>Chair also reported that Aryn Bartley and Dawn Whiting have brought the recommendations regarding grading policy to Faculty Council. Kerry Levett clarified that this is a grades policy that is looking for a procedure.</p>
Guided Pathways Grant Implementation	<p>Members discussed issues about implementation of recent grant awarded for professional development on the Guided Pathways program. The discussion included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Clarification on how the grant will be implemented.</li> <li>➤ Lack of communication to this council.</li> <li>➤ Request to Executive Deans of ASA to communicate when and what is happening.</li> <li>➤ Managers have got a specific list of the positions that needed to be sent to the first symposium. Confusion about message from OCCA regarding leadership team, the college is not doing that, but sending the people who has responsibility on content delivery.</li> <li>➤ Introductory webinar was this week; they are hopeful that there will be consistency on attendees with same areas of expertise.</li> <li>➤ Confusion on who gets the role of communicating the information out to campus community.</li> <li>➤ The more information we get the better, who is, what are the roles, who can participate.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Claire had draft a letter to send out, and have met with Kerry according to agreement at the last meeting, but Kerry did not have any language nor added anything to Claire’s draft.</li> <li>➤ Group should use the most basic type of project management.</li> <li>➤ People who was invited will become the leadership and should be responsible for communicating to the campus community. It should be the executive deans for ASA and the college President. What it is about this thing that is being dealt with so much mystery.</li> <li>➤ Chair pointed that Claire has done her part, and the minutes said that a letter will be sent to campus wide.</li> <li>➤ Aryn moved to implement what Claire recommended and have Jennifer and Kerry be the leadership on communication.</li> <li>➤ Because of recent disruptions it is unclear who is responsible of communications, and the lack of a person in the vice president position also contributes to that.</li> <li>➤ It was not clear until that webinar, that this group will have a role that this group will be responsible, also poor use of terminology “leadership” from OCCA.</li> <li>➤ Recent events at the college leadership have left many things up in the air. Perhaps we should bring someone from this team to communicate.</li> <li>➤ The conversation seems mismatched, all we need is to send a communication to the campus saying “<i>hey we got a grant and this is what we see in the horizon</i>” We could send it communication as a Learning Council explaining that this initiative is going on and ways to participate.</li> <li>➤ This is a professional development issue, perhaps Lynn Nakamura or Marcia Shills should be the communications liaison.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Learning council asks that the leadership provide a frame of regular communications on how to engage staff for the grant.</p> <p><b>Amendment:</b> Recommendation that Professional and Organizational Development staff is included as core members in the institute to take the lead role for systematic communication.</p> <p>Discussion:  Jennifer clarified that they will not be in the leadership institute  Christina clarified that their role will be communicate the information only  Phil, message from this council should be your better share that the intention to have a fully integrated group.  Christina, we can offer a solution, when things get disrupted at this level we should have someone such as POD</p> <p><b>Voting:</b> all in favor</p>
Learning Plan Development	<p>Christina reported that the Learning Plan has been presented at the Facilities Council, Student Affairs Council, and have got the following feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Staff does not know much about the subcommittee.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remind that this is not an ad-hoc group, they are working under the direction of Learning Council. Making sure that is inclusive, Anna Scott has join the subcommittee.</li> <li>➤ Gather some volunteers to do summer work.</li> <li>➤ How is the Learning Plan different from the Strategic Plan</li> <li>➤ What is the relationship with accreditation?</li> <li>➤ What is the relationship with strategic directions?</li> <li>➤ Confusion on place, purpose, people want to work but want to be clear.</li> <li>➤ May 16th conversation perhaps is not happening, has not been decided yet. Perhaps have the conversation about the questions that have emerged only.</li> <li>➤ Claire, was at one of the sessions, ended in a table with all sceptics, have had fundamental questions of the work and the process.</li> <li>➤ Library staff said that has already given a lot of information on this regard, when is going to be used.</li> <li>➤ At this stage we should know what happened with the information collected.</li> <li>➤ At this world café event, it seemed like we are still asking beginning questions.</li> </ul>
<p>Instructor Hours on Campus</p>	<p>Christina reminded that this policy is very old and it has multiple faults. It is written as a procedure. She recommended two actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Make recommendation to be re-written as a policy because it has lots of wills and shalls, and then have it referred to bargaining.</li> <li>2) Remove it because it is old and no longer reflects the current learning environment.</li> </ol> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Move it from procedure to policy, not OK removing it completely. It should be updated.</li> <li>➤ The issue is who takes the lead of drafting the policy.</li> <li>➤ Jennifer Frei pointed out that a policy has broad and overarching statements, she clarified the difference between the policy and procedure</li> <li>➤ Christina reminded the members that the faculty contract says that Faculty Council and LCCEA have the authority to make policies regarding faculty time.</li> <li>➤ Disagreement that this is academic issue because it does not talk about hours, it says that needs to be accessible, and a big portion of the text is procedure. It needs to be torn apart.</li> <li>➤ Christina asked which part should land in this council.</li> <li>➤ Phil responded that he only the percentages that should be within the contract. The rest is purely assignment therefore operational only.</li> <li>➤ Might be helpful to move this to a new policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Have a group to separate the language in two parts, one that with the policy language and another with the operational language.</p>

	<p><b>Amendment:</b> to invite Faculty Council members to be part of the subcommittee  <b>Voting:</b> Approved unanimously</p> <p>Volunteers for subcommittee: Aryn, Patrick and Ian.</p>
Syllabus Policy	<p>Jennifer Frei reminded them again about policy and procedure language. And this is a procedure. Christina presented a document with information that Tammy Salman referred at the last meeting.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is the syllabus considered a shared agreement? This should be included in the policy language.</li> <li>➤ The syllabus will be available on line regardless of the course, and be updated to the most recent course, and for two reasons, relief with the institutional statements and second for consistency on terms of pieces of information.</li> <li>➤ Besides the external organizational requirements, there are institutional values that improve communication between the organization and the faculty.</li> <li>➤ There is an informational strategy to have the document clarity and easily understood.</li> <li>➤ Christina was updated the document presented with the feedback provided by the members at the meeting. She will send the draft to Faculty Council for their feedback.</li> <li>➤ Recommendation was that the document be more polished before it is send to FC.</li> <li>➤ Christina, Ian and Claire volunteer to work on polishing the document.</li> </ul>
Future policy review	<p>Credit for Prior Learning Christina asked members to read this policy for next meeting discussion.</p>
Future Agenda Items & Other Business	<p>Christina has taken out some of the clusters, to keep it more clean.  Ian asked to add online development courses standards item</p>