

Council of Chairs
Meeting Minutes
6/18/2021

Members present were Vincent Bowhay, Lori Boots, Larry Markiewicz, Paul Molnar, Erica Cope, Cody Westerhold, Bridget Carson, Taylor Crawshaw, Brian Southworth, Mark Yaroslaski, and Cherie Stockton.

Vince opened the meeting with a conversation about policies in general. Feels by removing PAC it has made Council of Chairs the new voice for developing policies. Bowhay also wants to remove policies from the Board policy manual that are not actually Board policies.

Workplace Attire – set an expectation that people are dressing appropriately for work. Need a policy to hold people accountable with a place to start from that tried to encourage cleanliness and proper hygiene. Lori researched other community college policies. HR wanted a generic statement that can be addressed if needed. Bridget mentioned concerns – who makes the decision? Who gets to say what is inappropriate. Cody feels this would be a supervisor decision. Yaroslaski suggested that Appearance **MUST** be neat rather than should be neat. Marg suggested the policy read “employees have” should be the wording. The group liked the change and felt it ties back with the mission statement. HR will use revise the statement and send out for email approval.

Supervisor expectations – Leaving Covid, change in leadership. What /how do you supervise? Individual job descriptions are set up but ... This also addresses the submission of attendance policy. HR wants to add workplace expectations to this policy. Cody likes this policy. Erica was asked if she felt this fit the athletic department and she agreed that it worked. Bridget sent to faculty senate; received one concern stating that it might not work for workplace expectations.

Vince mentioned having an employee rights policy – along with supervisor expectations (like a sister companion of this policy) would also need time to talk about these policies and how they affect faculty. Edits will be made by Lori then sent via email for a vote.

Service and Outside Committees – Goes along / outside employment, outside duties. This is to make sure a clear policy is set-up, so the outside job doesn't affect the current job at the workplace. Vince suggested a disclosure that discloses if you were working another position outside of ICC's job. Brian Southworth asked if this form is only used if you are being paid money. Vince thinks a conflict of interest could create an issue. Cody said the goal was just to make sure you are not working at ICC and working at another job and doing the other job while doing the second job at ICC. Bridget mentioned that some side hustles might take you away but still meets some of your job descriptions. Taylor thinks the policy is too stern. Bridget, Erica and Lori will work on it and present at the next meeting.

Profits – Cody asked if Profit and Service outside goes together? HR feels we need to do it the same way across campus. Use of work time (faculty work time might not be defined appropriately, while a 40-hour employee time could be different). Cody motioned to approve profit activities as written; Taylor Crawshaw seconded. Would like to revise the Faculty time is defined as time in lecture/teaching/office hour. Business hours would be defined as Monday – Friday 8 – 5. Change second sentence and third paragraph to “business hours” rather than work hours. Cody Westerhold motioned to approve; Taylor Crawshaw seconded. Motion carried.

Productivity – Going back to evaluations. Staff /Faculty back to annual procedures for new hires at the first 30/60/90 days. Policy is needed for productivity in the workplace to define the items. Marg suggested Lori will add Marg’s info and add a piece of what the reproductions will be – and will resend to the group and vote via email.

Visitors in the workplace – Need a policy in case a violation is made and can be addressed. Vince mentioned safety of the guests. A motioned was made to accept changes mentioned for the policy, keeping the last policy with the change of a few words. Paul Molnar moved that we implement new language w/ addition of the closing paragraph from the original statement. Cody Westerhold second. Motion Carried.

Solicitation and Distribution policy – Excluding the info at the end of the first and third paragraphs of the policy; Cody asked about “getting things approved” for example, the marketing department and where/who prior approval should come from? Can we tie this policy back to the Marketing policy? When a system is in place that is timely (such as non-sanctioned college events). Non-college events need approval. Ample time is needed for approval as well as bulletin boards where community items can be approved. Lori will update the policy and send out to the group for a vote.

Recording time worked – tracking vacation/personal days/sick is entered and approved. Time sheets should be completed by the employee and not the supervisor. Training with groups will be provided. Marg asked if faculty needed to record time (only sick/personal days) and should be referenced in the policy. HR will make these changes for hourly/salaried/faculty so that each department understands. This will be brought back to the next meeting for discussion.

Professionalism – (screaming/cussing) Policy is needed to define and provide a way to report. HR mentioned that the definition of professional behavior could be defined differently in different departments. HR feels we could tone down the policy to ensure than it is understood that these behaviors are not acceptable. Staff/Faculty may not have the same policies/standards that students are being held to. HR will rework the bullet points to soften the tone and review the academic freedom laws to make sure faculty is covered. Cody felt like this was more of conduct rather than academic. Sexual references should be cross referenced with Title IX then brought back a the committee for review.

Communications – Combined with professional policies; can this tie in with out mission statement on values? Vince suggested a professionalism/Communications statement to cover both? Will bring back next time.

Brian Southworth suggested these policies be sent to faculty/staff as written to gain a chance for feedback. The group agreed that public vetting is good and from the faculty perspective gives different posture of attention.