

ManCom Meeting
French House
August 20, 2008

ATTENDING:

Milton Wong – FH
Ken Liao – HoC
Chris Severen – RO
Mike Jurkash – ComTrus
Brian Donovan – GA
Steve – NG
Aaron – AV
Nash - AV
Thomas – AV
Jessie – FH

Member Time

Jessie: Member time is at every meeting where members can bring issues before committees, often times this is with the FaCom or the Board (explanation of member time).

Use happy fingers and sad fingers

Intro to ManCom

Jessie: Let's clarify who's on ManCom.

Mike: Am I on ManCom.

Jessie: no, not assigned

(5 trustees present, **quorum**)

Jessie: Why does ManCom exist? To study an issue that needs to be revised or adjusted. Policy changes should come through a committee before the Board. ManCom will have a lot of those things. The best ideas that have come forth have been vetted by ManCom. We have power, we should use it wisely.

Brian is here, he is staffed to this committee:

Brian: I am assigned to this, ECC, and board, Jenn supports MemCom and EduCom, Billy, FaCom; and Gail, FinCom. Also, ManCom does my review at the end of the year, so you provide feedback for me and staff in general.

Jessie: Because the school year is about to start, I would like to study what we should be thinking about and get an idea about what you think we should do as a committee...(etc.) Questions?

If you have questions ask anytime.

The next item on the agenda is the **tasking of staff raises**. Right now the staff section of the standing rules is very long and cumbersome. The raise section is very long and doesn't work.

Brian: When I started, there were many positions that don't exist. Gave many powers to GA to be fair to staff, but many restrictions. Written four directors ago, but became a contract accountant, so there are many rules generated from previous structures. I would like to see it more simplified

Milton: What could we change that you could veto given your powers.

Brian: There could be an issue if the Board wanted to fire staff, but ...

Jessie: I think the general role for ManCom will be to pick up on most important issues. Billy's raise issue is a good place to start. Raise scheme section should probably be one first. Everyone should read through the schemes.

Nash: We should get rid of automatic merit raise.

Brian: We could go to court if we haven't met our rules.

Nash: Staff, according to rules, should get 5% raise.

Milton: What are these two issues.

Jessie: I would like to divide these up, they have separate nuances.

Milton: We were supposed to cover this, but there might have been some changes that weren't addressed or added. I want to task you(Jessie) with talking to Katie (Sobering) with catching these things.

Brian: I got Barb to go through the Standing Rules, and the online, but not pdf.

Mike: We should get a set process for getting membership in the know.

Jessie: We could have a recent ideas section on our website. About how all this happens. When I did ManCom with Katie Sobering we did grammatical changes. I suggest that we don't do that, and everyone bring ideas and proposals. I would like everyone to read through changes and minutes.

Brian: We have that documented, it will be in the new packets.

Jessie: We can smush these two items together (the raise scheme and staff raise). We need a way for a staff member to ask for a merit-based raise. In case whatever system we have isn't working, we should provide a way to systematically ask for a raise. Please read the minutes from the summer meetings.

Aaron: Why weren't the rules about merit raises being followed?

Brian: Because my and FinCoord's stinginess and rules being too complicated.

Mike: You said that it was a liability issue, I want to clarify, it doesn't guarantee the raise, it is "contingent on financial reasons".

Brian: You're right, I think I'm cheap.

Nash: It just muddies the waters. And, to hurt us, they just have to have enough of a case to take us to court, not to win.

Brian: I think it encourages fairness. It's complicated, more so than normal. Maybe after 3 years, we can do a review with a larger raise.

Mike: I like that idea, better than putting a system in place for the staff to request raises. The GA can give a raise, and there would be standard checkpoints to check for raises. That should cover it.

Brian: It isn't just Billy. Part of Billy's beef is that Jenn got a much larger raise last year by getting a higher paying job. I emailed ECC that the city minimum wage would be a good bottom. I convinced the ECC to offer that to Jenn. A better process would have headed Jenn asking for that raise, which would have lessened Billy's beef.

Nash: Having the minimum wage mentioned is good, but to clarify, it was several thousand above the minimum wage and there were transparency issues.

Mike: In response, Jenn's was bad, and Billy's was better. You had said maybe staff should leave room when we have these discussions, but no one acted. What if there was a silent minority that didn't speak? There could be more open discussions, like in committee meetings. The board seems an odd venue to discuss this. Maybe we could put something in here about venue for discussing this.

Aaron: Like secret ballots

Mike: Maybe?

Jessie: In all meetings?

Mike: No, with staff raises.

Brian: Billy, Jenn, and I were all there.

Nash: There might be concerns about how disagreeing with someone might affect performance, like if I say something, it will hurt maintenance at my house. It removes a weasel factor as well, if one wanted to hide from house.

Jessie: That should be a part of that. Everyone always has the power to ask, but sometimes exercising that power is intimidating.

Nash: Maybe we disagreed, if you are uncomfortable with Exec session, than Board Rep may not be a good position.

Jessie: How do we feel about putting that into this? Should staff be present while working on staff salary raise issue?

Ken: Maybe not just staff raises, any time we talk about staff issues

Brian: If someone said something about Billy from Avalon, and then Avalon was neglected, could that be immoral or backlash. Even if backlash doesn't happen, which with Billy I don't think it would, it could appear like that. When we go into Exec Session, we avoid that.

Chris: Staff should be present for developing the policy as long as it isn't incriminating.

Aaron: What about negatives? What if they can't respond to criticisms? Others?

Milton: Another one, the membership should know exactly why the board accepts or not a decision.

Aaron: ...

Ken: Can we have anonymous comments

Mike: When we did GA evaluation, we didn't cover up well.

Jessie: So, keep staff involved, and build into policy that if ever there is a staff issue, have staff leave and anonymous minutes. This is what I wanted to work on.

Brian: I think benefits for employees should be examined. It is really vague, I don't understand what baseline is, nor what health dental should be included. There are no numbers or references.

Nash: Make sure we don't forget mattresses.

Jessie: We can have joint meeting with FaCom

Nash: But separately

Jessie: We can have joint issue

Brian: I want to make sure the GA review gets done. Because of crisis last year, I missed out on a lot of Jan through May, I didn't get any feedback. This information included in the evaluation this year. In time for end of the year bonuses.

Mike: Did you do reviews for the staff? I don't remember that last year.

Brian: I only do it if the Board requests. So last year no, two years ago yes.

Mike: It was just weird with this staff raise issue, not knowing Billy's background.

Brian: we could.

Nash: I am against that, just because of libel issues and whatnot. It can be bad. I saw one a couple years ago, a line like "everyone knows x should be fired". What is that?!

Brian: I give quotes from members to staff members and the Board (on request). My review somewhat mitigated that.

Nash: I just don't like to see that floating around. But many people disagreed.

Chris: It should be available but private, to avoid micro-management.

Jessie: Should not be distributed.

Aaron: Hopefully we can be mature enough to trust people.

Chris: And to clarify, we can access most files.

Jessie: What else can we include?

Aaron: Privacy.

Mike: We don't do background checks. I would like to discuss this. It is standard that you do background checks. For example, your housemates should know who they are living with.

Brian: That is a rule, if a felon, they must tell us.

Mike: But if they don't tell us...

Nash: It is my understanding that, lawsuit-wise, the burden is on the people leasing the property. For example, if someone was raped by someone in the house with a background, and they didn't have a background check, ICC could be liable.

Jessie: Ok, so we can include privacy and background check ideas (after discussion with lawyer).

Brian: That is more of a practice than a policy.

Steve: I'm just wondering. If someone is dealing drugs from an ICC house to anyone not in the house, are we liable?

Brian & Jessie: Not as long as we don't condone it.

Nash: If 3 times within 18 months, there is someone caught growing, manufacturing, dealing, using, that can cause the state to become cautious.

Jessie: Let's save that for another meeting,

We Adjourn.

PRESENT:

Milton Wong – FH
Ken Liao – HoC
Chris Severen – Ro
Mike Jurkash – ComTrus
Brian Donovan – GA
Steve – NG
Aaron – AV
Nash - AV
Thomas – AV
Jessie – FH