

## **LEARNING COUNCIL MINUTES (Draft)**

January 8, 2016, 1:10 to 2:55 in the Boardroom

**Present from Learning Council:** Christina Howard, Marleena Pearson, Jennifer Frei, Kerry Levett, Lida Herburger (member by position), Jim Salt, Claire Dannenbaum, Phil Martinez, Dawn DeWolf,.

Absent: Sarah Ulerick (ex officio), Steve McQuiddy, Lesley Stine, Anastasia Vail (student), \_\_\_\_\_ (student). Alyse Stone.

**Notetaker:** Anna Kate Malliris

**Guests:** 

Item	Notes
Admin Tasks	Approved 12/11/15 Minutes without changes
Learning Council	Discussion- Pre-meeting review of sample positions and standards
Communication	Reviewed email sent by McQuiddy
Position	o Civility policy issues: What is the need? Will it address issues present at Lane? Who will enforce the civility policy? Will each committee have a different policy? This should be a
	college-wide process with representation of we want to undertake it.
	O Do we need a civility policy? Learning Council is not looking to adopt a civility policy but rather some ground rules about respectful communication within the meeting. This is just about how to conduct the meeting and what happens if there is disrespectful communication.
	o Important to have these ground rules because you don't need it until you need it so it is wise to have it in place. This can support an academic environment and provide protection of free speech because it makes clear how to engage.
	<ul> <li>Student leadership has expressed concern about their experience on the governance councils because of the incivility in meetings.</li> </ul>
	O Don't need civility policy/ground rules because that is the job of the chair person to control the meeting and make sure everyone has a voice in the meeting. Courtesy standards do not always accommodate people with different communication styles and challenges. As well, there is a question about how the committee would address when people do not live up to the standard.
	There seems to be an effort by management to control the conversation and to be able to disciple people when they don't like the content of the comments. Roberts Rules is the agreed
	to process for managing meetings and that should handle the issue.
	<ul> <li>Although don't think there needs to be a specific policy/ground rule with sanctions, this is probably becoming a best practice because under-represented groups are finding the</li> </ul>

	conversation by some political groups is repressing their free expression. It is difficult to find
	the balance between academic/free speech and still model appropriate behavior.
	o Council is pretty evenly split on whether the council should move forward on consideration of
	civility policy/ground rules.
	o Howard will send out some proposed language for adaptation of previously approved language
	for how to conduct meetings.
	• Motion to extend the time for discussion by 10 minutes failed (no consensus)
	Howard will send out Martinez and Dannenbaum statements.
Learning Plan	• Subcommittees- self appointments (3 committees are: Planning, Questions-raising, Outreach)
	o How to get people with different interests and skills from within and outside the council to
	participate in the work developing the Academic Plan.
	Are these sequential or concurrent subcommittees?
	<ul> <li>Need to start with Statement of Purpose.</li> </ul>
	Work session
	O Subgroup Academic Plan Statement of Purpose (Goal- statement prepared for vote by February
	12 <sup>th</sup> )
	<ul> <li>Could start with a subcommittee of members of the representative groups in the</li> </ul>
	Learning Council drafting a statement and then bring it out to the whole Learning
	Council and even the broader college community.
	<ul> <li>Faculty representation on the sub-committee needs to include members from different</li> </ul>
	academic perspectives (academic, career-technical, support).
	<ul> <li>Needs to have representation from student affairs areas.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>May want to invite non-council members to participate in the subcommittee to assure</li> </ul>
	proper representation.
	Reviewed draft
	at: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zGurcwHuvd1xhFQd04q79FyBDVPvQCWaI
	Uw_lgY1WnI/edit?pref=2&pli=1
	<ul> <li>Learning Councils should review and comment on the draft by January 18, 2016.</li> </ul>
	Dannenbaum, Frei, and Howard will take the comments and fine-tune it. At the January
	22 <sup>nd</sup> , the council will decide if it should be sent out to the broader college community for comment/feedback.
	O Subgroup COPPS Phase 1 review- timelines
	Took about 2 hours to look at 14 COPPs procedures and make comments (Handout #1)
	The subcommittee would welcome more members. Everyone will need to be reoriented
	to the difference between policy and procedure because it has been a while since the

	<ul> <li>subcommittee worked.</li> <li>The sub-committee will include Howard (liaison), Salt, Martinez, Pearson, and DeWolf. Dannenbaum will create indexing for the procedures as they are approved. These search terms would be given to Thwing Havens to code into the html.</li> <li>The subcommittee will have a standing item on the agenda to report out of there is information</li> </ul>
Other Business	<ul> <li>Finance Council is asking for feedback from all the other council to inform their planning.</li> <li>Who should be invited to share at the Learning Council? Discuss both COPPs and the development of the Academic Learning Plan.         <ul> <li>Achieving the Dream</li> <li>Helen Garrett (Enrollment &amp; Student Financial Services) regarding procedures before she leaves and feedback from them for Academic Learning Plan.</li> <li>Student Affairs Council joint meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Should agenda for Learning Council be sent out to all constituent groups? Might stimulate input. Could announce council meeting dates/times and chair name to contact for agenda.</li> </ul>
NEXT MEETING	January 22, 2016, 1:00 to 2:50, Boardroom