

Fall 2017 Policy Comments

1A.1

Faculty

I value how the Policy Committee functions. I appreciate the transparent nature of policy development and the opportunity to voice my opinions regarding them.

1A.1 – Given the importance of institutional knowledge in the development and evolution of campus policies, in the event that the Provost does not chair the committee, I would consider having the person with the longest institutional tenure serve as chair. There could be confusion if someone served on the committee, then left for a bit, then came back. Determining institutional seniority is clearer and allows someone with knowledge of past policy revisions to lead the committee.

- The committee agrees that institutional seniority is important as well as familiarity with the process of the Policy Committee, and we have updated language to take both factors into account.
-

1A.1 – I am not in favor of including the Diversity & Equity Council on the reviewing process the same way we include bargaining units and shared governance. To my knowledge that is not a decision making group, or am I wrong in that?

- The committee feels that it is crucial for us to examine policy through the lens of diversity and equity, and this is the best way to ensure that this lens is applied with the largest possible institutional knowledge pool.
-

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

1A1 Policy Development and Implementation Policy

Part 3 Policy committee makeup

Add member #9. Director of Equity and Diversity or member from Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Committee

- The committee discussed this and decided that formalizing the DEIC's role in reviewing policies was more inclusive and appropriate. The committee does feel that the Director plays a crucial role in educating the committee members in thinking about diversity and equity, and added this to the policy.

Subpart 1A1 part 4: Approval Process ISSCB member can propose changes to policies

- Any member of the campus community may propose changes to policies through the campus review process.

Subpart A #3: Create a more inclusive list to give the idea that there is expertise, rather than just chancellor or attorney general (i.e. American Indian Elder Council, Council of Black Minnesotans, HAP)

- Language has been updated to be more inclusive with less specificity.

Part 4 Subpart A #5 add ISSCB member

- This is covered under formalizing review of policies by DEIC
-

1C.0.2

Faculty

The proposed policy 1C.0.2 is problematic on many fronts. A lot of crucial terms are left undefined and so would be open to interpretation at the time. This can easily render the policy as a tool for shutting down dissent, particularly since the threat of termination is included in the policy.

For example, the word obscenity means different things to different people. It's my understanding that linguists put swear words are thought to include four categories: slurs, sexual terms, excretory terms, and religious terms. In each of these categories where will we draw the line? Can I say damn it, but not goddamnit? If my colleague calls me a dumb cracker (which has happened) is that banned? If my supervisor's supervisor calls me a fucking idiot in a public forum (which has also happened), is that in violation of the policy? Is poop okay but shit out of line? Unless we're going to make a specific list of terms that are allowed and banned this policy becomes a tool for stopping dissent. And I hope it's clear that making such a list is a fool's errand. We fight speech we don't like with speech that we do. And are we really so sensitive that we have to act like we've never heard these terms?

Furthermore, what constitutes a "non-verbal expression of aggression." Crossing my arms? Failing to make eye contact? I can get fired for this now? Seems like something that an administrator or co-worker who has a problem with me could make a case with.

And what, exactly, is wrong with the Minnesota State policy? Why could we not use that one on our campus? Why do we need another tool for shutting down discourse?

I encourage all of the members of the policy committee to reconsider this potentially disastrous policy.

I just looked at the proposed Respectful Workplace Policy document and am concerned that two subparts, B (Context) and C (Free Speech and Free Inquiry), that are in State policy are not included in NHCC's proposed policy. I also wondered why NHCC didn't just reference State policy instead of coming up with our own. Is that what we usually do with policies or do we generally just reference State policy.

I find the current NHCC policy regarding "Respectful Workplace" more restrictive of free speech than the Minnesota State Policy. An academic setting should promote the free exchange of ideas. The existing NHCC policy does a poor job of defining what a "respectful workplace" is and could inhibit creativity, learning, teaching, and critical thinking. I already find myself self-censoring controversial topics in class and meetings. I'd like to see a policy similar to that used by Minnesota State. Not talking about opposing ideas does not make them go away; it just makes people secretly angry and less informed on the viewpoints of others. This is not an avenue we should be taking considering the current polarization of the country.

One of the primary goals we have in education is to encourage listening to opposing points of view.

Descriptive words used to emphasize may be offensive to some people but I find it offensive when people use euphemisms for curse words. I find it offensive when I receive politically correct emails that say nothing. I find it offensive when someone says they "appreciate" my opinion. I appreciate your comments really means. I do not agree.

Say what you mean however you want to say it. That is open, honest communication.

Let's allow free speech. Limiting free speech is a very slippery slope.

Bob Hansen said it best in his email: Limiting free speech is a very slippery slope. I am very concerned about who will be making the decisions regarding offensive/not offensive word choice. I was raised in a home environment where there was a very large set of words that were not allowed due to their offensive nature. Words such as "gosh" and "heck" were not permitted. Once time I was punished for saying "fruit" instead of another f word because it was clear what my intended word choice was in that moment.

Personally, I struggle to speak up in meetings. I fight this anxiety every day to actively contribute to the NHCC community. This Respectful Workplace policy sends a clear message for me to let my anxiety win the fight and keep my mouth shut lest I offend someone (unintentionally).

I believe there are better ways to address respectful workplace conduct such as employee trainings and workshops. (Nikhil's microaggression breakout session for the last duty day is a prime example of this.)

I have shared my thoughts with my fellow faculty already, but was encouraged to send them on to all of you as well. I am confused as to why, when we are reverting to Minnesota State Board Policy on so many other policy issues, we are now proposing our own policy on language use and proposing disciplinary actions if someone uses language that another person finds offensive. What standard are we using to determine offense? The most vulnerable person? The reasonable person standard? Who defines reasonable? Is offense determined in a sender-based, intentional manner or a receiver-based, interpretive manner? Should we be held culpable if someone misinterprets our meaning in saying something and subject to disciplinary action? That there are so many questions to answer in response to this proposal should indicate that there are flaws in the design.

For example, what is offensive to one person may not be offensive to another. Furthermore, language evolves, so words that were once inoffensive may become offensive over time or in alternate contexts. As I mentioned above, there is no clear standard by which offense can be measured and whether or not offense is intended does not appear to be factored into the proposed policy.

Another problematic aspect of the proposed policy is that it can be interpreted as a means of directing people to speak in a particular way if they want to be heard. Not only does this threaten people's autonomy in selecting their speech, this approach contradicts the NHCC value of embracing diversity, as language and cultural values are intertwined. Being from a blue collar, working class background, I am accustomed to hearing swearing used as part of open, honest communication. Can I code switch and use alternate patterns/structures of language? Yes, but it takes effort and I don't always feel that I am able to accurately express my thoughts.

Beyond discomfort, I am concerned about the impact fear of disciplinary action associated with perceived language use may have across our campus. Is this part of what will be incorporated into the new Strategic Plan of holding people accountable? Fear of disciplinary action due to someone else's interpretation of your language could create a chilling effect on campus, leading us to avoid bringing up concerns for fear of accusations of being disrespectful in the workplace. This chilling effect would be more pronounced among our contingent faculty and at-will employees.

Relationships are built and maintained through communication; restricting communication would have a negative impact on the relationships we build with each other. Yes, there is work to be done in how we communicate with each other. The policy as proposed would stifle communication rather than facilitate it, further impacting already strained relationships on this campus. The Minnesota State Board Policy is written as it is for a reason and my hope is that our campus adopts board policy on this issue.

I see no reason why we should not just adopt the system policy. No need to reinvent the wheel here with some extra spikes that are not necessary.

I am against the new NHCC respectful workplace policy and I suggest we just adopt the one the Minnesota State system has in place.

My two cents!!

Thank you for taking the time to read this—and I'll attempt to keep it brief, as I'm sure you have many of these to read—but I have rather grave concerns with the proposed policy identified above. I agree with what I see as the primary intent, which is to work toward and provide a fully respectful workplace. This is important as a system of higher learning, as well as any workplace. While the proposed policy appears to be an attempt at being more specific than the previous policy (and, perhaps, the "Respectful Workplace" policy of Minnesota State), it breaks down a number of sub-categories, but remains vague to the degree that it does appear as if it could be used maliciously (I would hope not) to shut down dissent or disagreement, and it polices—in a biased fashion—complex methods of communication. Language, for example, is often formed by rhetoric (and within that, often cultural rhetoric), and within those rhetorical approaches, said language can be used in many ways, some of which some people might find offensive, especially if they disagree with the content or position of the speaker/communicator. And while I support being respectful to our colleagues, supervisors, students, visitors, etc., we need to be careful not to overreach and shut down legitimate communication because of our own prescribed biases. This policy change appears to reinforce those biases, and it ignores the larger communities at hand. This, of course, is my reading of it, but the decision to move away from Minnesota State's language is unclear.

Thank you for your time, and I appreciate your attention on these matters.

Who decides what is disrespectful or unprofessional? People are diverse with different experiences and cultures.

- Can a campus usurp an existing MN State policy/procedure, such as the current System Respectful Work Place Procedure (<http://www.minnstate.edu/board/procedure/1c0p2.html>)? If so, why, and what about other policies and procedures? Can they be replaced at will? We already have a policy in place, it applies to the entire system, not one campus.
- The preference for "informal means" of addressing issues in the proposed campus policy – Part 3, A, 1, b – reasonably references the evolving popular culture of the United States, demonstrated across decades, and the relative evolution of popular use and delivery of speech, especially when coupled with Part 3, A, 1, c. of the policy. I understand disliking how someone may choose to deliver their ideas in conversation to counter other proposed ideas, though ideas don't care if they are respected.
 - If administrators spoke to faculty in some manner deemed disrespectful, how would faculty respond?

- Is there a free speech issue materializing here? That's much more imperative than just the NHCC campus...

1C.0.2 – This is a terrible policy, poorly written, ill-defined, leaves itself wide open for abuse. We should adopt the system policy on respectful workplace and leave it at that.

I cannot support the respectful workplace policy as stated. I believe adopting the state policy would be sufficient.

I have been following the email discussions and I agree that the MN State policy should be adequate. There are too many areas where the NHCC policy is open to interpretation and the penalties are steep.

If the board and the author of this policy would take a step back and try and think through the roots of this policy, that would be an interesting discovery for me personally. Why is the policy written in this way? It seems to be an overreach that is rooted in a very specific set of experiences, as if the author or the board were considering a select few instances in which to build a policy on.

This kind of construct will never work, because the harm it does in controlling the 95% of people who regularly practice self control, respect, and maturity is worse than the benefit of controlling the 5% who are "unruly" with their language choice. It would be better to aim for a more broad definition, as already exists in the state of Minnesota. We have a board policy on this matter already, and it is appropriately "broad", leaving the vital grey areas in place that are needed for healthy dialogue to take place.

Let's just honor the fact that we are human and we will offend people. It is better to err as a human, offend your colleague, and work out this difference with a crucial conversation, than be governed by a lifeless "Law" that is impossible to live up to. The current proposed policy tries to control that outcome, to place human dynamics on a rubric, and ultimately puts too much power in a small group of people's hands. It is authoritarian in nature, even if the desire is a good one: respect. The goal for all organizations is "Authoritative" not "Authoritarian". Authoritative is a high concern with discipline *coupled* with a high concern for people.

There are plenty of dogmatic organizations all around us to demonstrate that legislating moral righteousness through language choices is ineffective and harmful to the overall human development.

The proposed policy involves forcing language choice with a rigidity that is impossible to live up to. It will close down conversation, decrease opinion sharing, and ultimately decrease trust and transparency. Yes, you will have more polite dialogue, but you will not have disagreement, conflict, and thus growth.

I just taught this in Human Relations. Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing. Google it, but basically to be a Performing team, you have to "Storm" (conflict). And this policy will keep teams in that forming stage forever. Not good.

Let's keep the broader MN State policy, and work to develop faculty, staff, and administration into folks that adapt to their environments rather than expect others to adapt to them. Let's encourage people to conflict healthily and respectfully, but..."to conflict". Muscles don't grow without being torn.

So my recommendation is first and foremost, to the board - "Why was this policy constructed as such? Are we able to step back and say honestly this was an over-reaction to a few hard cases of disrespect?" This is important reflection, understanding the roots. It's OK to be upset/flustered/irritated at the few who do not practice self control or maturity in a meeting with their language choices. I feel the same way. But it's not OK to react with an over-reaching and impossible-to-follow policy that will do more harm than good.

My second simple recommendation is to simply scratch in it's entirety the proposed policy, and go with the State's. It is necessary to have a broad definition of these kinds of things.

Perhaps Human Resources should consider training on this matter during a duty day. Some people need to hear that words that connote sexual violence (The F Word) are not appropriate, especially when directed at a person, a person's idea, etc, as there is case law that would be grounds for a harrasment (hostile work environment) claim.

Thanks for your important work on this matter,

- The policy committee thanks everyone for their comments. There is clear consensus that we need to defer to Minn State Board policy and the committee withdraws the campus policy.
-

3.3

Faculty

There are "MnSCU" references that need to be corrected.

- Thank you!
-

3.3.1

Faculty

There are "MnSCU" references that need to be corrected.

- Thank you!
-

Staff

Response:

Before getting into issues with what IS in the procedure. There is one thing not present that probably should be: There are now two types of "waivers" that a transfer student could get. Either a reading waiver based on transfer courses, or a developmental course waiver based on having taken developmental courses at another institution. These two waivers could mean very different NHCC course registration eligibility. (this could be added to C.1.K.)

- The committee believes this already addressed in the procedure.

Subpart C.1.A: Reading waivers now produce a placement in Engl 1201, so waivers are not given in English per-se. It can also be said that nobody outside EAP takes a “writing” test, although a “placement” is still generated by all this. This could be re-worded such that it reflects current testing policy.

- In very rare situations, some students may have writing waiver but not a reading waiver. This language addresses this rare case.

Subpart C.1.D: The bulleted list given there might need to be either edited such that it is an exhaustive list (it now lacks tech and military credits at least) or removed entirely and replaced with something about how the registrar determines the applicability of credits for reading waiver use.

- The list includes courses transferred in that **do not** exempt the student from placement. Other credits, like military and tech credits can exempt student from taking the placement test.

Subpart C. 1. G-I: These bullets reference actual cut scores in the ACT, SAT, and MCA respectively and as such, are not “waivers” but scores in a “system-endorsed placement instrument”. This entire issue could be resolved by simply ending Subpart C.1.F in “such as” then having these 3 bullets as sub-bullets to that. Although all of that would still be placement scores and not waivers so it should really all go somewhere else.

- Policy committee agrees.

Subpart C.1.J/L: Subpart J could be correct and enforceable (somehow) or Subpart L could be... but both, cannot be. Either a Reading waiver will produce a placement of English 1201 for all students with such a waiver, or it will not. Our current understanding (and the way it is enforced in eServices), is that a reading waiver produces a placement of 1201 regardless of past courses or test branches taken.

- We added language to clarify that they apply to different populations.

Subpart E.1: This only references the ACT. Are we not using SAT or MCA for PSEO moving forward?

- We updated language to be inclusive of Subpart C.

Subpart E.3: This seems redundant as PSEO already must be at college level in reading (ergo writing) anyway.

- E.1 is about when the placement test is necessary and E.3 is about what courses they can register for

Part 3: Subpart A 1 and 2: This two contradict each other. We could instead say in one bullet that the test is untimed with the exception of the EAP writing sample.

- We agree with the suggested language.

Part 3: Subpart A 1: We should not include in procedure the average amount of time it takes as it is not a procedural thing.

- We agree, but want students to have tools to plan appropriate chunks of time, so we changed language to refer them to the Testing Center.

Part 4.3 and Part 2.3: Part 4.3 appears to belong in the math section. These two parts also give different timeframe for having done High school coursework and those need to be equalized.

- The timeframes are different, but one refers to what we tell them BEFORE they test (2.3), and the other one refers to what we tell them AFTER they test (4.3).

Part 4.4: We do not need to say that “if students think that the test gives an incorrect placement”

- We agree. We clarified that there is always a re-test fee.

Part 5 Subpart A.5: This is not currently correct unless we are considering either adding a hold, or pre-reqs to enforce this. The only currently enforceable course is EAP 1260 as a pre-req to Engl 1201.

- We will confirm with EAP that they want a hold similar to ADEV. We do want to keep EAP distinct from ADEV.

Part 5 Subpart B bullet 1 (first use of bullets as opposed to numbers if that is important): Belief that their placement is incorrect is not a requirement to be allowed to retest. This phrase should therefore be removed.

- We agree. We removed this bullet (and changed to numbers, thanks) and clarified that re-test is once per semester in the earlier section.

Part 5 subpart B bullet 3: We usually use the term semester (if that is important). Currently, placement levels are effective immediately. Is this a change?

- We updated language to reflect current practice.
-

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

331 Placement for Success Procedure

Part 1 subpart C, 1 f – i Why are ACCUPLACER scores only good for 3 years and ACT, SAT, MCA scores are good for 5 years. Is this mandated by the state? ACCUPLACER number of years should be consistent with ACT, SAT, and MCA.

- This is a Minnesota State Placement for Success Policy. There are some conversations surrounding this and we may see some changes in the future. However, the math department would need to be consulted as a matter of math skills may decline over the years.

Part 1 subpart C, j EAP students should only receive a reading waiver instead of a reading and writing waiver in order to be exempt from reading and listening. Prospective or assumed EAP students are being held to a different standard. It is inherently xenophobic.

- There are two different Accuplacer test pathways. The Accuplacer reading and math tests for native speakers determines a reading, English and math course placement. The Accuplacer ESL reading, a written essay, listening & speaking, sentence meaning (Vocab) and math are administered to EAP students. A written essay (with a prompt determined by the EAP department) is administered and scored by a EAP faculty member and the English department to determine a writing course placement. If an EAP student is waived from the reading test, they would be required to take the writing, listening and sentence meaning tests. There are other metro institutions that also give written essays to their EAP students to determine a course placement. It is possible for EAP students to test beyond the level of the EAP program (exempt from courses) in reading, writing, listening and vocabulary. Assessing a student's language in their writing is essential for the most accurate EAP student writing placement. A reading test alone would not accurately place an EAP student in writing.
- Students can decide if it is right for them to take the math portion depending on their major; because their major may change we highly encourage them to complete the math at their test session.

Part 1 subpart C, k include transfer specialist to evaluate developmental coursework along with faculty

- Faculty don't actually do this first. Transfer specialist evaluate all developmental coursework initially. Then if a student wants to appeal their results, then the decision goes to the dean.

Part 1 Subpart E, 1 Include other tests in addition to MCA, SAT in addition to ACT

- We don't currently have equivalency benchmarks for other tests. There aren't really any other tests that students would be taking anyway. We did look into seeing if there could be TOEFL/IELTS equivalencies, but for now that would not count towards a waiver.

Part 3 subpart A #2 Drop EAP written placement test or allow it to be untimed

- The written essay for writing course placement has been part of testing for many years. As explained to me, the essay actually helps put students on the same level as native speakers for evaluation purposes. As I mentioned above, there are other Minnesota State institutions in the Metro area that have an increase of EAP students and have determined that the written essay is the best measure for a writing placement. At one time we did allow an untimed essay, but found that the student could write as much as they were going to for evaluating purposes within one hour (and we are flexible with this depending on the individual needs of the student). The common occurrence was that there was too much emphasis on one exam and their energy was needed to complete and do the best they could on the other exams as well.

Part 4 #4 Is this the correct retest policy re: fees? Is there a fee for the first retake?

- There is no fee for the first time students take the test at NHCC. Any student testing their second or more time must pay the \$10 retest fee.

Part 5 subpart #1 Remove “Enrollment in other college-level classes may be limited until this requirement is met.”

- There are some classes students can take while enrolled in ADEV, EAP, etc. classes. So this should stay as it is talking about enrollment being limited to specific classes.

Part 5 subpart A #3 Clarify what co-requisite course means.

- Updated language for clarity

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee requests that Placement for Success Policy and Procedure be tabled for further discussion.

- The current language reflects our current practice. We recognize that this policy/procedure will require more frequent review and may be a standing policy/procedure reviewed by the Policy Committee.
-

3.26.1

Faculty

Part 3 Subpart A 3. is vital for assessment of student learning.

3.26.1 – is MSCF not one of the parties needed for campus review on this item?

- MSCF reviews through Shared Governance
-

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

3.26.1 Intellectual Property Procedure

Part 1 subpart B, fifth para, lines 2-3 clarify that a student CAN download for educational purposes (what if they did not have WiFi at home).

Consider reframing language so that it is more positive, and so much all the things students CAN'T do.

- We recognize the technology limitations and need for flexible access. However, we are also trying to protect intellectual property rights of the faculty and other students who are recorded in the classroom capture (faculty cannot give away students' intellectual property).
-

3.37 & 3.37.1

Faculty

3.37. & 3.37.1 – same question about the campus review, but no issues

Staff

One note for the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum Procedure.

Part 3. Subpart A: the website www.mntransfer.org is going away. Currently all of the information listed as being housed there is now at the System Office sharepoint site.

- Thanks, we'll update the links!
-

3.54

Faculty

3.54 – I think there should be an option for non-student initiated independent study. Many students are not aware it is an option for them and faculty should be able to recommend it if they want to. I would just take out the line “Independent studies are student-initiated.”

- **We clarified that independent study can only be initiated by students or faculty**
-

3.54.1

Faculty

In NHCC Policy 3.54, it says that “independent studies are student-initiated.” Yet here, in NHCC Procedure 3.54.1 it specifies “Part 1. Student Initiated Independent Study” and Part 2. Non-Student Initiated Independent Study” so I am confused.

3.54 & 3.54.1 – I would like to see the language requiring meetings and defining objectives retained somewhere in the procedure. It is important to make sure that the work completed for the independent study was created specifically for that experience and with clear learning outcomes/ELOs in mind.

- **We added clarifying language.**
-

3.54.1 – faculty are not allowed to meet for the full class time when a course is switched from a normal class to a tutorial, it seems inappropriate that they could still choose to meet for the full amount of time for an independent study class. I feel it should have the same limitations on meeting times as a tutorial does.

- **Faculty can and do meet for more than the full class time, they just cannot be required to meet for the full class time for tutorials or independent study.**
-

4.9.3

Administration

Please remove the following language from the Administrator Evaluation Procedure:

- ***New administrators will be evaluated midterm of their first year and then annually thereafter (administrators do not have a probationary period).***

Administrators’ are at-will employees and the Administrator Plan does not require a midterm evaluation during Administrator’s first year so we do not want our policy to be counter to the Administrator Plan.

- **We removed the line about probationary, but comments below strongly support the 6-month review of new administrators.**
-

Faculty

I believe administrators, especially new administrators, should be evaluated at the 6 month period to “fix” any problems that might occur. I’ve got to believe that administrators are like faculty in that inadvertent issues can occur, and it is best to fix the problem earlier rather than later--or just let the administrator go. We have had a HUGE turn over of administration in the

last five years and I've got to believe some of that could/should have been prevented with more frequent evaluations.

I think it is crucial to evaluate new Administrators at the 6-month point. This evaluation can be used to help new administrators succeed at NHCC. If the administrator is not providing the best possible service, learning opportunities, and guidance for our students and other employees, they need to know right away so they can make adjustments, obtain professional development and grow in their administrative role.

Otherwise It may be difficult for a new administrator who has not been successful for a year to become successful.

Since you're seeking feedback on proposed revisions, I have some regarding Procedure 4.9.3: Adminstrator Evaluation Procedure.

I don't know what the current policy looks like, but the proposed procedure on the NHCC website looks okay, it just needs to be adhered to. I have one suggestion for a change in wording: under Part 3, Evaluation Components, input should be gathered from all of the administrator's staff and it should be done anonymously. This is important because everyone on campus should have the opportunity, annually, to report on the work of their superior. Personally, I have not had the opportunity to do so in many years, and I would have some very constructive things to say—things that could make the college stronger. This is particularly important now, when the college is in the midst of an administrative crisis, which is, I'll be frank, a crisis of competence, exacerbated by the lack of serious, clear-eyed evaluation.

Also, I don't know how to put this in the document, but there needs to be some way of seeing that the information gathered is taken seriously. It's my impression, from friends in another division, that this information, when it is gathered, is ignored.

Thanks for your time.

4.9.3 – We need to retain the 6-month review for new administrators. We have had many deans and administrators leave lately. Lack of support/clarity in a new role, particularly amidst all of the change that is happening on our campus is likely a big reason why they have left. Reviews are not meant to be punitive, but an opportunity for growth, which is particularly important as people integrate into new organizational roles. Annual reviews with an additional 6-month review in the first year are important.

4.9.3 – I think administrators should be evaluated at the 6 month mark, however I also understand that by the nature of the job it may take more than 6 months to get a solid feel for it. Regardless they should still be evaluated annually.

- Thanks everyone for the comments. We retained the 6-month evaluation and added clarifying language about input from direct reports.
-

5.31.1

Faculty

Part 1 Subpart B. A **WEEKLY** BASIS? REALLY? That's beyond generous; it actually encourages slacking. Also, what about faculty on sabbatical?

- We removed the time statement. Faculty on sabbatical are still employed by the college and still need to check email.
-

5.31 & 5.31.1 – to clarify, are faculty who are not teaching summer expected to check email weekly? That is not necessarily vacation time, but it is time that we are not under contract to work unless we have chosen to teach summer classes.

- We clarified that it's any leave, which covers faculty who do not teach during the summer.
-

General

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

To every policy, add Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Committee to the list of campus reviewers (table located at the end of each policy).

- DEIC will be an official policy reviewer effective Spring 2018 (pending final review process and approval by NHCC president). They will be added to the table at the end of each policy as policies are reviewed under the new 1A.1.