

**Forum Agenda**  
**Wednesday, February 13, 2013**  
Start Time: 4:18 pm, End Time: 5:10 pm

Attendance: Phil Jamison, Jeff Keith, Phil Otterness, Stan Cross, Dylan Suter, Candace Taylor, Brian Ammons, Tom Wilder, David Abernathy, Evan Wantland

1. Approval of November 28, 2012 minutes
  - a. Phil Jamison, Jeff Keith

2. Business

- a. **Report on Domestic Partner Issues:** Jonathan Ehrlich

- Worked one-on-one with the community (Laura Vance and Marty O'Keefe) to look at our policy and make it workable for the community.
- Unless people see the revised document we don't know how they have been changed. It's important that the community see these changes.
- Now that we have a new affidavit, how will it work? Does everyone have to fill it out or are we grandfathered? We are grandfathered.

- b. **Alcohol Policy:** Forum

Motion: Forum moves that the APC reconsider the Alcohol Policy and take into account College community sentiment and questions of structural consistency and rationale. (Steve Cartier)

- 2<sup>nd</sup> by David Abernathy
- Will the comments from the President go back to the committee?
- The comments will be passed on and Steve and Natasha would like 2 forum members to serve as a liaison with the APC on this policy.
- Among the duties of Forum, approve for recommendation policies, President sent back to us to look at the rationale of the policy. This is an empowering thing.
- Rationale comes up because the policy is inconsistent. If the policy is consistent then the rationale might not matter as much.
- Part of problem is we need a policy that deals with alcohol and students and the 2<sup>nd</sup> part is what is the policy for alcohol with staff and faculty events. Maybe we need two policies and not one.
- There is an alcohol policy for students. This is an umbrella policy for all. Do we need both?
- Good to take the inconsistencies and then question why we have the policy and what it is for and means.

- c. **Holidays:** Forum

Motion: Forum moves that the Administrative Policy Committee (APC) re-evaluate the status of MLK Day, Memorial Day, Labor Day and the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as College holidays. As MLK Day affects

more than employees, Forum requests that, as part of this motion, the APC work with the President's appointed MLK Day task force to evaluate the current status and make a recommendation on the future status of this particular day. (Steve Cartier)

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Jeff Keith
- amend motion (Stan), 2<sup>nd</sup> Phil Jamison
  - Forum moves that the Administrative Policy Committee (APC) re-evaluate the status of MLK Day, Memorial Day, Labor Day and the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as College holidays. Forum requests that, as part of this motion, the APC work with the President's appointed MLK Day task force to evaluate the current status and make a recommendation on the future status of this particular day.
  - 10 vote yes.
- See an opportunity in this and recognizing the holidays exist. MLK Day and Labor Day can provide an opportunity to reflect on these holidays.
- I would like to see us honor the what these holidays mean. What is the true spirit of Labor Day. What does it mean?
- Don't want to be black listed if one does choose to do some work.
- Vote: 10 for

d. **Legal Indemnification Policy:** Administrative Policy Committee, Jonathan Ehrlich

Motion: The Administrative Policy Committee moves that Forum approve for recommendation the Legal Indemnification Policy.

- What is breach of duty – this would be decided by us not the court of law. Who would make this decision? College administration. President would make the final decision.
- We pass this so even if the lawyer advised against it we could do something else. Yes.
- Breach of duty and Breach of loyalty is what the lawyer provided. Not noticed that this is mentioned elsewhere. Added 1 and 2 after reading our other statements.
- Might be in there because of instances where the employee might sue the employer.
- Still many problems –
  - pg 1 – paragraph 4 (already said in the new paragraph – redundant)
  - covered expenses – stated in new paragraph
  - portions added to explain things need some work
  - concerned about the portion called modifications – seem that the policy could be withdrawn as soon as a problem comes up.
  - Seem that the possibility that this needs a little work yet.
  - Concerned about clear definitions of terms (improper conduct, deadline for notification, is there a modification clause on any of our other policies)

- Concerned about how this effects our participation in experiential education. The ambiguity does not serve the purpose of helping us make decisions.
- Not just to protect the college but to protect the employees as well.
- If we have new terminology then we need to know what that means.
- Motion to send the policy back to committee (Candice Taylor), 2<sup>nd</sup> Stan Cross

d. **Harassment Policy:** Administrative Policy Committee, Jonathan Ehrlich  
 Motion: The Administrative Policy Committee moves that Forum approve for recommendation the Harassment Policy.

- Amend the policy to agree with title 9 specifically pg 7. (Brian Ammons), 2<sup>nd</sup> Evan Wantland
  - Vote on the amendment – pass (all)
- Vote on Harassment Policy – pass (all)

### 3. Adjournment

- a. The meeting will adjourn to the next Forum meeting on March 13, 2013
  - 1. 2<sup>nd</sup> Stan Cross