CEER Notes
April 24, 2015

Members Present: Bob Bradshaw, Jennifer Harper, Mark Lieu, Shairon Zingsheim

Guests: Laura Schulkind, Rob Smedfjeld, Ron Travenick

1. Minutes of April 17, 2015 were approved as corrected.
2. Laura Schulkind presented her suggested revisions to the Student Conduct Policy, including this overview:
   - Campuses are open and therefore have all types of students/issues (i.e. PTSD, disabilities, etc.) and helping deal with these issues is a statewide concern.
   - Laura recommends we create a Behavior Intervention Team (BIT) similar to Chaffey College to help deal with immediate safety threats on campus.
   - It is a core responsibility for administration to manage such issues, not the manager of the area. This ensures that policy is followed with fairness and consistency.
   - Ensuring the safety of the work environment is separate from the discipline and remediation process. As a result, her suggested comments to the policy were guided by this principle.
   - The language is something she negotiated for another district. Hence, some of the language (e.g. stalking) is appropriate for inclusion in the faculty contract.
   - Smedfjeld stated that he appreciated the approach of separating discipline, remediation, and safety as being a good approach.

3. Getting to the details of the document:
   - Short-term suspension: Level of due-process is lower allowing it to be done quickly by the administration without Board approval. Hence, length of the suspension is shorter.
   - Interim suspension: Suspension while the matter is being investigated (like paid leave). Due to the effect on student learning, it requires an expedited process. Used in a situation where, if the accusation is true, it would have strong repercussions.
   - Long-term suspension: Due process is longer, requiring more steps, hence the need for a longer term suspension. Suspension occurs after the student has had the due process.
   - 14-day removal is not discipline. It is a completely different tool that comes from ed-code. There is a need to develop language on when this would be used versus the Interim suspension.
   - The use of “days” needs to be cleaned up. The law does not care about the definition but we need to be careful about consistency.
   - The question of missing class due to a suspension raised several questions on the responsibility of the faculty to provide make-ups, (Laura said zero), and the catalog drop policy. Laura stated explicitly that if a student is suspended, the faculty for all the student’s other classes must be notified of the suspension (there is no privacy concern).
   - Laura stated the faculty need to know if there is a student in the class who is a minor. This is not what we currently do.
   - There needs to be a clean-up of the VP titles in the document.
   - This procedure does not interfere with the rights a faculty member has if the faculty member also files a complaint using the college complaint process. These are separate processes even though they may be about the same issue.
   - "Tape recording" should be written as "audio recording".
   - Expulsion is permanent unless rescinded by the Board. So the mention of the number of semesters should be deleted.
   - Mark volunteered to re-work the document to clear up the language.

4. Larger issues to discuss as we move forward:
   - Are students held harmless when they return from a suspension if deemed “not guilty”?
   - What if a student’s absence conflicts with the instructor’s attendance policy on the syllabus?
   - Do we want/need a BIT
Next Meeting: Friday, May 8, 1030am