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This report has been compiled to document Academic Senate activities initiated in response to the ACCJC recommendations received in July 2013. It is also intended to serve as a basis for setting goals for continuing work. It is not an exhaustive compendium of all of the actions taken by the Academic Senate in support of ACCJC accreditation standards.

In July, ACCJC provided CCSF with two recommendations concerning governance structures including the Academic Senate:

Recommendation 12: Leadership, Governance and Decision Making. To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends that the district engage the services of an external organization to provide a series of workshops for the governing board, chancellor, faculty, staff, students and administrators to clarify and understand their defined roles of responsibility and delineated authority in institutional governance and decision making (IV.A, IV.B).

Recommendation 13: Governance Structures. To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends 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 and ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3). 

In addition, the Evaluation Report prepared by the ACCJC visiting team included the following:

The college noted difficulty in maintaining a central repository of agendas, minutes and other records of the activities of the shared governance committees and made a commitment to improve the system (IV.A.2). (p. 59)

The college has 43 committees with defined roles and responsibilities. It was noted that student participation was of concern and that recording of meeting outcomes needs improvement (IV.A.2.a). (p. 60)

Effective communication includes feedback that closes the loop and ensures that decision making results in continuous improvement. The college has structures in place locally to support college decision making; however, the effectiveness of these structures could not be verified and is questionable. There is an undercurrent of distrust among the governance constituents that manifest as indirect resistance, primarily by the faculty, but also among and within each constituent group. The delineation of roles and understanding of authority for input and decision making, greater awareness of the institutional processes and the use of evaluation and assessment tools are needed to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the planning and decision-making processes (IV.A.2, IV.A.3, and IV.A.5). (p. 62)
Participation in accreditation and leadership training by external organizations

Members of the Academic Senate attended training sessions provided by ACCJC regarding accreditation training; sessions provided to the Board of Trustees by the Association of Community Colleges Trustees, facilitated by Dr. Narcisa Polonio; and sessions provided jointly by the Community College League of California and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott Lay, and ASCCC President, Michelle Pilati). Presidents Pilati and Lay also met with each constituent group separately, and addressed concerns and questions raised by members of the faculty, and followed up the visit with a Participatory Governance Technical Assistance Report. Of the workshops conducted by external organizations in response to Recommendation 12, most directly germane for the Academic Senate was the training and follow-up report provided jointly by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and the Community College League of California.

Officers of the CCSF Academic Senate and most members of the Executive Council have completed the Online Accreditation Basic Training Course, and encouraged all faculty to take this online course.

The Academic Senate President has attended additional conferences and meetings concerning accreditation issues and provided reports:

ACCJC Regional Workshop. Santa Rosa. Sept. 21, 2012


Accreditation Institute. San Jose. February 8-9, 2013.

Two members of the Executive Council and three additional members of the Academic Senate attended a regional leadership meeting:

ASCCC Leadership Regional Meeting. Solano Community College. March 1, 2013

Continuing work in this area:

The Academic Senate will seek a follow-up visit from the ASCCC/CCLC technical assistance team as recommended in their report.

The Academic Senate President and members will continue to attend and report back on relevant conferences and workshops to the extent that these activities are funded.

The Academic Senate will encourage all faculty members who have not yet completed the Online Accreditation Basic Training Course to do so.

Improvements to governance structures

Interim Chancellor Fisher included Academic Senate President Karen Saginor and Executive Council member Francine Podenski among the faculty that she appointed to the workgroup for Recommendations 12-13. Drawing on their training, their own observations, the results of a 2011-2012 Shared Governance evaluation, the July recommendations of the ACCJC Commission, the Evaluation report of the March Visiting team lead by Dr. Sandra Serrano, and the Participatory Governance Technical Assistance Report prepared by Pilati and Lay, Workgroup 12-13 evaluated strengths and weakness of the shared governance systems before making recommendations to develop new policies and procedure in accordance with accreditation standards and the laws and regulations of California.
Officers of the Academic Senate and members of the Executive Council drew on the same sources and met with additional faculty members to discuss improvements to policy and procedures specific to the committees of the Academic Senate. Two major outcomes of these discussions were recommendations for policy development and goals for restructuring Academic Senate committees. (See below)

**Continuing work in this area:**

*The Academic Senate will work with the administration and other constituent groups on the continuing development of inclusive participatory governance structures.*

*The Academic Senate will work with the administration and other constituent groups on the evaluation and assessment of participatory governance, including Academic Senate committees and Executive Council.*

**The development of recommendations for policies, procedures**

In Fall, 2012, the Academic Senate Executive Council reviewed and made recommendations on three Board Policies pertaining to academic and professional matters:

- **Board Policy 2.07 concerning Participatory Governance.** Representatives of the Academic Senate collaborated in initial recommendations in Workgroup 12-13. The Academic Senate Executive Council reviewed the draft and recommended some revisions on October 3, 2012. Board Policy 2.07 was adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 25, 2013.

- **Board Policy 2.08 City College of San Francisco Collegial Governance.** An initial draft of this policy was developed by representatives of the Academic Senate working with the Administration, based closely on Title 5, Section 53200. It was recommended by the Academic Senate on October 24, 2012, revised by the Administration, and adopted by the Board of Trustees on November 15, 2012.

- **Board Policy 8.01 Budget Preparation and Fiscal Accountability.** In accordance with the Title 5 responsibility of the Academic Senate to provide recommendations on matters pertaining to institutional planning and budget development, the Academic Senate Executive Council provided suggestions for clarifying the language of the policy and a recommendation to better align the policy with accreditation standards. Board members expressed agreement with the suggestions and recommendation and the Board of Trustees amended the draft before adopting the policy on January 24, 2013.

The Academic Senate Executive Council has developed a recommendation for a new policy and procedure for program revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance. Initial work had been done in Spring, 2012 by the Program Review Committee and Academic Senate Executive Council. The initial drafts were reframed and rewritten to separate procedure from policy, to incorporate new understandings from a Fall 2012 ASCCCC paper (*Program Discontinuance, a Faculty Perspective Revisited*), and to provide an expedited option for each step of the process should a review process become urgent. The Academic Senate Executive Council recommended the policy and procedures on December 12, 2012. The recommendation was shared with the Participatory Governance Committee on February 21, 2013, and it was presented as an informational item to the Board of Trustees on February 28, 2013. When this process is completed, it will correct a deficiency in meeting Standard II.A.6.b.

The Academic Senate also has responsibilities for making recommendations concerning administrative job descriptions. Prior to the July Show Cause sanction, City College Chancellors sought a recommendation from the Academic Senate concerning new or restructured administrative positions before the development of job announcements in accordance with established written procedures. The Senate was also asked to review and make recommendations about administrative job descriptions. Now
practices have changed. A recommendation is no longer sought from the Academic Senate for new or restructured positions, but the Academic Senate is still provided with some opportunity to review administrative job announcements before they are posted.

- For the reorganization of Research and Planning, the Academic Senate recommended the reorganization unsolicited.

- For two administrative positions in Research and Planning in August, 2012, and for two Vice Chancellor positions in December, 2012, the Academic Senate Executive Council discussed the job description and suggested revisions, some of which were adopted by the administration.

- In January 2013, Human Resources provided drafts in pdf format for job announcements for dean positions with a request for the Academic Senate to complete review in three and a half working days and before the next meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Council. Although the Brown Act precludes consultation with a majority of the Council members between meetings, the Academic Senate President was able to solicit input from faculty of diverse perspective in order to provide a provisional recommendation within the requested time frame, and confirm the recommendation at the following Executive Council meeting. For the Center Dean, the Executive Council recommended changes to the job announcement. For the School Dean job announcement, the Academic Senate recommended against the process going forward with the job description provided because it appeared to set unrealistic expectations for the quantity and quality of work to be accomplished. The School Dean job descriptions were significantly modified before they were posted.

- In February, 2013, the Academic Senate President was given access to three Associate Vice Chancellor job descriptions through the HR software and asked to review them in less than three working days (less than one working day for one of the three job descriptions). This was not feasible. Some suggestions were provided from the Executive Council after the deadline, and all suggestions were rejected.

In February, the Academic Senate was provided with a draft proposal for new Administrative Hiring Procedures to replace procedures that had been put in place through mutual agreement in 1992. The Academic Senate’s review, completed at the February 20, 2013 meeting of the Executive Council, identified many passages that seemed to diminish the rigor and possibly the fairness of the process. At the Participatory Governance Council meeting on February 21, 2013, the Academic Senate was able to ask briefly about only two of the issues and provide a written document. On February 28, 2013, the draft Administrative Hiring Procedures was shared with the Board of Trustees as an informational item. Although one of the Trustees asked specifically about how the process was being changed and about the response of the constituent groups, the administration’s presentation did not reflect that there are many changes and that the Academic Senate has multiple significant concerns.

In general, communication between the Academic Senate and the Administration about policies and procedures has become strained. Interim Chancellor Scott Skillman met with the Academic Senate officers on November 6, 2012, but not again until January 21, 2013 because the Chancellor’s office needed to cancel two intervening appointments. From the meetings so far this semester, it appears that informal methods for reaching understanding about matters of mutual concern employed prior to receiving the Show Cause sanction will not be sufficient. The Academic Senate is investigating best practices at other community colleges for formal methods that may be employed here for successful communication and for building trust.

**Continuing work in this area:**

The Academic Senate will work with the administration on the development of procedures to ensure effective collegial consultation with respect to the academic and professional matters
Restructuring of Academic Senate committees.

A workgroup led by the Academic Senate First Vice President including some members of the Executive Council and other Academic Senate members reviewed the Evaluation Report prepared by the ACCJC visiting team, the Participatory Governance Technical Assistance Report, and analysis provided by Workgroup 12-13. This Academic Senate workgroup identified the following deficiencies in committees/subcommittees reporting to the Academic Senate:

- Lack of clarity about the goals and scope of some committees/subcommittees
- Too many layers for ideas for improvement to arise – subcommittee then committee then Executive Council.
- Some committees/subcommittees that were no longer needed or no longer meeting still existed on paper.
- Too many committees/subcommittees.
- Meeting schedules, agendas, minutes and other records of activities not posted reliably.
- Insufficient student participation.
- Confusion among participants of how to conduct committee/subcommittee business effectively.

The Academic Senate workgroup examined committee structures at other California Community Colleges and proposed re-examining the purpose and goals of each group and restructuring continuing groups as committees grouped by type and reporting directly to the Executive Council. The Executive Council adopted a representational schema for the new structure and seven goals for the restructuring on October 24, 2012.

At the same time, a plan for meeting the goals was approved by the Executive Council, along with Elements of Committee Description and Purpose Statement. Among the key elements required for each committee is a statement of how the committee supports student learning, a list of ACCJC accreditation standards to which the committee contributes, and the relevant Title 5 § 53200 academic and professional responsibilities. Each committee is also required to specify a regular meeting day and time to reduce scheduling conflict issues for students and faculty.

The following month, on November 28, the Executive Council approved Guidelines for Academic Senate Committees to provide guidance concerning committee actions, membership, the responsibilities of the committee members and chairs, how to record actions through minutes or notes, and similar matters. The guidelines for committee outcomes specify that:

- Committees may not set policies for students or for the college. Committees propose policy. The Academic Senate recommends policy. Policy decisions are made by the Board of Trustees.
- Committees may not direct the administration or other college bodies to take particular actions. Committees make decisions for the actions only of the committee itself, or the actions of its members in regards to the purpose and goals of the committee. Committees may recommend actions to others through appropriate channels.

For those Academic Senate committees and subcommittees that continued into the new structure, the Academic Senate First Vice President and the President supported the chairs and members of committees and former subcommittees in the preparation of new Description and Purpose Statements. The drafts were posted online for review and then approved by the Academic Senate Executive Council on February 6, 2013.

The Academic Senate First Vice President and President provided a FLEX workshop on participating in governance for committee chairs and members on January 11, 2013. A skit was used to engage the attendees in identifying effective and ineffective practices.
Obstacles have been encountered in efforts to maintain committee membership and provide up-to-date information about Academic Senate committee activities to the college community. The Shared Governance Office that coordinated assignment of students, classified staff and administrators to Academic Senate committees, maintained a unified calendar of meetings, and posted minutes online was eliminated in August, 2012. The Chancellor’s Office now maintains online information for the Participatory Governance Council and its committees, but not for Academic Senate Committees. The Academic Senate officers have received mixed information about whether or how the Chancellor’s office will support Academic Senate committees. The Academic Senate’s full time office secretary who maintained the Academic Senate’s website and committee membership database was laid off in January 2013 without sufficient notice to allow for continuity, and replaced in February with a part-time clerk typist who is not trained in database or web page maintenance. Lack of continuity in centralized information about the students, classified staff, and administrators who serve on Academic Senate committees has made it difficult for the Academic Senate Office to notify those constituent groups of vacancies, and student members have not been appointed. The First Vice President of the Academic Senate, with assistance from other faculty, is constructing online pages for Academic Senate committee information.

Continuing work in this area:

Academic Senate officers will continue to work with its committees on the implementation of committee goals and guidelines.

The Academic Senate officers will seek understanding with the Chancellor’s office about appropriate support for Academic Senate committee information so that committee memberships, meeting schedules, agendas, minutes, and other records may be readily available online.

Academic Senate committees will conduct self-assessments, and the Executive Council will assess the overall effectiveness of the restructuring.

The role of the Academic Senate officers and faculty communication.

It is clearly stated in both the Accreditation standards and in California Title 5 regulation that the Academic Senate is an advisory body. Its officers represent the faculty voice. Robust two-way communication is essential for officers to inform faculty about issues and hear faculty perspectives.

The Academic Senate Executive Council meets about twice per month during the academic year. Meetings are noticed at least three days in advance in accordance with the Brown Act. Links to the agenda are sent to every faculty member by email, as well as posted online. Anyone may attend and speak on the issues under consideration or – during public comment – on any issue. The Academic Senate holds two plenary meetings a year which all faculty are encouraged to attend.

Academic Senate web pages are maintained by the officers. Prior to layoffs in January 2013, the Academic Senate had classified support for its web pages. Agendas, minutes, sound recordings of meetings, documents under review, reports, and other information related to college wide governance issues are posted online. In addition, the President of the Academic Senate sends email about once a week to all full-time and part-time faculty to communicate information about upcoming governance meetings and to provide information about issues of particular relevance to faculty. The First Vice President of the Academic Senate emails faculty to solicit volunteers needed for governance councils or committees. Faculty are also kept informed along with other constituency groups by emails from the Chancellor’s office and the SLO coordinator and through City Currents – an in-house online publication.

Voting by the elected members of the Academic Senate Executive Council is the decisive method for determining Academic Senate recommendations. However, email correspondence, meetings, and
informal conversations with diverse faculty are indispensable for providing Senate officers with textured understanding of diverse and sometimes divergent perspectives of faculty who interact with students in many different ways.

Because of the size of the faculty body – about 1500 full- and part-time faculty – City College gives only a limited number of persons the ability to send email to all faculty. In 2010-11, in response to the dissatisfaction of many faculty with the experience of receiving email without the ability to reply to all recipients, the Academic Senate requested Information Technology Services to create EFF: the Electronic Faculty Forum, an email list that allows any subscribed faculty member to write to all subscribed faculty. The EFF list has about 1,000 subscribers. EFF has always served its purpose imperfectly, in large part because of logistical and software limitations. It has no archive, no digest option, no threading of related messages and is cumbersome to unsubscribe from or resubscribe to. In January, 2013, all faculty, including both EFF subscribers and EFF non-subscribers, were surveyed concerning the usefulness of the EFF list and improvements that might be made to it. The Secretary of the Academic Senate facilitated a workgroup to prepare an evaluation of EFF based on the survey results, with recommendations for its improvement.

**Continuing work in this area:**

*The Academic Senate Executive Council will review the evaluation of EFF and investigate improvements to the EFF list in its current format and possibilities for changes to EFF after the ongoing transition to the Outlook email system is complete.*

**Support of progress in achieving proficiency in student learning outcomes.**

While responding particularly to ACCJC recommendations 12-13, the Academic Senate has supported work for correcting all deficiencies. Supporting student learning outcomes work is of particular concern to the Academic Senate. In early August, 2012, the Academic Senate Officers in concert with the leadership of the faculty bargaining units, requested the conversion of an instructional day, September 12, to a FLEX day devoted to Student Learning Outcomes. The administration concurred in the change and made arrangements for Dr. Robert Pacheco to provide keynote addresses for the day. The Academic Senate Officers collaborated with administration, with members of Accreditation workgroups #4 and #5, and with classified staff in organizing the activities, ensuring that participants received materials (including the new SLO handbook), and even assisted in the coordination some of the logistical needs, such as room assignments. Donated lunches were sponsored by the Faculty Association. The day started with a thousand faculty members in attendance at the keynote meeting in the gymnasium and ended with more than 80 evening part-time instructors attending break-out sessions.

On October 3, 2012, the Academic Senate Executive Council requested that the administration increase institutional support for Student Learning Outcomes by providing staffing, technology, and professional development. An SLO coordinator was appointed in December, 2012 and an additional faculty member provided with reassigned time to support SLO work.

In October 2012, the Academic Senate Executive Council, meeting with administrators as the Bipartite Committee, reviewed General Education Outcomes (GEOs) and the mapping of GEOs to draft Institutional Learning Outcomes. The committee made recommendations and plans for GEO assessments.

The Academic Senate initiated the development of Institutional Learning Outcomes. Models from other community colleges were considered and discussed through email, at the Fall Plenary session, and in Executive Council meetings. With refinements provided by the newly appointed SLO coordinator, Institutional Learning Outcomes were recommended by the Academic Senate Executive Council on
February 6, 2013. These ILOs were presented to the Board of Trustees as an informational item on February 28, 2013.

**Continuing work in this area:**

*The Academic Senate Executive Council will review Student Learning Outcomes reports and plan actions for increasing support for SLO assessment work, especially in the nurturing of widespread institutional dialogue.*

**Academic Senate engagement in the accreditation processes.**

The Academic Senate President submitted nominations of faculty members to the Accreditation Response work groups. The faculty chosen by the Chancellor to serve on the teams included 9 members of the Executive Council.

The officers and Executive Council of the Academic Senate encourage and support faculty engagement in the accreditation process. Through email and at meetings, the officers of the Academic Senate have exhorted all faculty to become familiar with ACCJC publications especially the standards themselves. The Academic Senate President alerts faculty about meetings on campus concerning accreditation, and reports to the faculty about meetings off campus that she attends. She corresponds frequently with faculty about progress on the development and preparation of accreditation materials and she acts as a conduit for faculty input as feasible and appropriate.

The Academic Senate officers have organized and facilitated meetings concerning accreditation matters, including:

- November 21, 2012. Special meeting of the Academic Senate (all faculty invited)
- January 24-30, 2012. A series of five accreditation forums to engage faculty with reviewing and understanding the first draft of the Show Cause Report.

For the Show Cause Report, the Academic Senate President signs a statement that the report “accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.” Because the inaccuracy of the 2012 Self Evaluation had severe consequences for the College, the officers and Executive Council of the Academic Senate have been attentive in review of the Show Cause Report and somewhat persistent in seeking corrections or additions needed for accuracy in all areas of the Report, not just those that pertain to matters under the purview of the Academic Senate.

In addition to the January 2013 accreditation forums, the officers of the Academic Senate sought and received faculty feedback on the drafts of Show Cause Report drafts through email, documents, in person conversations and hand-written comments. On the request of the Academic Senate President, Executive Council member Carol Reitan created an online form that stored entries in a spreadsheet so that could be sorted by the standard section to which the comments pertained. With the help of several volunteers, the Academic Senate President received and collated additions, corrections and comments to the draft Show Cause report from well over 200 members of the faculty. The President transmitted these to the Chancellors accreditation team and followed up through several iterations concerning suggestions for revisions to the draft that were not incorporated and were deemed significant for providing ACCJC with accurate information. In some cases where consensus was lacking about information in descriptive summaries or self evaluations, the Show Cause Report includes statements identifying passages as supplied by the Academic Senate. The initial Academic Senate revision requests were posted online. The Academic Senate Executive Council was kept informed and provided guidance during the process.
**Continuing work in this area:**

When the March 15 reports are completed, the officers and Executive Council will continue to encourage faculty to engage in working on action items.

**Evaluation of the effectiveness of governance structures**

The Show Cause Report includes plans for evaluating the effectiveness of BP 2.07 and BP 2.08 in promoting appropriate input by students, classified staff, administrators, and faculty. The officers and Executive Council of the Academic Senate will collaborate with other constituency leadership groups in conducting those evaluations.

In addition to formal assessment, the officers and Executive Council of the Academic Senate employ informal methods on an ongoing basis to identify needed improvements. For instance, email discussions on the EFF list have suggested areas of concern or ideas for improvement, and these are addressed when feasible. In response to criticism on EFF of the 25 word limit on the statements of candidates seeking election to the Executive Council, the statement pages have been redesigned to allow candidates to submit statements of up to 200 words.

Additional formal assessment activities will be undertaken to improve the effectiveness of the Academic Senate.

**Continuing work in this area:**

The Academic Senate will work with the administration and other constituent groups on the evaluation and assessment of participatory governance, including Academic Senate committees and Executive Council.

In Spring 2013, the Executive Council of the Academic Senate will commence self assessment activities by identifying goals and assessment methods, continuing the self assessment work in Fall 2013.

In Fall 2013, the Academic Senate committees will conduct self-assessments.

In Spring 2014, the Executive Council will analyze the assessments provided by the Academic Senate committees to assess the overall effectiveness of the committee restructuring.
Evidence and Sources

Participation in accreditation and leadership training by external organizations


Informal Notes from *the Transformation of Education: Evolution not Revolution.* Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall Plenary Conference Irvine, California, November 7-9, 2012. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/FallPlenaryNotesASCCC.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/FallPlenaryNotesASCCC.pdf)


Improvements to governance structures


Office of Shared Governance Committees and Subcommittee Index. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/council.html](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Shared_Governance/council.html)

Accreditation Work Group Progress From 9/12/12 Workgroup #12/13 [http://www.ccsf.edu/ACC/Groups_12_13/2_Progress%20Form%209%2712%2712.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/ACC/Groups_12_13/2_Progress%20Form%209%2712%2712.pdf)

The development of recommendations for policies, procedures


City College of San Francisco District Policy on Participatory Governance. BP 2.07. October 25, 2013. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/2/bp2_07.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/2/bp2_07.pdf)


City College of San Francisco Collegial Governance – Academic Senate. BP 2.08. November 15, 2012. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/2/bp2_08.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/2/bp2_08.pdf)

Board Policy 8.01 Budget Preparation and Fiscal Accountability. BP 8.01. January 24, 2013. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/8/bp8_01.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Policy/Manuals/8/bp8_01.pdf)

ASCCC. *Program Discontinuance, a Faculty Perspective Revisited.* Adopted Fall, 2012. [http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Program_Discontinuance_Fall2012.pdf](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Program_Discontinuance_Fall2012.pdf)


Email and attachments re: Final Drafts for VCAA and VCSSD positions. 12/17/2012. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EmailReAdminPositionReview.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EmailReAdminPositionReview.pdf)

Memo from Karen Saginor to Dean Starr concerning Draft Job Announcements for Center and School Dean January 22, 2013. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/CenterAndSchoolDeans.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/CenterAndSchoolDeans.pdf)

Email re: Center and School Dean Draft Job Descriptions. 1/24/2013. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/emailReCenterSchoolDeans.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/emailReCenterSchoolDeans.pdf)

Email re: Documents under review. 2/19/2013. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EmailReDocumentsUnderReview.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EmailReDocumentsUnderReview.pdf)

2 emails concerning AVC Position announcements. 2/21/2013. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/emailsReAVCPositions.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/emailsReAVCPositions.pdf)


**Restructuring of Academic Senate committees.**


*Quick-Start Guide for Academic Senate Committees at City College of San Francisco.* Adopted by the Academic Senate Executive Council December 12, 2012. [http://tinyurl.com/ComQuick](http://tinyurl.com/ComQuick)

Examples of letters to Academic Senate Committee Chairs concerning committee descriptions. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/ExampleLettersAcSenCommittees.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/ExampleLettersAcSenCommittees.pdf)
CCSF Academic Senate Resolution 2013.02.06.02 Academic Senate Committees. February 6, 2013.


Academic Senate Committees [webpage] http://tinyurl.com/AcadCommittees

Academic Senate Committees [webpage through Google] https://sites.google.com/a/mail.ccsf.edu/ccsf-academic-senate.Committees/

The role of the Academic Senate officers and faculty communication.

Constitution of the Academic Senate of City College of San Francisco. Ratified April, 1997 and Bylaws of the Academic Senate of City College of San Francisco. Amended May, 2011.
http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Committees/constitution.pdf

Email re: the Power of the Academic Senate and Accreditation. 12/10/2012.

Responses to written questions from a student working on a Poli Sci project. Sent by email on 2/28/13
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/PoliSciResponses.pdf

Academic Senate web pages: home page, agendas/minutes, resolution archives

Electronic Faculty Forum Information.
http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Committees/EFF%20Welcome_website_1.pdf

http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/PrelimResultsEFFsurvey.pdf

Support of progress in achieving proficiency in student learning outcomes.

Email re: Draft Schedule for Sept. 12th 8/31/2012 9:32 AM.
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/emailReDraftSchedule.pdf

Email re: Everything I know about Sept.12.  9/11/2012 5:05 PM.
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/EmailReEverythingIKnow.pdf


http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Resolutions/F2012_S2013/2012100307_Requested_Institutional_Support%20for%20SLO.pdf

CCSF Bipartite Committee Meeting Notes. Wednesday, October 17, 2012.
http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeeting_F12/AsNoteBip20121017.pdf

3 sample emails re: ILO discussion on EFF.
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/SampleEmailsReILOs.pdf

Institutional Learning Outcomes from other Community Colleges Examples for discussion at CCSF Academic Senate Fall Plenary.  
http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Committees/SampleILOs.pdf

CCSF Academic Senate Resolution 2013.02.06.01 Institutional Learning Outcomes.  

Institutional Learning Outcomes and Mapping to the Mission Statement. Informational item presented to the Board of Trustees on February 28, 2013.  
http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2013/Feb28/Appendix%20B%20with%20cover.pdf

**Academic Senate engagement in the accreditation processes.**

4 sample emails re: communication with faculty concerning accreditation.  
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/SampleEmailsAccreditation.pdf

http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/ListOfMeeting_F12/AsAgen20121121_Specia.pdf

http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/AccredForums.pdf

http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/AccredParticipation.pdf

Partial print of database of feedback from faculty received through Google form. February 4, 2013.  
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/ReportFeedback.pdf

Show Cause Report issues in process of resolution. 2/18/13 Discussed by the Academic Senate Executive Council on February 20, 2013.  
http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/ShowCauseIssuesFeb18.pdf