IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

IV.A.1. Descriptive Summary. In its July 2012 determination letter, ACCJC recommended “that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college’s governance structure and consequent processes used to inform decision making for the improvement of programs, practices and services. The college must ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3).

The Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System, in accordance with Title 5, Section 53200 in 1993. To support the Shared Governance System, the Chancellor and the Academic Senate, with the approval of the College Advisory Council (CAC), created the Office of Shared Governance in 1994.

Until Fall 2012, the CCSF Shared Governance organization consisted of three systems, each with a set of permanent committees:

- **Collegial Governance System:** The Academic Senate Executive Council was responsible for making recommendations to the Chancellor and Board based on input from the following committees: Academic Policies, Curriculum, Staff Development, and Student Prep/Success.

- **College Advisory Governance System:** Membership was comprised of senior administrators and elected leaders from student, faculty and classified organizations.

- **Budget and Planning Governance System:** The Planning and Budget Council met monthly and more often when needed to review budget and planning issues. Committees reporting to the Budget and Planning Council included: Classified Position Allocation, Faculty Position Allocation, Program Review, Research, and Facilities Review.


All constituent groups of the City College community—students, faculty, classified and administrators—were represented in Shared Governance committees. The committees established sub-committees and task forces, wherever needed and appropriate. Collectively, there were over 80 committees in which over 400 members of the college community participated.

While the previous system was comprehensive and encouraged Collegewide participation, among other merits, the workgroup focusing on ACCJC’s Recommendations 12 and 13 identified a number of shortcomings and barriers inherent in the system that impeded decision-making. The workgroup also discussed the value of using the term “Participatory Governance” versus “Shared Governance” in that it more accurately reflects the advisory nature of college councils and committees. This process involved input from College leaders from all constituencies.
During this same time period, administrators, classified managers, faculty and trustees participated in training sessions to better understand roles and responsibilities within a Shared Governance environment as an advisory participatory governance process. Facilitators included: Dr. Barbara Beno (President, ACCJC) & Trustee William McGinnis (Butte-Glen Community College), Scott Lay (President, Community College League of California), Michele Pilati (President, Academic Senate for Community Colleges), Dr. Narcisa Polonio (Association of Community Colleges Trustees).

The workgroup responsible for Recommendations 12 and 13 reviewed sample policies on Shared Governance from other districts and established a list of the ideal criteria for a Participatory Governance system. Given the review activities taking place, the Fall 2012 CCSF Shared Governance committee meeting schedule was suspended. The review activities resulted in a proposal for a revised Participatory Governance system and draft policies.

On November 15, 2012, the Board of Trustees established two new separate governance systems through Governance Board Policies 2.07 and 2.08:

- **Policy 2.07** established a **Participatory Governance System** that replaces the College Advisory Council and Planning and Budget Council with a new Governance Council which will have 16 appointed members representing all college constituent groups.

  The new Governance Council comprises four appointed members from each stakeholder group and allows for the provision of alternate stand-in members for the student stakeholder group. Membership to the Governance Council is for two year terms; except for students who would serve a one-year term. The Chancellor has the sole responsibility of supporting the Governance Council, and the Council is charged with determining committees and their charge.

- **Policy 2.08** established a **Collegial Governance System** with the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate in comprised of all full time and part time faculty represented by a 29 member elected Executive Council.

  The Academic Senate Executive Council comprises 29 elected faculty members. Membership is for two-year terms. The Council elects officers each Spring for the following year. After a second two year term, faculty must sit out for a year and then may run for election to Council again.

  The Academic Senate Executive Council discussed the Academic Senate committee structure and charge at Executive Council meetings on [dates of meetings/agenda and minutes as evidence] The Academic Senate Executive Council is reviewing proposals for new committees with specific charges directly related to Accreditation Standards such as Educational Policies, Matriculation Advisory, Student Equity Strategies, Works of Art, Learning Communities & Career Pathways, Student Grade and File Committee and others.

**IV.A.1. Self Evaluation.** Since the inception of shared governance, the college had clearly written policies that delineated roles and responsibilities of all constituents in the decision-making.
making process with formal structures for participation by staff, faculty, administrators, and students that facilitated cross-constituent communication. However, the College had difficulty maintaining a central repository of agendas, minutes and other records.

The process was nonetheless mysterious and cumbersome to some, and some groups lost sight of the fact that shared governance was advisory and thought it was their role to make decisions rather than present recommendations to a parent committee or Council.

Although there was typically representation from all stakeholders, and participants worked together and respected one another across all constituent groups, at times some stakeholder groups in attendance were outnumbered on committees. This created an inequitable system where students, the main beneficiaries of much of what is deliberated in participatory governance, were left confused and feeling unsupported. Without a process for equitable representation from all stakeholder groups, a level of distrust sometimes occurred, delaying the completion of committee business.

The fact that students have not been participating in Shared Governance at an optimal level was of particular concern. At one time, students received stipends from Associated Students for their participation, but that was stopped a few years ago. The workgroup believes that this is a major contributor to the lower participation rates and recommended reinstating this practice of providing students with stipends to boost participation. The Associated Students have reinstated the stipends as of Fall 2012 and will discuss further ways to enhance student contributions to Shared Governance.

The College believes it has addressed the overarching concerns relating to governance structures through the development of the new Participatory Governance system. A number of concerns remain.

For example, the College has not clearly defined procedures for how the two separate systems will interact. At the same time, the membership on the Participatory Governance Council is largely the same as it was in the previous Shared Governance system. This may limit the emergence of new perspectives and practices.

Although the regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning and Budgeting Council and the College Advisory Council were officially suspended during Fall 2012. This has raised concerns that the College has been out of compliance with this Standard. However, the Accreditation Steering Committee served as a de facto governance council during this time given the representation of all constituencies on the Committee and until the Participatory Governance Council membership formed.

Given the streamlining of the Participatory Governance system, fewer individuals will have the opportunity to engage directly through participation in committees. Currently the system encompasses the Participatory Governance Council and four subcommittees. As the Participatory Governance system becomes more established, additional committees and workgroups may emerge which will provide more opportunities to serve.

**IV.A.1. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the advisory roles of Participatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Collegial Governance systems. Ensure that recommendations be made through proper channels within these systems. Final authority rests with the Board of Trustees without exception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Get council and committee systems underway as soon as possible to ensure compliance with this standard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to encourage student participation in Participatory and Collegial Governance systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue governance professional development activities for the college as a whole to support academic democracy and a culture of inclusion in the newly established governance systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore options for increasing opportunities for faculty, staff, students administrators to serve on governance councils and committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and clearly describe and publicize protocol for stakeholders to introduce proposals, concerns and new ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and assess governance systems periodically by conducting college-wide surveys. Expand on most recent survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>