SAC Minutes: January 4, 2019, 1-3 pm

- Attending: Kyle, Nick, Brenda, Casey, Rosa Maria, Sue, Lida, Dawn, and Carl
- Excused: Helen
- Recorder: Carl Yeh
- Quorum: Met, 9/11

1. **Approval of December 7, 2019 minutes**: Lida moved to approve, Casey seconded, unanimously approved.
2. **Travel and Lodging Policy**: (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1K0SHzN-O3uyAypU9wLh_-0f0JAN7xVCxc-wefPoQrdE/edit) Carl reported that the subcommittee needs more time, will present at next meeting
3. **Student Communications Policy:** (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rSF_zJF22VJ-VIb-jYtQ9We5jFDey6-wm8CvefM6gYc/edit?ts=5c11a158#) The intent is to avoid "spamming" students. There was a question about using the e-mail provided by the applicant. There was agreement that there should be limitations on how employees communicate with students. Case moved to pass the policy, Lida seconded. Passed unanimously.
4. **Student Government Policy Proposed Changes:** (https://drive.google.com/file/d/10Kss0m6kHOgnmUqjtTUE1D-StgycHVfF/view) Nick said this was a "first look" and was comfortable tabling this and discussing these changes further. Kyle asked whether the current policy (https://www.lanecc.edu/copps/documents/student-government) even needs to be changed or updated. Lida is joining the subcommittee.
5. **SAC Self-Evaluation:** (https://www.lanecc.edu/board/policies/bp325) SAC needs to make a self-evaluation based on these criteria:

    1 - Clarity - not sure exactly what our role is, especially in planning, and if we should be advisors to a strategic plan or if we should be developing a strategic plan. We've been operating under the assumption that the enrollment growth plan is our strategic plan, but that was formed outside the council. Also difficult to adopt a plan without a learning plan.

    2 - Wide and explicit communication - We're content with our internal communication, but don't feel that the entire governance system is terribly transparent with the rest of campus. The lack of clarity feeds this as well.

    3 - Effectiveness - We'd had a lot of changeover, and a lot of shuffling in student affairs, and a lack of leadership that have made it hard to be effective. All but 2 people have changed in two years, and two deans appointed this year. For instance, travel and lodging policy - it's been put on this committee, but would it have made more sense as an administrative rule, and did we just add it to this council because we have that council?

    4 - Efficiency and Timeliness - having to bring even minor policy changes through - like adding a word to our records policy - is terribly slow.

    5 - Participation is encouraged, and we express that it's wanted, especially with students. We're not doing a great job surveying for input or doing focus groups on

policy changes or planning.

6 - processes made at the appropriate level by appropriate group - We don't make decisions, we make recommendations to college council. Confused about how there are groups that overlap and we're all confused about how many groups we have. We're pretty happy with the makeup of our council, but the scope of our council is so large it's difficult for us to have sufficient expertise in all areas. And we're unsure if we're supposed to be SA experts, or people from across campus to comment on SA. Feels sometimes like we're justifying our existence by doing things like going through all the policies.

7 - recognition of support needed for employees and students to participate. - Even the student has noticed that employees are spread thin. Student rep felt that an additional incentive would be helpful - lack of clarity on what the process for getting paid is, and lack of education on that process, and lack of clarify with employees on what that process is.

There were concerns about how leadership changes and not being sure about what we are supposed to be doing. Kyle asked how we were doing on policy work. Carl said that some work that might have been handled by administrators is being put on the councils because the council structure exists. Nick said students could be better-educated about this process. Lida said we don't have a lot of outreach to the college community, and it should. Nick said employees are spread too thin.

6. **Procedure Review:** (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1edEfMIKV2dFMTFuCqBrk8Ug-KmQmhuefJualqeZDJg4/edit#gid=1300747555) SAC should come back next meeting with feedback.
7. **Information share:** We reviewed a timeline for the college governance review. NC Subcommittee said NC grade is going away, but there is a subcommittee working on an alternative mark because of faculty concerns. NC announcement will be made at a later date.
8. **Adjournment:** Nick moved to adjourn, Dawn seconded, meeting adjourned.