

Forum Meeting

Wednesday, October 16, 2013

In attendance: Brian Ammons, Candace Taylor, Teresa Imfeld, Evan Wantland, Stan Cross, Phil Otterness, David Coffey, Sloan Poe, Chris Kypriotis, Jen Mozolic, Natasha Shipman, and John Casey. Principal Session Convener: Natasha Shipman

Call to Order: 4:03 p.m.

Minutes of the September 18 meeting approved pending correction of minor typographical errors.

Continuing Business:

A. Revised Tuition Remission Policy

Initially presented to Forum for its September 18, 2013 meeting.

Main concerns expressed during the Public Comment Period:

- 1) The revision takes away an important benefit for many employees, remission of board and room, without much savings to the College, supposing that the cost of an extra bed in a dorm room does not cost the College much and that the meal plan is "mostly off-set" by participation in the Work Program and, so, that the total cost to the College per remission student is around \$250 compared to a cost to employee parents of \$35,000 for four years of board and room.
- 2) Few college employees use this benefit, so the total savings to the College will be low.
- 3) Benefits such as this one help to compensate for low employee salaries and so serve as a recruitment incentive.
- 4) Implementation needs to be a more gradual than just grandfathering students currently enrolled, e.g. by grandfathering all current employees.

Main issues raised by Forum Representatives:

- 1) The proposed revision has not been considered by the Administrative Policy Committee.
- 2) More information such as the following is needed. What are the actual figures concerning cost to the College and to employee parents? What part does participation in the Work Program play in determining these costs? How many employee dependents are likely to participate per year?
- 3) The main reason for the policy change appears to be a desire to bring College policy into agreement with policy at most other institutions, while we may have special circumstances such as comparatively low salaries.
- 4) The policy is insufficiently clear, e.g. "financial aid" needs to be defined and the role of student loans and the Work Program in the calculation of costs after remission made clear. Also there are presentation issues, such as reference to a non-existent section of the policy.

A motion was made to "refer this policy to the Administrative Policy Committee for revision and for the additional information that we have been discussing" and seconded. After additional discussion of the ground for sending to committee, the motion passed 9 to 0.

B. Bottled Water Policy

Brought to Forum directly by Caucus via publication with the agenda on 10-14-2013 and represented by student Rubin Rosen, author of the motion approved by Caucus.

According to the information provided by Mr. Rosen and Forum Representative Stan Cross, in 2010 the College paid \$4000 for large bottles of water for dispensers on campus. As a result a decision was made to invest in filters on drinking fountains instead. Also, the College purchasing pattern language does not allow the sale of bottled water on campus, but this practice continues. The proposal under consideration would disallow both the purchase of large dispenser bottles by the College and the sale on campus of bottles of water to individuals.

Discussion ensued as to whether the proposal from Caucus actually represents a College policy matter and whether additional policy is needed. Convener John Casey presented the opinion that whether the College goes about fulfilling the obligation to supply free drinking water via dispenser or filtered fountains is not a matter of College policy, but a matter of "Local" purchasing policy and/or practice, while a ban on the sale of bottled water on campus may be a College policy, depending on the content of an actual policy proposal.

A motion was made to send the proposal back to Caucus to be rewritten as college policy proposal. Convener Casey noted that Caucus is not a committee of Forum and so the proposal cannot be sent back to Caucus in the way in which this is done for college policy committees. The motion was withdrawn without a second. The motion was made to "table this motion until Caucus presents us with a policy for consideration" in order to give Caucus an opportunity to provide a "solid proposal." The motion was seconded and, after a brief discussion, the motion was approved by a vote of 8 to 1.

The opportunity for new business was announced, but none was forth coming.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm until the next regularly scheduled meeting on November 20, 2013.