

## Chapter 2 - Board of Trustees

### **AP 2410 Process for Revision of Administrative Procedures or Board Policies**

Administrative Procedures (AP) and Board Policies (BP) are often proposed, revised, updated, or edited for a variety of reasons including changes to Title 5 language, recommendations from the Community College League of California, Academic Senate resolutions, or recommendations from units across the campus. It is important to follow a systematic review process for these revisions to ensure accuracy and broad institutional dialogue as the basis for building consensus.

The revision process assumes appropriate review and discussion by designated groups on campus whose work is affected by changes to policies and procedures. These groups may include the Academic Senate, the Classified Unions, and the Faculty Association, along with the appropriate councils and committees whose purpose and function determine their participation given the particular issues under discussion.

The revision process begins with the proposal being transmitted to the President's office for review by the President's Cabinet to determine the impact of statutory or regulatory language, the integration with existing policies and procedures, and the accuracy and clarity of the language of the proposal. Cabinet comments will be attached to the original proposal. The proposal then goes as originally written to the President's Advisory Council (PAC) for a first reading. PAC, as the body that represents all factions impacted by policies and procedures, provides input.

The Academic Mutual Agreement Council (AMAC) determines whether a proposed policy and procedure should be considered an academic and professional matter. The Classified Unions and the Faculty Association will determine if the proposal is negotiable. The collective bargaining unit(s) will have 30 days to notify Human Resources of their intent to negotiate the issue; otherwise, the new or revised procedure or policy will proceed through this review process.

If the issue is neither negotiable nor an "Academic or Professional" matter, the proposal will proceed through institutional review. This review shall involve input from all groups represented on PAC and may include review by the appropriate council or committee. Upon completion of institutional review, the matter will return to PAC for a second reading as an action item. This action will be a recommendation to the President to adopt the BP or AP.

If the issue is deemed an "Academic and Professional" matter, the new or revised AP or BP will go to the appropriate council or committee, and then to the Academic Senate Executive Board and the full Senate. If the Senate approves the new or revised AP or BP, the document returns to the Academic Mutual Agreement Council. Should the Academic Mutual Agreement Council then approve the proposed creation or revision, the BP or AP will go to the College President, who will then share the outcome with PAC as an information item only. If the President proposes any change of language to the policy or procedure, it will be returned to AMAC for reconsideration or additional review.

If the issue has been deemed negotiable, the appropriate collective bargaining units will work with Human Resources to reach an agreement. After an agreement has been reached, the BP or AP will go to the College President, who will share the outcome with PAC as an information item only.

Issues that are both “Academic and Professional” and negotiable will be discussed by the affected groups so as to determine which aspects of the BP or AP are appropriate to which organization.

Upon the President’s approval of an Administrative Procedure, as presented, the changes are considered to have been adopted by the College, and the new or modified AP shall be shared with the Board of Trustees as an information item and posted to the web. However, if the revision is a proposed Board Policy, then it must also be approved by the Board of Trustees before it will be considered adopted by the College and posted to the web.

Approved: April 25, 2011

Revised: April 11, 2012

Reviewed: May 14, 2013

Reviewed: December 16, 2014

Reviewed: June 9, 2015

Reviewed: May 10, 2016