Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Minutes
April 12, 2011

<u>Present</u>

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS-faculty)   Noelle Eckley (Div Chair -faculty)
Terry Bartley (management)   Toni Gomez (ASB)
Sandy Beckwith (Lead Counselor – faculty)   Phil Horner (classified)
Dr. Irving Berkowitz (Dean of Instruction)   Dr. Doug Houston (President)
David Burris (Exec Director-HR)   Jeff Lang (classified)
Carie Camacho (Div Chair -faculty)   Logan Merchant (Chair/IT Planning)
Kayleigh Carabajal (Exec Director-IR)   Sue Mouck (Accreditation Liaison -faculty)
Dave Clausen (Exec Director –Fiscal Services)   Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)
Monica Cochran (Public Relations)   Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)
Marshel Couso (management)   Brian Wolf (Div Chair –faculty)

<u>Absent</u>

Shelly Baxter (management)   Carol Montgomery (classified)

<u>Guest</u>

Diann Jackson (classified)   Laurel Norman (classified)
Katelyn Johnston (ASB)   Ross Stevenson (faculty)
                                                      Tami Wattenburg (classified)

With a quorum present, the meeting began at 9:33 am.

Consultation Council:

1. **Consultative Process [Reaffirming Consensus – Building Solidarity] (Consultation) –pages 1-3 of Shared Governance Handbook adopted August 27, 2010**
   Sue Mouck reminded the committee of the agreed on characteristics of consensus decision-making articulated in the shared governance handbook, which has been adopted and reaffirmed by Consultation Council each of the last three years. Specifically, she referenced that consensus does not mean unanimity and that when consensus is used all representatives agree to support the decisions of the group, even if they personally disagree with those decisions. She identified that in the course of discussions and recommendations concerning controversial topics disagreements are expected. Consultation Council has not experienced many challenges to reaching consensus and discussion to clarify and reaffirm the process of consensus decision-making seemed warranted. A lengthy and rich discussion ensued. The discussion included reference to the lack of time to sufficiently elicit feedback from constituent groups in order for constituent group representatives to accurately represent their constituent group's views. The utilization of email for communication between constituent group members when face-to-face meetings are not possible was suggested. The membership was reminded that originally there were two separate groups, Consultation Council and the Strategic Planning Committee. Through the evaluative process the two groups were combined, but two distinctly different processes are still occurring during the meetings. The separation of the processes for governance and consultation along with the differing roles of Consultation Council members in each process was articulated. Governance relates directly to the development of policies and the discussions are deliberately slower paced to allow sufficient time for constituent groups representatives to confer with their constituent group prior to Consultation Council considering it's recommendation. Consultation relates more to the Strategic Planning Committee component of the groups responsibilities. Planning requires a more rapid pace and the appointees to Consultation Council are expected to present the interests of either the committee or group they represent without need to elicit committee or constituent group opinions. The concept of solidarity was discussed. Consensus decision-making expects that participants will be able to support and explain a decision. Individuals questioned the responsibility of members in responding to another member 's actions contrary to the expectations of the group (voicing opposition to a decision agreed to by consensus). Several members indicated the need to remind the individual of the agreed upon standard. The need to support the institutional value of respect for others was voiced. It was suggested that more time needed to be allotted to discussions and perhaps one Consultation Council meeting each month set aside for action while other meetings allowed more time for discussion. It was also suggested that the process leading to the recommendation to not offer resident hall facilities next year had allowed ample time for consideration. The proposal had been discussed at open forums prior to Consultation Council discussion and forwarding a recommendation.

Dr. Houston reminded the groups that the processes of inclusive decision-making are hard. He complemented the group on the time and effort that has been invested into making the process work. Many other campuses are not nearly as far along in implementation of consultative governance as Lassen and as a consequence several are on accreditation sanctions. He suggested that focusing on the criteria for decision-making, makes the decisions easier. One criterion for decision-making at Lassen is the consistency of a recommendation with the board adopted strategic goals, specifically the goals to improve student success and student access. The example given was the residence hall. Sufficient resources could be allocated to the residence hall to make it a state-of-the-art facility. However in order to accomplish to accomplish to accomplish the upgrade, the resource would need to be taken from other projects. The strategic goals would need to be rewritten and readopted to support such a decision.

2. **Personnel Update (Information) - Administration**
   Tabled due to time constraints.

Strategic Planning:

1. **Review of COM.P.ACT Strategies for Draft 2011-2016 Student Services Plan (Consultation)**
   Cary Templeton presented five handouts from student services discussions at the state-level supporting the proposals contained within the COM.P.ACT relating to student services.
   a. **(8) Counseling Portfolio**
      The proposal is to implement a welcome/support center staffed with trained student orientation leaders, provide on-line student orientation, provide on-line registration, pursue through the appropriate processes adoption of a required first semester experience course (i.e CG 1) and implement intrusive personalized follow-up with students.
   b. **(10) Enrollment Services**
      The proposal is to implement a wide variety of technology innovations such as on-line application, on-line grading, on-line attendance reporting, improved web interface and many more.
   c. **(18) Book Loan/Rental Program**
      The proposal is to eliminate district support for the book loan/rental program. A discussion identified that the program has been beneficial to many students. Suggestions included returning the program from the district to ASB or possibly the foundation. The system being investigated for the bookstore includes a component, which would allow for book rentals. The retention and use of existing inventory within the book rental program was encouraged.
   d. **(20) Fee Payment Contracts**
      Along with other conservation measures proposed is the elimination of fee payment contracts.
   e. **(28) Space Utilization and Reductions**

   After considerable discussion, the group agreed by consensus to forward the general concepts identified to the Student Services Planning Committee for consideration in the Student Services Master Plan. It was recognized that the specific details may change significantly depending upon a variety of factors, for instance whether or not residence hall facilities are provided next year. The agenda for next week's meeting will include the discussion of the COM.P.ACT Strategies relating to institutional technology and the following week will include the impact of COM.P.ACT Strategies on staffing (Human Resource Master Plan- Staffing Plan).

Other:

It was identified that the college budget is due in about sixty days and there appears to be many decisions still to be made in order to address the 1.7 million expected shortfall in revenues.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 am

Future Agendas:
1. **Human Resource NIPR (Information) – April 19, 2011- David Burris**
2. **Updated Draft 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan (Consultation) – April 19, 2011- - Dr. Berkowitz**
3. **Prioritized Budget Requests from Administrative Areas (Consultation) – April 19, 2011 - Dave Clausen**
4. **Third Quarterly Update on Progress on Annual Action Plans 2010-2011 (Information)- - Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**
5. **Review of COM.P.ACT Strategies for Draft 2011-2016 Institutional Technology Master Plan (Consultation) April 19, 2011- Dr. Carabajal**
3. **Plan for Work Study Allocation for 2011-2012 (Information) April 19, 2011 – Cary Templeton**
4. **Review of May 10, 2011 Governing Board Agenda (Information) – April 19, 2011-Dr. Houston**

5. **Timeline and Instruments for the Annual Evaluation of the Shared Governance and Planning Structure and Procedures (Governance) – April 26, 2011- Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**