Accreditation Work Group Progress Form – 9’12’12

Workgroup #12/13

Updates to original document are highlighted in yellow

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:

#12 -- Governance and Decision Making

#13 -- Governance Structures

Full recommendation text:

#12 – 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 all college constituencies, including the members of the governing board, the chancellor, faculty, staff, students and every administrator, in order to clarify and understand their defined roles of responsibility and delineated authority in institutional governance and decision making (IV.A, IV.B).

#13 – To fully meet Standard IV.A Decision-making Roles and Processes, 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. 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).

Related standards:

Staffing – Workgroup #7

Board Organization – Workgroup #14

Work group members:

Pamila Fisher, Clara Starr, Tom Boegel, Laurie Scolari, Francine Podenski, Andrew Chandler, Doug Re, James Rogers, Attila Gabor, Aaron Holmberg, Raja Sutherland, Joshua Beisiegel, Hal Huntsman, Karen Saginor, John Rizzo, William Walker, Natalie Berg

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 19, 2012 – The workgroup introduced themselves, read over the recommendation and discussed generally what was working and not, and their experiences in shared governance. Members were assigned to come to the next meeting with more detailed information including a report on what is not working, what are barriers to decision making in negotiated contracts, and report on what is working.
August 1, 2012 – Group members discussed in further detail based on reports presented on the many aspects of shared governance that was/was not working. Perceptions of shared governance and participatory governance were discussed. The workgroup reviewed other college district models. Dr. Fisher shared with the group the various meetings and trainings planned for the future, including: Board meeting with guests Dr. Jack Scott and Dr. Scott Himbelstein; FCMAT oral remarks on Aug. 3; Aug. 6/7 board retreat; future training on governance issues by the California Community College League and State Academic Senate.

August 10, 2012 – Workgroup members reviewed the Shared Governance Evaluation document. The workgroup also discussed criteria, charge, and structure of ideal model of shared governance. Homework assignments included drafting language which would form the narrative/introduction of the values and criteria, and the structure of an ideal governance system.

August 27, 2012 – Workgroup members discussed outcomes of the CCCL/AS Training with Scott Lay and Michelle Pilati. They reviewed draft narratives of an ideal policy – workgroup members suggested edits and added additional concepts, e.g. the role of committee chairs, how we operationalize values in the charge, adding term limits, training, pathways for ideas. The workgroup agreed in principle to the concept of having one “super-council” which is advisory. Homework assignments were distributed to combine the structure and values statement and to further review the shared governance policy (separating out sections related to the Academic Senate).

September 10, 2012 – Workgroup members continued to discuss the shared governance policy, including the introductory new narrative for an ideal model, and discussed a new draft policy. Under continued discussion is defining further the charge, structure, and operating guidelines for the policy. Model policies will be reviewed again to refine the policy.

September 24, 2012 – Next meeting.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

1. ACCJC Training with Board of Trustees – The Accrediting Commission President, Dr. Barbara Beno, with Trustee William “Bill” McGinnis of Butte-Glenn Community College District presented a 2-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation’s purposes, processes and standards, the roles and responsibilities of trustees, advice for board excellence and examples. (Completed July 10, 2012)

2. Community College League Training with State Academic Senate – Scott Lay, President of the California Community College League, and Michelle Pilati of the State Academic Senate, conducted a training workshop titled “Participating Effectively in District and College Governance – The Law, Regulation and Guidelines.” They provided a half-day training for all constituent groups and then met individually with the leadership of constituent groups. The College expects to receive a report with their recommendations in late September. (Completed August 23, 2012)

3. Association of Community Colleges Trustees (ACCT) Training – Dr. Narcisa Polonio, President of ACCT, conducted a self-evaluation of the board and held a two part retreat to better understand the roles and responsibilities of the board, and to outline common board goals. (Completed August 6 and 7, 2012)
4. Report on what is working – Discussion included the merits of representation and diversity in committee appointments, shared governance provides for connectivity and district-wide communication, makes use of volunteer time supplementary to operations, allows proposal of new ideas, and feedback mechanisms.  (Completed August 1, 2012)

5. Report on what is not working – Discussion focused on lack of understanding of shared governance, confusion with participatory governance, culture of circumventing governing bodies. Other issues included the number and level of committees, unclear decision making processes, lack of authority for administrators, sense of frustration and disenfranchisement, scheduling and communication issues.  (Completed August 1, 2012)

6. Report on barriers to decision making in negotiated contracts – Areas discussed in the workgroup included the vacancy review group, the AFT2121 contract, the issue of part-time loads, Counseling transfers, calendar, and grievances procedures, organizational culture, and unavailability of chairs over the summer. Items relating to Workgroup #7 were forwarded to them, including the AFT2121 contract, training of supervisors/administrators, counseling issues, department chair issues.  (Completed August 1, 2012)

7. Review sample policies on shared governance – Workgroup members reviewed the Yosemite, Pasadena, San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Santa Rosa models. (Completed August 1, 2012)

8. Identify ideal criteria of model – The workgroup discussed the criteria, charge, and structure of an ideal model. The following table represents the draft brainstorm of the group. Workgroup members will formalize this at following meeting into statement/narrative format. (Completed August 10, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grounded in solid processes and outcomes</td>
<td>Understanding roles</td>
<td>Clarity of components and roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>No one component can dominate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust and respect</td>
<td>Promotes better college</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>Authority/responsibility</td>
<td>Accessibility for participation /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>/accountability</td>
<td>opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action-oriented</td>
<td>(with default deciders)</td>
<td>Promote student voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Term limits/appointment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages diversity of voices</td>
<td>Clarify charge of committees</td>
<td>Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruits experience/expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear chair/responsibilities/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data informed decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>agendas/minutes (need template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(quantitative vs. qualitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centered (impact on students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisory Committee which ultimately may get formed should be charged with following:

- Budget
- Planning
- Policy
- Institutional Effectiveness
9. Draft new model – With step 8 in progress, the model will be further discussed at the August 27 meeting. The Workgroup continues to work on a draft board policy which includes an introductory statement embracing the values noted in the brainstorm session on Aug. 10 and defining the charge, structure, and operating guidelines. The workgroup reviewed an initial draft policy at its September 10 meeting and will continue to work on refining the statement.

10. Identify ways to improve student participation – Students receive stipends for participating in meetings, a practice which had stopped for a few years. This practice is being reinstated and is anticipated to help increase participation.

11. Proposed revised policy – The workgroup initially intended on having a draft ready for board feedback by Sept. 27, 2012. This work will likely not be completed by then, though much progress has occurred. At its September 24 workgroup meeting, the workgroup will discuss next steps after reviewing the 2nd draft of the policy.


13. Address Climate/Culture issues – This is an item to consider when time allows to articulate the campus climate and culture and how it can be improved upon as the governing structure evolves.

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

The workgroup has completed its analysis of the shared governance process and is now working to develop a model which will be more efficient and effective. Several trainings have been held with the board, and further training will be conducted for the other constituent groups by the California Community College League and State Academic Senate.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

The dialogue has been honest and difficult in recognizing the challenges of the shared governance system. As a model is developed and discussed, there may be some resistance to improvements since the status quo roles and authority of various stakeholders are questioned and redefined to meet the accreditation recommendation.