AGENDA

1. Minutes Dated January 23, 2012

OLD BUSINESS:

2. BP/AP 3280 Grants (Roxanne)

3. BP 4030 Academic Freedom (Utpal)

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CURRENTLY OUT FOR CONSTITUENT REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Constituent Review Ends:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP 4030</td>
<td>ACADEMIC FREEDOM</td>
<td>02/06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP/AP 3280</td>
<td>GRANTS</td>
<td>02/06/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRACKING ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP/AP 7310</td>
<td>NEPOTISM</td>
<td>PPRS working with CRFO on revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>SECTION 508: ACCESS TO INFO AND DATA</td>
<td>Mark W. to investigate and report to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP 3410</td>
<td>NONDISCRIMINATION</td>
<td>Council requests review of best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>GRANT FUNDED FACULTY CONVERSION PROCESS</td>
<td>Roxanne seeking legal precedent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP 2435</td>
<td>EVALUATION OF PRESIDENT SUPERINTENDENT</td>
<td>Tables pending BOT discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP 3435</td>
<td>DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT INVESTIGATIONS</td>
<td>Council will consider Chancellor’s Office model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP 3430</td>
<td>PROHIBITION OF HARASSMENT</td>
<td>To be redistributed with AP 3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP 3430</td>
<td>PROHIBITION OF HARASSMENT</td>
<td>To be redistributed with AP 3435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBERS PRESENT
Mark Winter, Mike Richards, John Johnston, Kasey Merten (ASCR), Isaac Cameron (ASCR), Mark Renner (phone), Marcia Williams (phone), Utpal Goswami, Lee Lindsey, Keith Snow-Flamer, Roxanne Metz, Ahn Fielding

MEMBERS ABSENT
Jose Ramirez, Ron McQueen, KT Rep

CALL TO ORDER
Utpal Goswami called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.
Utpal reported that he had received notice from Ron McQueen, CSEA College Council representative, that Ron would no longer serve on College Council.
Utpal reported that he would request that CSEA leadership appoint a replacement representative.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Shawn Adelman, CR student and advocate with the CA Youth Advocacy Network, reported that he had recently attended a CA Youth Advocacy Conference where Community College and CSU smoking policy and nicotine dependency programs were discussed. Shawn noted that new legislation would allow ticketing and fines of individuals who violated smoking policies. Shawn suggested that CR adopt a “smoke free” policy and that CR help smokers to quit smoking by implementing nicotine dependency programs.

Utpal Goswami reported that the CR Board of Trustees had expressed interest in learning more about the smoking policies of other CA Community Colleges and CSUs, and that he had compiled data and reported back to the Board the smoking policies of colleges across the state (number of campuses that are “smoke free,” “designated smoking area,” or “x number of feet from a building”).
Utpal noted that he expected the ASCR smoking survey results to be available within the next two months and that the results of the survey would be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

MINUTES
The minutes of 12/05/2011 were approved as presented.

Utpal requested that the agenda be amended to include an item nine and that the subject would be “discussion of Board comments regarding BPs and APs.”

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

AP 5075 CREDIT COURSE ADDS AND DROPS
Support staff noted that at the direction of College Council, Cheryl Tucker had revised AP 5075 to reflect the Chancellor’s Office opinion that instructor’s may, due to poor attendance, drop students after census date.
Academic Senate representatives reported that the revisions to AP 5075 were consistent with their requests.
The Council concluded that since the changes to AP 5075 were substantive, the draft ought to be distributed for an additional 30 day constituent review.
Members of Council commented that dropping students after the census date (and other stipulations of the AP) may cause outcomes that the Council had not yet considered, and that protocol was not in place regarding how ‘excessive absence’ should be defined in syllabi.

The Council discussed the possibility of creating a process allowing instructors to drop excessively absent students via Webadvisor.

Utpal suggested that the procedure might include a minimum definition of excessive absence.

**ACTION**

In order to allow feedback regarding practical implementation of the new procedure, a motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to distribute AP 5075 for a 30 day constituent review period.

**AP 2411 INTERIM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES**

Utpal reported that at their 01-03-12 meeting, the Board of Trustees had discussed the use of the term “policy” in proposed AP 2411 “Interim Policies.”

Utpal noted that AP 2410 “Policy and Administrative Procedures” recognizes that policies may exist outside of Board Policies:

> “The Board shall consider the development and revision of all policies related to board authority and governance. Changes to other policies and administrative procedures may be recommended by the Academic Senate, Sr. Staff, or Associated Students. These policies and administrative procedures involving the operation of the college shall be normally presented to College Council so that all represented groups are allowed to provide input.”

Utpal reported that he was reluctant to remove the term ‘policy’ from the proposed AP since management of the District required administration to adopt operational and administrative policies. Utpal noted that AP 2411 only describes a process of adopting interim operational or administrative policies, not Board Policies.

There being no objection from the Council, Utpal reported that he would relay College Council’s discussion regarding proposed AP 2411 to the Board, and that if necessary he may suggest the addition of language to distinguish the difference between ‘Board Policy’ and operational or administrative policy.

**AP 7217 FACULTY PRIORITIZATION PROCESS**

Support staff noted that at their 01/03/2012 meeting, the Board suggested slight revisions to the College Council approved draft AP 7217. Support staff summarized the Board’s feedback:

1. So that the process description is consistent with the procedure outlined in the timeline, under ‘Process’ item 1: strike out and ‘Department Chairs’ and insert ‘Deans’ so that the first sentence reads “Each academic year, as part of Program Review, Department chairs Deans/Area Coordinators will have the opportunity to fill out a faculty position request form, providing relevant data and a narrative justifying
2. The board discussed whether ‘replacement requests due to tenure track attrition were filled automatically unless there was mutual agreement to the contrary’ as stated in the AP. Utpal confirmed that they were.

3. The Board discussed Process item 14: “Should the president override any of the ranked positions, he or she must present a detailed written explanation of that decision to the Academic Senate and to the Deans’ Council within one week.” Discussion included whether the one week reporting requirement was appropriate and whether the language describing the process for Presidential override of any of the ranked positions was sufficiently explicit. No changes regarding Process item 14 were suggested by the Board.

4. The Board questioned whether the AP should require that one of the four faculty members of the prioritization committee be identified from an outlying site. No change was suggested by the Board.

5. So that the process described in the ‘Process’ section of the AP is consistent with the process described in the ‘Timeline’ section, the November action in the ‘Timeline’ section was amended to include Deans’ Council, so that the sentence reads “Faculty Prioritization Committee evaluates and ranks the requests. Ranked list is forwarded to the President/Superintendent, the Budget Planning Committee, the Deans’ Council, and to the Academic Senate.”

6. In order to clarify the quantity of points available in the prioritization process outlined in Exhibit AP 7217.A “Rubric for Prioritizing Full-Time Faculty Positions,” the Board suggested that the horizontal partitions in the right hand column between the “Faculty Replacement Position,” the “Growth Position,” and the “New Program/Discipline Position,” be eliminated so that it is clear that only five points total are available for award under these three sections.

The Council discussed the description in the AP regarding who could submit faculty position requests form, and whether the language would allow administrators who were not Deans or Area Coordinators, but were responsible for instructional areas and completing program reviews (Director of the Learning Resource Center and Director of PE and Athletics) to submit faculty position request forms. After discussion, the Council concluded that the existing language was sufficient and would allow appropriate instructional administrators to submit faculty position requests through program review.

No members of College Council voiced objection to the changes suggested by the Board of Trustees.

Keith Snow-Flamer reported that the constituent review period regarding AP 5500 concluded 01-23-2012. Keith noted that the ‘Informal Student Hearing’ process outlined in the existing Student Conduct Code would no longer be officially titled as such, but would still exist in practice as described in the “Disposition of the Case by CSSO” section on page six of the proposed AP.
The Council discussed the substantial length of the revised Student Conduct Code and debated whether a summary or abstract of the process would be helpful to users. Keith noted that he would consider creating a process abstract.

**ACTION**  
A motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to approve AP 5500 with the following revisions:

1. Page 15, paragraph two of item 10: to the end of the paragraph add the sentence “This does not apply to knives kept in College kitchen facilities.”
2. Page six, item D, a), strike “University” and insert “College” so the item reads “…the College’s final determination with respect to the alleged…”

**AP3435 DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT INVESTIGATIONS**  
Ahn Fielding reported that the initial draft AP 3435 was submitted to College Council in August and subsequently distributed for constituent review. Ahn reported that during the constituent review period, an alternative harassment investigations model, authored by the Chancellor’s office and updated for CR, was offered for consideration. Ahn recommended that the existing draft AP 3435 be rescinded and that the Council consider forwarding the Chancellor’s Office model. Ahn noted that when approved, AP 3435 will replace exiting AR 809.03.

A motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously to table the existing draft AP 3435. Ahn reported that she would present to College Council the Chancellor’s Office model at the next Council meeting.

**BP/AP 3430 PROHIBITION OF HARASSMENT**  
Ahn noted that the review schedule for BP and AP 3430 coincided with that of AP 3435, and although related the two topics could be approved separately.

Utpal suggested that BP and AP 3430 be re-reviewed by Council when the updated AP 3435 is considered.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**BP/AP 5300 STUDENT EQUITY**  
Mark Winter, Academic Senate representative, suggested that since BP and AP 5300 were drafted by a Senate subcommittee, and since the Senate had not completed its review of BP/AP 5300, that distribution by Council for constituent review may be premature.

Utpal suggested that the AP be revised so that the President/Superintendent is not part of the Student Equity Plan Committee, and that at least two students should be added to the Committee.

The Council tabled BP and AP 5300 pending final review by Academic Senate.

**2012-13 BUDGET**  
Utpal reported that the Governor’s proposed 2012-13 budget included substantial potential cuts to CA Community Colleges, including a potential cut to CR of $1.9 million (pending passage/fail of tax measure).

Lee noted that the Governor’s May revise may include additional cuts.
Utpal Goswami adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.
GRANTS

The Board will be informed about all grant applications made and grants received by the District. The President/Superintendent shall establish procedures to assure timely application and processing of grant applications and funds, and that the grants that are applied for directly support the purposes of the District.

See Administration Procedure 3280.

Reference: Education Code Section 70902

Adopted: xx/xx/xxxx
New Board Policy
GRANTS

Purpose:
The pursuit of private and public grants is encouraged to secure funding for efforts that advance the mission of the college.

Grant activity will be prioritized to ensure the scope and scale of funding is commensurate with institutional efforts required to accomplish grant activities.

Roles and Responsibilities:
Grant writers are required to consult with stakeholders and other impacted areas. Permission to submit a grant application is granted by the President’s Cabinet. On the rare occasion that sufficient time for responding to a grant application does not afford Cabinet review, the Superintendent/President or designee may approve submission of a grant proposal. Permission is required for all grant proposals, including renewals of current grants, regardless of whether the college is the lead agency or a sub-recipient.

Process:
Ideas for grants can be generated by any staff or faculty member. Any member of the district who intends to submit a grant application on behalf of the district must complete a grant proposal form provided by the Grants Director or administrative designee for grants. This process applies for submission of letters of support and/or partnership.

After review by the area vice president and the Grants Director or administrator responsible for grants, grant proposal forms will be submitted to the President’s Cabinet for review and approval. Preliminary and final grant budgets will be reviewed and approved by the Chief Business Office or designee and the Grants Director or designee.

In the event that a grant proposal is not reviewed by Cabinet prior to submission, it will be subsequently submitted to Cabinet as an informational item.

Grant proposals must be available for review and signature by the appropriate individuals prior to submission to the granting agency. The Grants Director or other administrative designee must review all proposal documents prior to submission, including the budget, narrative, and letter of support from the college. The Grants Director and the Chief Business Officer will notify the Board of Trustees of all grant applications made and grants received by the District.

Unless otherwise directed, grant writers and project directors shall ensure the Grants Director and any other administrative designee receive copies of all grant proposals, budgets, and letters of support, award letters, contracts, and grant reports. Final contracts and budgets will be maintained in the business office.

Reference: Education Code Section 70902
GRANT PROPOSAL FORM

Background/Overview: All grant applications (including minor donation requests as well as partnership letters for other agencies) will follow the same general process as outlined.

Preparation of Grant Proposals: The decision to apply for a grant is made by the area Vice President after consultation with Cabinet. Approval to submit a completed grant application is given by the President/Superintendent.

Funding Agency: RFA/NOFA/RFP number or other reference to official notification (may be a web link):

Will CR be the lead agency or a subrecipient/contractor?

What partners are required?

Are other partners anticipated?

How does this grant proposal link to planning (departmental, functional, strategic, ed master plan, etc.)?

Proposed approach/project (not extensive, a few sentences may suffice):

What Outcomes/Objectives are anticipated?:

Grant Writer/Responsible Parties for Grant Submission:

What assistance is required (e.g. IR support, Grants.gov submission)?

Who is “authorized” to sign the grant proposal? Is a cover letter from the President required?

Project Manager/Director and Proposed Project Team:

What staff will be required to accomplish this grant? (Be specific about full- and part-time faculty and staff, whether they will be new hires or existing employees, etc. Note: Full-time hiring requests must comply with the policy on grant-funded faculty positions):
Stakeholders/Impacted Areas (Be Specific – include names and initials): ___________________

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Who has been consulted/notified? _________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What are the sustainability requirements (or expectations)? _____________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Match requirements (specific dollar amount)? ________________________________________
Where will the match come from? _________________________________________________
What grant guidelines must be followed (e.g. EDGAR, DoL/ETA, CFR number, OMB number):
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What other requirements need to be considered? _____________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What is the proposed indirect cost rate? (NOTE: CR’s indirect cost rate is 20% -- a lower
indirect cost rate must be approved by the Grants Director: _____________________________
What is the anticipated total requested budget? ______________________________________
Submission Deadline: _________________ Anticipated Award Date: _________________
Grant Period Start Date: ________________ Grant Period End Date: ________________

Approval to develop grant proposal (upon review by Cabinet) (includes any authorization to
expend resources prior to grant submission):
Grants Director: ________________________________ Date: ________________
Vice President: ________________________________ Date: ________________

Grants Checklist:
☐ Partner Letters  ☐ Consult with appropriate parties  ☐ Final Budget and Proposal to Grants Director
(including match documentation)

Final Approval to Submit Grant Proposal:
Chief Business Officer: ________________________________ Date: ________________
President: ________________________________ Date: ________________

Exhibit Approved: xx/xx/xxxx
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate of the Redwoods Community College District, in an effort to promote and protect the academic freedom of faculty and students, endorse the following policy.

It is the responsibility of the Redwoods Community College District to provide an institutional environment that encourages academic freedom and instills respect and commitment to the obligations required to maintain these freedoms.

Academic freedom represents the continual search for truth, and it includes protection for the teacher to teach and for the student to learn without coercion, censorship, or other forms of restrictive interference. Academic freedom recognizes that freedom to teach and freedom to learn imply both rights and responsibilities within the framework of the law. Free discussion and free access to information, therefore, are the heart of the continuing search for truth.

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in and outside of the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression. When faculty members speak or write as citizens, thereby exercising their constitutional right of free speech, it should be as persons who are free from institutional censorship or discipline. With academic freedom comes academic responsibility which implies the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution.

References: Title 5, Section 51023; Accreditation Standard II.A.7; ASCCC Resolution Approved Fall 2010; 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, including the 1958 and 1970 interpretative comments of the American Association of University Professors.

Adopted by Board of Trustees: 12/5/06
Amended: xx/xx/xxxx
Former Policy #326, “Academic Freedom,” Adopted by the Board of Trustees: 8/15/77
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate of the Redwoods Community College District, in an effort to promote and protect the academic freedom of faculty and students endorse the following policy adapted from the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (including the 1958 and 1970 interpretative comments of the American Association of University Professors).

A. Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing issues germane to their academic discipline. Academic freedom inherently involves the right to introduce within the assigned teaching discipline controversial topics, concepts, issues, and systems as long as the method or manner of presentation involves objective reasoning and rational discussion.

B. Faculty members are citizens, members of a profession, and employees of an education institution. When faculty members speak or write as citizens, thereby exercising their constitutional right of free speech, it should be as persons who are free from institutional censorship or discipline. In the process of making such utterances, faculty members have a responsibility to make a clear distinction between personal viewpoints and the college's official policies.

C. Faculty members are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the administration of the college.

D. The protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply to full-time probationary, tenured, and part-time faculty.

Reference: Title 5 Section 51023; Accreditation Standard II.A.7

Adopted by Board of Trustees: 12/5/06
Former Policy #326, “Academic Freedom,” Adopted by the Board of Trustees: 8/15/77
Former BP 326 renumbered BP-4030