

Spring 2015 Policy Campus Review Comments

March 16-27, 2015

****The comments below were received from the campus community between March 16 and March 27. The Policy Committee reviewed every comment received and either made the requested change or responded to the comment. The result of the discussion at Policy Committee is in blue below each comment.**

3.54 and 3.54.1 Academic Amnesty Policy and Procedure (Revision):

1. No comments received.

5.33.1 Tobacco Use and Sales Procedure (Revision):

1. (Faculty) I would really like to talk about the Tobacco use policy. I know there are designated spots on campus that are for that purpose only, however...it's not enforced. There was a student smoking an e-cig in the HWC building 2 weeks ago and threw up a fuss when I asked him to go to one of the designated areas. I understand that we don't want those that smoke to feel unwelcomed, however...I am wondering why larger 4-year campuses in the MnSCU system have no problems going 100% smoke free, but we can't. Again, it would be one thing if it was enforced, but because it isn't...
 - We need to add that Public Safety will be the department that will enforce this policy.
 - The college will promote the designated spots on campus. Public Safety, working with Student Senate, shall explore the various creative ways of enforcing this policy.
 - The college will add visible non-smoking signs in non-smoking areas where smoking is more prevalent.
 - The college will engage students to come up with creative ideas. Student Clubs could sponsor a policy that they can promote and advocate for.

5.36 and 5.36.1 Postings and Displays Policy and Procedure (Revision):

1. No comments received.

6.14 and 6.14.1 Vehicle Use for Official College Business Policy and Procedure (Revision):

1. No comments received.

4.9.3 Administrator Evaluation Procedure (New):

- We discussed this procedure and decided that, due to the concerns raised, it would be better to postpone this to the fall semester. The group recommended that a Committee (representing all the bargaining units and students) be created to examine the Administrator Evaluation process and come up with recommendations.
1. (Faculty) I'm worried about this sentence from the Administrator Evaluation Procedure:

I suspect that the “a” before faculty is inadvertent, but then again, perhaps not. Perhaps administrators want the option to only seek feedback from one member of the faculty and staff. I want it to be clear that each administrator is required to seek feedback from all those she supervises every year. It’s not clear from the procedure that the opportunity to comment occurs every year. It’s clear that administrators meet with their supervisors every year but not that there’s an annual feedback opportunity. Personally, I have never once had the opportunity to comment on my superior’s job performance. Also, though this likely can’t be changed, the entirety of subpart F is enough to make me weep for the demise of my native language.

2. (Faculty) Thanks for sending out and asking for comments. I think in Administrator Evaluation Procedure (4.9.3) the Part 3 Subpart B should read “...shall provide faculty and staff” instead of “...shall provide a faculty and staff” and maybe it should read “...shall provide all applicable faculty and staff.” Also there seems to be two different opportunities mentioned for faculty and staff to give feedback on the supervisor.

Part 3 Subpart B. 360° Leadership Competencies Inventory. Administrators shall provide a faculty and staff the opportunity to provide written feedback during their review process and prior to the reviews completion.

Part 5 Subpart C. Leadership feedback survey conducted at least every three (3) years by direct reports, peers, and other important constituents during fiscal year. Results to be used in development of next fiscal year’s performance and professional development objectives.

Are these the same opportunity or is this two different opportunities? Also I think there should be language that ensures the request for feedback go out to all applicable faculty and staff for feedback, that at least one of these opportunities for feedback happens every year and that faculty and staff have at least a week to complete it during the fall and spring semesters and two weeks during the summer semester. I think it is important that faculty and staff can give feedback every year.

I am not sure why the Part 5 Subpart C asks for feedback every 3 years when the goal is to use the results in the next year’s performance and professional development objectives. I think it should ask for feedback every year.

And just to be clear, is the intent of this document that the feedback from the faculty and staff be read by the administrators supervisor? So would the Vice President of Academics read the consolidated but uncensored feedback from the staff and faculty of a particular Dean? Or is it the Dean’s job to collect and incorporate the data into a big form and then discuss the form with the Vice President? If the VP does not see the original feedback from the faculty and staff, I am not sure it is worth the effort to give the feedback.

5.34 and 5.34.1 Visitors and Minors on Campus Policy Procedure (New):

1. (Staff) In Procedure 5.34.1 (Visitors and Minors Campus Procedure) there is a reference in paragraph 4 to “campus security.” This should be changed to “Public Safety.”

- a. **We agree that this needs to change.**

2. (Staff) I read through most of the policies listed below. I have a quick question regarding procedure 5.34.1 Visitors and Minors on Campus. It appears minors and youth must be supervised by an adult while on campus, whether as part of a program or not...is my understanding correct?

- a. (Landon Response)

Yes, unaccompanied minors not in one of our programs (upward bound, etc) would fall under the following clause:

If minors, who are not participating in an official NHCC program per Policy 5.34, are left unattended and are disruptive or in distress, NHCC may notify law enforcement personnel and/or the Department of Social Services.

I would stress that just because we see an unattended minor shouldn't mean that we automatically call the police or social services. That said, the language is proposed language. If you have suggestions, please send them my way for consideration by the Policy Committee. Whatever changes go into effect would occur at the start of fall semester.

- b. (Staff response to Landon)

Thank you for replying to our emails and clarifying the policy for me. The continued concern for me is community minors and youth on campus that are not participating in NHCC programs per policy 5.34. Throughout the year, particularly during the summer months and K-12 holiday sessions community minors and youth have traditionally used NHCC as a “hangout” – much like a shopping mall or house – without adult supervision. During this traditional use we have had issues with minors and youth committing crimes against others including: assault, harassment, theft, vandalism, drug violations, and gang activity. Although I understand NHCC has a desire to be open to the public, the college is also taking on risk and liability, and in most cases we (Public Safety) are tasked with monitoring the unsupervised minors and youth on campus.

- **The Policy Committee believes that Public Safety will need to follow the current process that is set up to address issues mentioned above. This policy will not have an impact.**

I ask that if NHCC moves forward with this policy and procedure that within Policy 5.34 there is stronger language concerning where unsupervised minors and youth are allowed to “hangout” on campus (campus center), and available sanctions NHCC employees can use to make sure unsupervised minors and youth, and all who are on campus are safe at all times.

Additionally stronger language may need to be added when describing what disruptive and distressed behavior is. As the policy is written now, each Public Safety officer could interpret disruptive and distress differently based on their own personal beliefs; which could lead to inconsistent understanding and enforcement of the policy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

- **The interpretation of the policy needs to be looked at within the context of Public Safety training. So, there is no need to change the language.**

3. (Faculty) I have read the policies on visitors to the classroom on the website and the policy on alumni. I was wondering what the committee is thinking of changing in the policy. At present the instructor has the discretion to bring in any visitor to their classroom. And the visitor needs to follow the same rules as the student, as laid out in the student handbook. I invite alumni and other visitors to my classroom to help my students with their planning for the future and as part of my personal student mentoring program, which I think is very beneficial to the students. So I am very concerned about changes to this policy. I am happy to respond to any questions.

a. (Landon response)

- There is no current policy/procedure, so this is new. Under this policy, instructors still have the discretion to have visitors and alumni in the classroom. Can you tell me what section of the policy/procedure is worrying you? I want to make sure it isn't worded in such a way that it would prohibit faculty from having visitors/alumni.

b. (Faculty response to Landon)

- Thanks for your email. So this is what I do - last semester, I had three students who were taking Organic Chemistry, to be able to apply to Materials Science Engineering, Chemical Engineering or Biomedical Engineering. They were still undecided. So I bring in alumni, one who studied Materials Science engineering and another who studied Biomedical Engineering after taking Organic Chemistry with me at NHCC. Additionally they are working in the field. So they help the students by talking through with them about the content of the two engineering courses, what they see as the future of each, how to get admission and so on. One of them took two of the students to his workplace and allowed them to shadow him for a day to show him what he does.

This semester, I have three wanting to go to Pharmacy school, one to Dental School, one to Medical School, one to vet school and so on. I have a student from three years ago who is in dental school and who will come in and talk to the one student who wants to go to dental school.

Without going into more details, most of the visitors to my classroom are alumni, but a few are people I know from local industries.

I think the information they provide to my students is invaluable. I would like to be able to continue doing this. Any policy that is created should allow me to bring alumni and visitors to campus to talk with my students.

There would typically be three to four visitors per semester, not more. The visitors may come into the classroom during the last ten minutes of class and then continue talking to the interested students after class time. I could fill out a form with their name etc and give it to security if necessary, but I would like to make sure that there is no restriction on bringing people to the classroom.

- **The Policy Committee is not trying to limit visitors or alumni, we are still leaving the decision up to the discretion of the faculty. There is no need to change the language.**

4. (Faculty) Thank you meeting with Doris and I this morning. I learned a lot and I look forward to collaborating in the future. I had one question regarding the Visitors & Minors Policy. In our first semester of nursing, we do have a lab where we have minors come in with their parent/guardian and students do assessments/teaching (vital signs, teaching about dental hygiene). This is a very beneficial class to our students. In the policy below, it states an 'official NHCC program' and refers back to policy 5.34. I am wondering if we as a program have to take one step further to report to administration about this event occurring so no minors with adults will get into trouble as I didn't see this addressed in either 5.34 or 5.34.1 policies. Is there a form that faculty should fill out in anticipation of this lab?
 - **Faculty have the discretion to decide here. The faculty will not need to take the extra steps to report to administration.**
5. (Faculty) So far, I have read the policy on Visitors/Minors. Overall, several things make sense (as I'd like to think children under 12 are supervised by an adult, etc)... I'm concerned about faculty being required to get permission:
 - a. Why? Are we worried about faculty bringing kids to school too often? Children being disruptive? What is the purpose of requiring permission? If one faculty member repeatedly brings a disruptive child, then can't we address that specific situation, not create a policy that seems to penalize everyone? We don't trust our colleagues to use good judgment?
 - b. **Define supervisor** (my department coordinator? my dean?) –
 - **The Policy Committee believes that this is a matter of educating faculty that their Dean is their supervisor, not Department Coordinators.**
 - c. "Human Resources will develop guidelines for supervisors to follow to ensure consistency" - (We shouldn't vote on this procedure until these guidelines are developed. If we approve this procedure, then are we going to approved the actual guidelines later? **Let's see those guidelines now.**)

- **The Policy Committee discussed this and concluded that before this policy/procedure go into effect in August, 2015, that HR will develop guidelines that will be communicated along with the policy/procedure.**

d. I'm OK with the policy overall as it seems pretty reasonable (kids should "hog" computers, equipment, etc., and faculty should have the right to say yes/no on this matter), but let's **delete the whole part about faculty needing permission?**

- **The Policy Committee does not agree with this. This policy should include all employees including faculty.**

6. (Faculty) I would like to comment on 5.34 and 5.34.1 Visitors and Minors on Campus Policy Procedure. While I agree with most of the wording in the policy, I question the need for employees to ask for prior permission from both the supervisor and HR. I think this is a cumbersome policy and that paragraph should be removed. It is sufficient for supervisors to determine whether employee children are disruptive to workflow and speak to employees in those specific cases.

I feel very strongly about this because it is an equity issue. Too many workplaces are family-unfriendly. It would sadden me to see NHCC become more corporate and less humane. Childcare burdens fall heaviest on single-parent families and on women. As a community college and a diverse workplace, it is important for NHCC to be welcoming to working families.

Also, children should be welcome on this campus. Many of our students of color come from cultures where children, grandparents, community, and parents are interconnected. I love seeing children on campus because it introduces those children to the idea of college at an early stage. It also sends a clear message to young women that they can belong here. They don't have to make a choice between children and career.

If we want to be a family-friendly workplace, if we want to honor diversity, and further gender equality, we need to carefully consider the unintended consequences of making employees choose between children and work.

- **This policy is not intended to prevent minors from being on campus, but rather to make sure that the minors are not disruptive and their safety is not compromised.**

The communication that went out to the campus regarding the posting policy and say this is what this sections was supposed to say.

NH III.02.13.01 Procedure on Program Review (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH V.02 Breach of Security of Data System policy (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH V.02.01 Breach of Security of Data System procedure (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH V.02.04.03 Alcohol and Drug Free Campus Policy (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH V.02.09 Public Information Access Policy (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH V.02.09.01 Public Information Access Procedure (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH V.02.10 Ropes Course Policy (Rescind):

1. No comments received.

NH v.02.10.01 Ropes Course Procedure (Rescind):

1. No comments received.