The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Guest:  Cason Smith (for Laura Martinez)

1. **Review of December 7, 2011, Meeting Notes**

   Approved, as presented.

2. **Budget Committee Update**

   None.

3. **ITAC Update**

   None.

4. **Facilities Advisory Committee Update**

   None.

5. **IEC Update**

   None.

6. **Proposed Revisions to Assessment & Matriculation Committee Function Statements**

   This item was approved by the Academic Senate on September 29, 2011, and it will be brought back to PAC at a later date.

7. **Proposed Revisions to BP and AP Approval Process, including AP 2410 - Process for Revision of Administrative Procedures or Board Policies**

   CSEA 262, the Faculty Association, and the Faculty Senate met to discuss AP 2410. The Academic Senate Executive Board is recommending that it not be approved, as presented. Both Eric Kaljumagi and Jennifer Galbraith indicated that this version is different than what they've been working with. How do we consolidate different amendments? Bill Scroggins recommended that PAC be the central body that reviews any changes. The
President’s Office is responsible for the final version. Jennifer Galbraith indicated that the Faculty Association will be voting at the next meeting; but, that a 30-day response time is a problem. After the March meeting, a more appropriate timeline will be presented.

Bill indicated that Cabinet members should look at all BPs and APs with their expertise, and include their commentary, before the governance groups look at them.

It was suggested that each constituency have 30 days to report back to PAC whether the particular BP or AP is negotiable. Also, language should be included that clarifies the unions’ intent. It was noted that, if it’s deemed a negotiable item, it can take a very long time to review.

There was discussion as to whether an item can be an academic, professional, and negotiable matter. Bill indicated that it could be both, or it could be separate. Can it be both a negotiable item and an academic and professional item? Jennifer indicated that one example is the Technology Use Agreement. Bill suggested that they be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. He also said that a number of proposed changes have lingered for quite awhile with no way to resolve them, and there are conflicting opinions on how they should be handled.

PAC is a process monitor and a point of communication to resolve conflicting opinions. In the past, proposals had been working their way through the governance process with no feasible resolve. Liesel indicated that, sometimes, changes need to be made as soon as possible to be compliant. Bill suggested that PAC comments be added to the draft in order to track it, i.e., a clearing house, and it will always come back to PAC as an information item before it’s published. Liesel Reinhart is concerned that the proposed process is adding too much time.

In the future, with all PAC meeting agendas, a listing of outstanding APs and BPs, and their status, will be included.

8. Proposed Revisions to AP 7120 – Recruitment and Hiring – Proposed AP 7121 – Recruitment and Hiring, Classified Employees and AP 7122 – Recruitment and Hiring, Management Employees were pulled from the original AP 7120, which is now Recruitment and Hiring, Faculty (Scroggins - second reading) (attachments) (NOTE: AP 7122 has been revised since first presented to PAC in October.)

AP 7120: AP 7120 is for Faculty only. It was suggested to remove letters of recommendation for Faculty hiring. In October, this item was pulled at the administration’s request, and a new draft is being developed.

AP 7121: E. Screening (fourth bullet), “One optional member recommended by the Office of Human Resources/Manager.” It will be changed to read, “One member recommended by the Office of Human Resources/Manager as non-voting EEO representative.” With that correction, AP 7121 was approved.

AP 7122: Regarding H., Eric asked, if there’s an externally contracted professional expert, how would it be used? Bill indicated that it would be an internal selection; for example: Lisa Sugimoto as the Interim Executive Director of the Foundation. Jennifer asked, what would keep the contracted professional from staying for a very long time? Bill said that California State Law has limits, and this is for management positions only. He suggested that there be
language included that would be sunshine the rationale to keep managers longer than the law permits, which is one year. If it’s an internal candidate, the EEO process is required; but, not for external candidates. Bill will author some language and send it out to PAC members. Regarding D., Cason asked why there aren’t two classified representatives. Bill said that a hiring a manager needs management expertise representation. However, a case can be made for an additional CSEA representative, when appropriate. He asked Cason to provide additional language.

This item will be brought back to a later meeting.

9. **Proposed Revisions to AP 4300 – Field Trips and Excursions** (Scroggins – first reading) (attachment)

Jennifer indicated that the Faculty Association needs to review this. Bill Scroggins suggested that an ad hoc group be put together to review AP 4300 and AP 4350. At the March Faculty Senate meeting, Eric will solicit interested parties to serve on the ad hoc committee. The fifth paragraph was reinstated, which reads, “Students on college authorized field trips will not be penalized for absences incurred in other classes during the field trips.” Bill asked Karen Saldana to write a guidelines document, regarding liability, to be posted with the AP. Liesel suggested that the form be put on the portal for students to fill in. The Student Travel and Medical Release form will be sent to all PAC members. The Senate will be asked to create a task force of faculty who typically are involved with field trips, and classified who typically supervise field trips. That group will work with both AP 4300 and AP 4350 and the forms, and will be brought back to PAC at a later date.

10. **Proposed Revisions to AP 4350 – Student Travel Guidelines** (Scroggins – first reading) (attachment)

Same as No. 9 above.

11. **Proposed Revisions to AP 3500 – Campus Security** (Scroggins - first reading) (attachment)

On July 25, 2011, the Board of Trustees approved establishing the Public Safety Police Department under Education Code 72330, in order to provide professional State-certified accredited training within the Mt. San Antonio College Department of Public Safety. The recommended changes to AP 3500 reflect this Board-approved designation.

Cason Smith asked that this item be pulled and addressed at a later date, after it’s been determined if it’s a negotiable item. Another concern is that Mt. SAC has a police department in the jurisdiction of the L. A. County Sheriff’s Department. Bill indicated that, in order to be armed, the officer must be POST certified and a member of a police force. An example of when it’s needed is when large amounts of monies are being transported. Bill asked Cason to send him an e-mail with his concerns. The Associated Students will also review this AP and provide their input. This item will be brought back to PAC at a later date.

12. **Proposed AP 4051 – Course Equivalencies and Variances** (Scroggins – information only) (attachment)

Information only.

13. **Other**

None.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
14. FUTURE MEETINGS:  
February 1, 2012  
March 14, 2012 (second Wednesday)  
April 4, 2012