X. A. Academic Senate President Lillian Marrujo-Duck's Report:

Elected Board of Trustees and new Special Trustee,

The beginning of this semester brings several changes, including the introduction of a new Special Trustee. With that in mind, the theme of this report is good governance. Good governance is based on the professional meeting of responsibilities and the development of trust between constituent groups.

CCSF faculty regularly go above and beyond teaching to meet broad professional responsibilities. Our faculty spent the beginning of this semester assisting students displaced by the removal of classes from Civic Center. Five faculty volunteered to serve on a Civic Center and Gough Street Taskforce to continue these efforts. Numerous faculty volunteered and five faculty were selected to serve on and assist the new District Capital Outlays Committee. We also recently formed and defined two new committees. The Ad Hoc Accreditation Workgroup is intended to look more deeply into accreditation issues. The Ad Hoc Program Review Workgroup is looking into our program review processes and providing suggestions for aligning our processes not only with accreditation standards, but also for continuous improvement in each department. Both of these committees will provide recommendations to the Academic Senate Executive Council that will be forwarded to other groups. It is through these committees and the others like them that the work of this college is accomplished, please feel free to check in on any of these committees.

During the most recent Executive Council meetings the Academic Senate reviewed our general education philosophy statement; AB86 plan; Area B GELOs; 2015 institutional set standards; and Board Policies and Administrative Procedures on District Travel, the Name of the District, and the Repetition of Credit Courses. We also engaged in a discussion of how the Executive Council can assist in creating the engagement with disaggregated learning outcome data necessary to continue building a culture of evidence across the college. Key to our planning processes is the program review created by each department, program, and service unit. The Senate has begun a review of the program review processes across the college in order to promote data-informed decision making that leads to continuous improvement.

While engaged in these services to the college, many faculty stand out. We recently recognized Susmita Sengupta as an outstanding part timer and Leslie Simon for her work on furthering diversity. In addition, Karen Saginor, Alisa Messer, and Susan Lopez volunteered to serve as the faculty representative on the California Board of Governors. These individuals are typical of the entire body of faculty dedicated to this institution.

We also have faculty stepping into newer leadership roles that we would like to acknowledge: the coordinators for the AB86, professional development, equity, basic skills, and SSSP participants are all providing examples of leadership and continuous improvement for CCSF.
There are new opportunities being created for leadership in learning outcome coordination as well.

However, while many faculty and administrators are working together to meet our goals, the full trust necessary for true participatory and collegial governance across the college is missing. This lack of trust creates unnecessary challenges in meeting our accreditation and overall improvement goals.

Faculty are following the accreditation processes very closely. We provided a letter to City Attorney Herrera asking that he request the termination decision be vacated as part of the remedy addressing the bad acts of ACCJC. While we are disappointed that Judge Karnow decided against this action, we are pleased our request for transparency and clarity on the part of ACCJC during the reconsideration process was granted. We hope you will follow these developments closely as well.

We see the standards not only as a compliance issue being enforced by ACCJC, but ideally as a set of guidelines, derived from among our peer colleges, that can be used to strengthen the institution overall. We would like to see our Board of Trustees, our Special Trustee, and our top administration demonstrably and transparently working with faculty and staff to use the accreditation standards as guides to improve the governance of the college. Governing transparently would help restore the trust that is missing among the various constituent groups. Working with the Standards as guidelines, transparently, is also a key to regaining full accreditation.

Building this trust is difficult when our administration is unstable. Due to no one individual's efforts, we remain without a permanent Vice Chancellor of Student Development and our Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs has announced her departure. The new President of Ocean Campus and Centers is from a state that has neither unions nor, apparently, shared governance. This creates a steep learning curve in a position that is critical to CCSF’s success. Furthermore, our previous Vice Chancellor of Student Development was required to step aside from her duties yet remains employed by the college engaged in other work that was not planned for during this accreditation crisis process. At a time when resources are scarce and other essential positions remain unfilled, this is troublesome.

These challenges are exacerbated when we have a very tight timeline to meet two accreditation hurdles simultaneously. We need to address approximately 30 deficiencies identified by the recent visiting team based on the 2002/2012 standards. We have plans developed for this step. However, we also need to bump up to the 2014 standards. While the new standards are essentially an evolution of the previous ones, asking for deeper analysis of more discrete data and tighter planning connections, and while such improvements are certainly accomplishable, the less than 18 month timeline to reach 100% is a substantial challenge that was acknowledged in the visiting team’s report. We are not seeing the full recognition of the nature of this challenge in the actions of our administration. For example, we do not have a full time accreditation liaison officer with the requisite experience to help us meet these challenges. Our Associate Vice Chancellor of Institutional Development includes serving as ALO among her many responsibilities and the Academic Senate President is currently a part-time Accreditation Co-Chair. Neither has ever been on a visiting team nor successfully aided an institution out of an accreditation crisis. While many members of the Senate have devoted a great deal of time and energy to becoming quite knowledgeable about what needs to take place, our informed assessment of our situation is that we need a fully devoted accreditation expert at the
appropriate administrative level to effectively drive the necessary changes within the timeline provided.

Under these circumstances, the Academic Senate opposes the use of any further resources to reorganize the college's departments. We have begun conversations with the District on the 10+1 impact of any departmental reorganization. The Academic Senate's first position is that the District's main goal that falls under the 10+1, strengthening the governance of the college, is realizable by using the accreditation standards to improve the practices of the college. Doing so would in fact accomplish multiple goals simultaneously. Transparent, data-informed, dialogue about student success in each program would build trust between constituent groups, identify clear specific strengths and weaknesses in each program, further develop a culture of evidence, and strengthen pathways for participatory and collegial governance practices across the college. This would also redirect valuable resources away from a top-down disruptive churning of energies clearly opposed by faculty and toward a constructive thoughtful use of expertise across the college clearly desired by all constituent groups. Such procedures are also required by several of our Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, California Ed Code, and AB1725 for all other areas that benefit from faculty expertise. Since student success, program review processes, accreditation processes, and faculty roles in governance would all benefit from such a process and all fall under the 10+1, we would like the college to rely primarily on our judgment in this case. Engaging in a data-informed program by program improvement process would further the reliance on the good exercise of our professional responsibilities and help establish the necessary trust to continue to improve our institution. Should the District choose not to heed this advice, the Academic Senate has requested copies of the data used to make the proposed reorganization decisions and the continuation of discussions.

Thank you.