# Fall 2020 Campus Comments

## 3.8 Student Complaints & Grievances

### Faculty

I see the student complaint/grievance policy is up for review.  I don’t really know where to go from here but I do know the current system/procedure can be flawed and open to potential bias, retaliation (even though it says it won’t happen) and a student not having, really, proper representation, support or “help” when meeting with two or three people with authority including who they are bringing a claim against.

I see the part where help can be given by the advisor... but I see this more as help filling out the complaint form. I would really like to see almost another student who could attend the meeting as an observer and/or even an advisor (neutral party but on behalf of the student) to make it more even.  The power dynamics I have seen in these situations were very worrisome.

Having stronger language about a trusted person that a student can bring with them I think is the smallest things we should push for. In addition to the person supporting the student, I think having the dean or administrator provide a written summary of their rationale in their decision would also lead to a potentially more equitable process versus “siding with the faculty because not enough proof”.  For example, if I kept seeing that same comment from a Dean regarding a student making, for example, discriminatory claims against a faculty member (or the same faculty member); I would have a couple conversations.  One starting with “what kind of proof of racism do you think you are able to find/looking for?”

What is the time period to respond to a student after their complaint is received? Is there an order to who is met with first? The student complaining, or the person being complained against?

After lengthy conversation, the policy committee decided to table this policy for review in Spring for the following reasons: the committee initially believed that the structural inequities were dictated by Board Policy; we decided that we can do better to eliminate these inequities, but it would not be possible in a single meeting. We also discovered that the procedure does not fully align with current practice, so it needs to be rewritten to do so.

### Staff

The Higher Learning Commission, as part of its Policy on Assumed Practices, gives the following expectations in regard to procedures for receiving complaints and grievances (highlighted below).

Does Part 5. Recordkeeping of the procedure speak enough to the analysis?  Periodically reviewed by whom? Is this referencing a specific Quality Improvement Process or is it generally part of the college’s overall quality improvement efforts?

I’m sorry, since the form was crossed out in the procedure and I did not see any link I inappropriately assumed that a form was not going to continue.

Should the suggestion box be mentioned here?

Functionally I was just looking for more clarity in the analysis portion.

The content provided in Julio’s response below provides much more context.

How else so students or employees learn about the Suggestion Box and its purpose/location (other than in emails where Julio mentions it specifically)? If it is a mechanism for fulfilling this policy it should be mentioned in the policy.

Knowing when (spring) and which positions (VP & Dean of Students) review this information (as you clarified below) is much more meaningful. Including a bit more info in the policy makes it more likely to continue, even if the people in those positions change (which I hope they don’t).

Thank you for your input. We have tabled the policy/procedure for Fall and plan to rewrite the procedure to better align with current practice in Spring 2021.

## 3.15 Advanced Placement & 3.16 International Baccalaureate

### Staff

I have reviewed the AP and IB policy and procedures with Candice Bartelle and Deena Marks.There are no changes in these policies and procedures for AP and IB.

## 3.56 & 3.56.1

### MMA:

Discussion about shortening the 5 year wait period. Decided that given the language as we have it there is sufficient flexibility for appeal. End result – MMA okay keeping the language as suggested.