



Local 3533 General Membership Meeting Minutes

President: Michael Richmond

Date: 1/29/2013: 12-1pm: E137

Attendees: Margo Toner, Scarlet Kendrick, Monta Frost, George Dalich, Jim Howe, Jason Sobottka, Marti Garrels, Doug Rupik, Dave Meyers, Mike Clifton, Heidi Shepherd, Jerry Peterson, Phil Snider, Cheyenne Roduin, Roxanne Spring, Mikal Steinbacher, Letty Barnes, Bobbi Julag-Ay, Peter Welty, Nolan Koreski,

Topic: Safety on Campus

[All]

Discussion: Mike Clifton described his situation on campus. Broad strokes: Mike worked immediately with Patrick Sturgill, Bob Monroig, Ruby Hayden and Dennis Long. Kirkland police were included and suggested Mike get a restraining order which the union reimbursed him for. The restraining order superseded the suspension from LWIT, which doesn't prevent a student from being on campus. Restraining orders can be modified with student services and faculty that may enable a student to finish school/program. Interesting note ** Once Mike mentioned that he asked questions to his own attorney, HR bowed out of assisting him.* Mike's suggestion is to get a restraining order that covers campus first and then modify it later for personal property if needed. Bobbi described her situation. Bobbi was made aware of issues with the student prior to accepting student into class and she kept a full report of student behavior and of threat made by student. Reports went to Ruby Hayden, Nancy Dick, and Dennis Long. Bobbi spoke with Greg in HR and he helped prepare her for the harassment charge that student was making (the students' sexual harassment charges and appeal have since failed) and Bobbi got advice from union members. Biggest problem was that the appropriate reports and documentation kept by Bobbi were not forward to all the right parties so there was a lot back-tracking to make sure all the correct info/reports were collected centrally. This particular situation also included another student in the class and there was no guaranteed protection for faculty or student unless they each took out restraining orders on the other student. ***Important to immediately contact your dean and Union president/officer for support!!!!**

*Special note is that there is really no formal communication process for alerting faculty about potentially dangerous students on campus or issues that may be pending or in appeal of a security nature.

*Special mention that safety on campus has come up in bargaining

*Special mention that faculty have control over their closed classrooms

*Special mention that a suspension does not prevent student from being on campus

Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
Suggestion: students should register with a physical address and full names at registration...P.O. Box isn't sufficient for a restraining order.		
Suggestion: A central, protected location (SharePoint?) be identified to keep a security log for campus and crime	Cheyenne emailed Patrick with this idea	1-30-13
Suggestion: bargain in contract language for enforcement concerning student suspension and being on campus		

Topic: Presidential Search		[All]
Discussion: Faculty participating on the Presidential Search committee: Michael Richmond as Union officer, Scarlet Kendrick, Peter Welty, and Stacie Chappell-all representing faculty.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
none		

Topic: Faculty and Governance		[All]
<p>Discussion: Michael would like to help faculty gain more respect and be represented on campus. Requests that faculty take issue through the process stated below. SharePoint is where all the committee minutes and actions are supposed to be kept. Mentioned that committees became part of governance structure for the college in the last 4 years due to accreditation.</p> <p>*Issue raised that we want to make sure we have addressed all the right avenues before it makes it to president or BOT – this is not a feeling shared by all union members...feel that we don't need to run everything by the college president if we feel it isn't getting addressed appropriately.</p> <p>*Issue raised that we have no idea which faculty are taking items to meetings/committees/etc. and maybe we need some more centralized way of tracking these issues so we don't step on each-others toes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A faculty member has a concern (XX is faculty). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. That faculty member brings their concern to the meetings that XX is facilitating individually. b. During that meeting, the faculty from XX's representative group vet their opinion and ask that it be taken to E-Board. c. XX brings the vetted concern to the E-Board meeting. d. We the E-Board, vet the concern, and determine which committee it should be taken to in order to make a change. e. XX goes back to his group and reports what is recommended by the E-Board. (Next steps for the faculty member.) The faculty member that raised the concern takes the concern to the committee that was vetted by the E-Board. (This gets them involved, and it allows for better communication) f. The faculty member that has the concern presents to the appropriate committee. The faculty member then reports back to XX's meetings what occurred. g. XX then reports back to the E-Board what occurred or the outcome from presenting to the committee. h. If change does not occur to the faculty member's satisfaction in the committee, we then as an E-Board come together and determine the next action. i. At this point it may be to take the concern to the President of the college through the VP and Pres. of the union. j. The VP & Pres. Report back to E-Board what the College President will do or not do. k. XX reports to his group where we are at with faculty members concern. l. If satisfaction does not occur with the concern, then the E-Board votes whether to take it to the BOT or some other action. 		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline: