MEMORANDUM

Date: February 28, 2011
To: All Employees
From: Vice Chancellor Alice Murillo, Co-chair, Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee
           Academic Senate President Karen Saginor, Co-chair, Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee
Subject: First Draft Accreditation Self Study Report

A first draft of the Accreditation Self Study Report is now available on the web for review by all members of the College Community. You will find links to the Report in both Word and pdf format at http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/study.html. We would like to encourage you to discuss relevant sections within your department and through shared governance structures. You can send your suggestions and comments to Steering committee co-chairs: Karen Saginor (ksaginor@ccsf.edu) and Alice Murillo (amurillo@ccsf.edu) or directly to the co-chairs for the standard as shown in the footer to each page.

The Self-Study Report is a key document that will be carefully examined and evaluated by the WASC Evaluation Team who will start their work with us in Fall, 2011 and visit us in March, 2012. After their visit, the WASC Evaluation Team will make recommendations regarding our reaffirmation of accreditation. The Self-Study Report is our vehicle for providing honest and constructive self-assessments of our success in meeting all the required standards.

Well over a hundred members of the College Community have contributed their work to help produce this initial draft. Correction, completion, and updating are needed in many areas. We will continue to work on it, and we especially welcome your input. Most helpful to us are suggestions that provide us with specific language to use or specific facts or examples to refer to. Planned for the Self-Study Report, but not yet included in this initial draft, are introductory materials, summaries, full references to resources, and supplemental information. Your feedback from this draft will inform a second draft to be sun-shined later in the semester. Schedules and timelines for the full Accreditation Self Study process are provided on the website.

The deadline for submitting feedback for this draft is March 24th, just before Spring break.
Standard IV. Leadership and Governance.

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

Standard IV.A: Leadership and Governance:
Decision-Making Roles and Processes:

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

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.

Questions:

- Are the institution’s goals and values clearly articulated and understood by all? Can college staff tell you what those goals and values are?
- Can staff describe their own roles in helping the institution achieve its goals?
- What information about institutional performance is circulating and available to staff and students?

The CCSF Vision and Mission statement, approved in 2010, states that;

"In our community, respect and trust are common virtues, and all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner".

While this section of the vision statement was recently reworded it continues to reflect the spirit of a long standing tradition at our college. During the early 90's, the college administration and representatives of the major college constituencies engaged in a series of discussions about participatory governance at CCSF, in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 1725. In September of 1993, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the CCSF Shared Governance System, in accordance with Title V. Over the next two decades members of the college community has demonstrated their commitment to work collaboratively within the CCSF Shared Governance System. The level of trust and collaboration has grown each year as faculty, classified staff, students and administrators set together in over 43 Shared Governance committees.
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and subcommittees, to discuss issues, to resolve problems and to recommend policies for adoption by the Board of Trustees.

The College Advisory Council (CAC) consists of the institutional leadership, both appointed and elected. The appointed leaders who sit on the CAC are: the three senior vice chancellors, the district and the student Shared Governance Coordinators and the chancellor, who also serves as the chair of the CAC. The elected institutional leaders are; the co-chairs of the Administrators Association, the presidents of the Academic Senate, Faculty Union (AFT 2121), and Department Chair Council (DCC), the Presidents of the Classified Union (SEIU 1021) and Classified Senate, as well as the Student Trustee and the President of the Associated Students, Ocean Campus. The College Advisory Council meets monthly during the course of the spring and fall semesters. During these meetings the college leadership discusses ideas and policies that have district-wide significance. The CAC also provides a forum for dialogues, between the various constituencies at the highest level, as well as with the Board of Trustees via the chancellor.

Within a year of implementing Shared Governance System at CCSF, the leadership of the institution recognized the need to improve the way the district articulates the institution's goals and values to the members of our college. In 1994, the Chancellor and the College Advisory Council created the Office of Shared Governance, and the position of the District Shared Governance Coordinator, the first one in the state of California. The first project suggested and implemented by the coordinator with the approval of the CAC was the CCSF Master Calendar. It was published in the City Currents, the college’s internal weekly newsletter, and with the advancement of technology, posted on the Office of Shared Governance website. The concept was that in our multi-campus institution a Master Calendar, that included the meeting dates, times and location of all shared governance committees, would provide and easily accessible information to when and where to attend a meeting to provide input on any topic. This simple way of dissemination of information was an excellent first step to bring the college community together to work within the framework of Shared Governance. The transparency allowed for truly district wide ownership of our institutional goals and values.

The establishment of the shared governance system and the subsequent support for the process and practices from the district, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff and students work together for the good of the institution. College constituencies are familiar with and use the Shared Governance System to address the issues facing the College, bringing forth innovative solutions (e.g., a proposal for designated smoking areas) and filtering out ideas, such as the proposal for campus polices to carry guns on campus.

The Veterans Program is an example of how expediently the college can respond, using its Shared Governance processes to address urgent issues. The entire College pulled together to form a Veterans Program to help, encourage, and provide successful life options to our returning veterans.

During the implementation of the Student Success and Social Equity resolution many different approaches were taken by the various leaders of the institution, most significantly by the Board of Trustees. Members of the College’s constituencies through the well-defined Shared Governance System expressed their concerns. The Board remedied and rectified how they work with the College constituencies to ensure that the College would forward together in providing the best solutions to the students and communities the District serves.
Section: IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

The district has a Shared Governance handbook that details specifically how each constituent group can participate in the decision-making processes of the college. All Shared Governance committees except the Academic Senate Executive Council have membership positions for all four constituencies. All committees have a parent “Council” that is empowered to bring recommendations to the Chancellor.

All policy resolutions are debated at open-session Trustee meetings. The Board of Trustees holds two hearings for each policy. First reading is a draft and open to input from all constituencies. Second reading is not held until the policy is ready for passage, giving everyone adequate time to provide input and to develop consensus around the best and most appropriate policy. We are updating the entire policy manual. Thus, constituents participate in both the formal and informal processes.

IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Questions:

- What do institutional policies and procedures describe as the roles for each group in governance, including planning and budget development?

In September of 1993, the Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System, in accordance with Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725). The CCSF Shared Governance organization consists of three systems, each with a set of permanent committees. All members of the City College community — students, faculty, classified and administrators -- are represented in these committees. The committees may establish sub-committees and task forces, wherever needed and appropriate.

The College Shared Governance System has three parts:

1. The Collegial Governance system, in which the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate and its representatives. The membership of the Shared Governance committees and subcommittees in this area include all College constituent organizations but with at least a plurality of faculty sitting on each of the four major committees — Academic Policies, Curriculum, Student Preparation/Success, and Staff Development. Recommendations from the Collegial committees are forwarded to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, for review before being sent to, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees. Recommendations from the Executive Council of the Academic Senate are advisory to the Board of Trustees. However if the Board does not take the
advice of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate the Board needs to give a written justification to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate.

2. The College Advisory system, in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from committees including Communication, Diversity, Information and Public Records and Information Technology Policy. The committees report directly to the College Advisory Council (CAC) and are composed of representatives from all the major College organizations—students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators as noted in details earlier. The CAC is chaired by the Chancellor. The CAC oversees the development of Board Policies, annual Shared Governance Report, annual Student Success and Social Equity Report, Technology Plan, Accreditation Report and Internet related reports. Recommendations from the CAC are advisory to the Board of Trustees.

3. The Planning and Budgeting system is an integrated system of college-wide planning and budgeting for the College. Included in this system is the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), composed of representatives from each of the College constituencies — students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff. The PBC is also chaired by the Chancellor. The PBC oversees the development of the College’s Strategic Plan (every five years), the Annual Plan (each year), the annual College budget, and the annual Mid-Year and End-of-Year Assessments of the achievements of the Annual Plan. The PBC also oversees the annual College Performance Indicators Report. Additional committees reporting to the PBC include the Facilities Review Committee, Program Review Committee, Faculty Position Allocation Committee, and the Sustainability Committee. Recommendations from the PBC are advisory to the Board of Trustees.

Appointments to the committees, subcommittees and task forces are the responsibilities of each four constituent groups. For the administrators, the initial recommendation is made by Administrators Association to the Chancellor who finalizes the appointments. For classified employees, the SEIU 1021 makes the appointments. For faculty members, the Executive Council of the Academic Senate's Committee on Committees makes the initial recommendations and these are finalized by the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. The student appointments are made by the Associated Students. The 43 committees and subcommittees has over 400 members of the college constituent groups participates in the work of the CCSF Shared Governance System.

IV.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

Questions:

- What documents describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters?

The institution has clearly defined policies and practices that follow Title 5 and give authority to the appropriate Shared Governance constituency. Specifically, it recognizes faculty primacy in all ten Title 5 academic and professional matters. Additionally, decisions about associate degree requirements rest with the Bipartite Committee on Graduation requirements, a body that comprises the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and administrators representing Student.
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Development and Academic Affairs. The most significant main documents that describes the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters is the Curriculum Handbook and Ten-Plus-One based on California Education Code, Section 53200 and the Curriculum Handbook. Ten-Plus-One states that;

"Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters. Academic and Professional matters means the following policy development matters: 1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites. 2. Degree and certificate requirements. 3. Grading policies. 4. Educational program development. 5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success. 6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles. 7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process. 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities. 9. Processes for program review. 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development. and 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon."

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

Questions:

- Do the written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students? Do these policies specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning?

- Are staff and students well informed of their respective roles. Do staff participate as encouraged by these policies? Do the various groups work in collaborative effort on behalf of institutional improvements? Is the result of this effort actual institutional improvement?

- Is there effective communication at the college – clear, understood, widely available, current communication?

- Do staff at the college know essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning?

CCSF’s written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students. As noted above, these written policies also specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning.

The depth and specificity of the Shared Governance section in the Policy Manual (section 2.07) is considerable, and is one of the most developed areas of College policy. The Board Policy Manual (Revised September 29, 1998) gives the College’s constituent groups — students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators — the right and responsibility to serve on committees and to address all facets of the College’s mission. The appendix of the BP section 2.07 defines the standing committees of the Shared Governance System, including the number of representatives of each
constituency, their time to serve and provides for continuing evaluation by those constituent groups, which is to be summarized by the Chancellor and passed through to the Board of Trustees.

Implementation of the Shared Governance System has seen changes over time. The documents attesting to the nature of the Shared Governance System, such as the Shared Governance Handbook and related literature, are numerous and have been developed at considerable effort. The Shared Governance Handbook takes the process much further than the Policy Manual, providing an organizational chart of how the committees fit within the system. The Handbook defines the charter of each committee as well as the numerical membership of each constituent group, including a directory with committee name, the chair’s name, and contact information. California’s laws and administrative regulations provide that students, classified staff, and administrators play an advisory role to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The faculty role is more specific. The provisions say that the College will “rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the faculty in academic and professional matters.” Title 5 regulations include 10 specific areas of academic and professional matters and a provision that other areas may be included if they are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Academic Senate.

The CCSF Shared Governance System is organized in compliance with this Title 5 regulation.

There are many examples to attest to the level of trust and collaboration within the College’s shared governance system, especially since the past and current Chancellors. For example to lighten the growing financial crises the College is faces due to state cuts in the College’s budget, the College constituency groups within the Planning and Budgeting Council as well as the College Advisory Committee discussed and resolved to support the decisions of the College’s unions (AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021) to defer all contractual and step increases for all CCSF employees as well as adopt other financial measures such as hiring freeze for staff. This collective decision was a critical factor for the College to avoid layoffs and minimize cutbacks in student services and class offerings and saved the College millions of dollars during one of the worst downturns in funding the College's history. A second example of the commitment to collaboration and trust within the College is the 2010 agreement to support the use of short form for administrators’ evaluation by classified employees. At the same time there is still room for further improvements. For example, the new placement policy of the college was not taken to the matriculation committee of the college governance system, which would have been the proper shared governance venue; rather it was only reviewed by the administration.

College-wide discussion and communication is facilitated in committees and subcommittees throughout the Shared Governance System. While there is an ongoing collegial discussion amongst the constituencies’ further improvement and expansion already existing communication is always a goal. The Associated Student Council has an independent student council on each of the college's major campuses. There is an ongoing effort to better incorporate these AS councils from the satellite campuses.

In 1994, the college created an Office of Shared Governance, which is independent of all four constituent groups. In 2004, the College constituent groups recommended that the Office of Shared Governance be placed in an independent location close to the office of the Academic Senate. In addition it was recommended that the District Shared Governance Coordinator report directly to the Chancellor (Shared Gov Evaluation), which was accomplished by 2007.
The College’s Shared Governance Coordinator provides information and trainings about the Shared Governance System and updates information on its website and in City Currents, the CCSF internal weekly newsletter. Information is readily available regarding roles of constituent groups and committee mission statements on the College’s Shared Governance website and additional documents such as, the Shared Governance Handbook. The Shared Governance Coordinator posts on the Office of Shared Governance website information received from constituent groups and committee chairs regarding committee membership updates, meeting schedules, meeting agendas, and approved meeting minutes. The communication and distribution of information has evolved over time to keep up with the changing technology, increase outreach, improve timeliness, and expand coverage. As new technologies emerge and new policies are implemented the Shared Governance Coordinator works diligently to keep up with the changing demand. The two latest changes are, the use of Grenicus to use streaming media similar to the California State Assembly for the Board of Trustees meeting and the change in the District Sunshine Policy to increase transparency in the institution. The District Sunshine Policy calls for audio recording of all meetings of the College Advisory Council, the Planning and Budgeting Council, and the Executive Council of the Academic Senate.

CCSF embraces debate as an important way to educate constituencies on issues and voice different perspectives. Current issues such as the speed of processing student workers and financial aid have definitely been much improved because of the focused attention they have received. Other issues are still in process, such as the pilot math and English compressed course sequences. We will need to assess the outcomes of these pilots before reaching consensus on how best to proceed.

District employees have been made aware of essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning through multiple means.

District employees have been made aware of essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning through multiple means. As part of the Strategic Planning process, employees are invited to attend Community Listening Sessions and presentations are made to all constituency groups. Drafts of all College Plans are circulated throughout the District Shared Governance System which allows for employee and student input.

IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study, and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

Questions:

- What does documentation of the institution’s past accreditation history show about integrity in its relationship with the Commission – has it responded expeditiously and honestly to recommendations, are there citations indicating difficulty, etc.?

- Are the institution’s communications of institutional qualities or effectiveness to the public accurate?

- What is the institution’s track record in its relationship with the U.S. Department of Education?
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CCSF exercises the highest level of integrity communication and in its relationship with the Commission—it has responded expeditiously and honestly to recommendations and any citations of difficulties.

For example, during the last accreditation visit, the visiting team suggested to increase outreach and education on shared governance system to the various stakeholders. This recommendation was also addressed in the mid-term report and by the 2010 internal audit. The district shared governance coordinator regularly provides orientations to new employees, to the Executive Council of the Associated Students, the Executive Council of the Classified Senate and other groups as needed.

The College’s communications are handled by the Office of Public Information and Marketing. Checking on the accuracy of a given communication to the community, whether it be a brochure or a news release, continues to be a matter of honesty, integrity, and professionalism in the College’s relationships with external agencies.

The College’s relationship with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) primarily involves the Financial Aid Office and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. Since the last accreditation, the relationship between the USDE and the CCSF Financial Aid office has been excellent. The CCSF Financial Aid office continues with the established a staff development training program with the training specialist for Region IX and also participates in regular other USDE training opportunities. The Program Participation Agreement with USDE, which is similar to an accreditation approval, has been approved through June 30, 2015.

City College of San Francisco’s Office of Workforce, Economic Development and Grants relationship with the ESDE has been excellent as well. The Office regularly reviews USDE publications regarding current and future policies and legislation, particularly as it relates to the Carl Perkins CTE Act. Staff actively participates with local, regional, state and national Workforce and Economic Development Councils, Consortia and Associations, including the Bay Area Community College Consortia (BACCC), the California Community College Association of Occupational Education (CCCAOE) and the National Council for Workforce Education (NCWE). Faculty and administration regularly attend and present at national and state conferences. Currently, the Chancellor serves on the San Francisco Workforce Investment Board (WISF) and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Workforce, Economic Development and Grants serves on the WISF Youth Council and as President of NCWE (20010/2011), a council of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Information is communicated to CCSF’s Career and Technical Education Department Chairs, faculty, Career and Technical Education (CTE) Subcommittee, Academic Policies Committee, and the Executive Council of the CCSF Academic Senate. Input from CCSF is provided via surveys generated from both the State Chancellor’s Office and the U.S. Department of Education on CTEA Reauthorization and reporting requirements. Various departments within CCSF have also applied for and received grants from the USDE.

**IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.**

*Questions:*
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• What process does the institution use to evaluate its governance and decision-making structures? Are the results communicated within the campus community?

• How does the institution use identified weaknesses to make needed improvements?

The Shared Governance Agreement specifies that each constituency should evaluate the Shared Governance System every two years. The last substantive evaluation and revision of the Shared Governance system was in 2007, with the involvement of the leadership all four constituent groups. During the initial phase of the writing of this accreditation report there will be a district wide survey sent out including questions regarding shared governance. The results of that survey will be reviewed by the Committee on Information and Public Records. Recommendations will be forwarded to the College Advisory Council. The results of that survey will be also included in the accreditation document. In addition, on the recommendation of the Committee on Information and Public Record the Office of Shared Governance will start an annual survey of the district employees and students to evaluate CCSF Shared Governance System by using the district newly purchased survey monkey.

Since the last accreditation visit, our Board has begun conducting an annual self-evaluation that is informed in part by surveying all College constituencies. The Board also evaluates the Chancellor each spring; this evaluation is informed in part by employee surveys. Specifically, the trustees and the employees express how well they feel the Chancellor is achieving the Board-identified objectives. If recommendations are made, they are then given to Shared Governance for follow-up.

References

• Strategic Plan Shared Governance and Community Review Process 8/9/10
• Student Equity and Achievement Gap 4/29/10
• Monthly Chancellors Report Board of Trustees: September 2010; March 2010
• Institutional Annual Plan 2010/11
• Annual Plan: Developmental Objectives 2010/11
• Accreditation Follow up Report for WASC March, 2010; Focused Midterm Progress Report 3/15/2009
• Annual Budget Report Recommendations for Board of Trustees: 2010/11; 2009/10; 2008/09
• Shared Governance Handbook 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9; 2009/10
• San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual
• CCSF Mission and Vision Statement
• Listening Sessions: December 9, 2009 and February 10, 2010
• CCSF Technology Plan 2009
• Executive Summary of Sustainability Plan December 2009
• Office of Research and Planning
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Standard IV.B: Leadership and Governance.
Board and Administrative Organization.
In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

IV.B.1. The Institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

_Questions:_

- Does the institution have a policy manual or other compilation of policy documents that show the board’s role in establishing said policy and reviewing it on a regular basis?
- What statements about quality of program, integrity of institutional actions and about effectiveness of student learning programs and services are to be found in the institution’s board-established policies, mission statements, vision or philosophy statement, planning documents or other statements of direction? (Standard 1 and 1A)
- What is the written policy describing selection of the chief administrator? Has the board followed it or another process?

City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees has a policy manual that identifies Board roles. In 2008, the Policy Implementation Committee of the Board with the assistance of an outside legal counsel began the process to review and update the policy manual. In 2009 due to budget restraints, the services of the outside legal counsel were terminated and the process delayed until the end of March 2010 at which point the Board of Trustees put forward its updated policies to be distributed through the Shared Governance system to elicit feedback in the development of policies, regulations, and recommendations from appropriate members of the college as stated in BP 2.07.

The College’s Vision and Mission statements, Strategic and Annual Plans, Program Review, Educational Plan and other institutional planning documents address program quality and student learning outcomes as well as services provided to ensure student success as outlined in Standards 1 and 1A.

BP 1.200, District Vision and Mission Statement, addresses the college’s commitment to superior levels of educational participation and academic success among all students. The statement further addresses the college’s commitment to providing an affordable and unparalleled learning experience in a supportive and caring environment that leads students to successfully complete their goals. In addition, the college is committed to expanding out-of-classroom learning activities to provide a range of opportunities, including service learning, internships, tutoring, mentoring, and cultural and recreational activities throughout the district.

BP 1.200 further states:

“Our principal distinction will be high quality of instruction. The educational experience will feature successful learning in areas as varied as basic skills, academic skills, academic courses, advanced honors, career and technical courses, retooling of job skills, and
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preparation for transfer to other educational institutions. Learning opportunities will extend to a broad array of courses and programs to offer any student a pathway to educational and career success”

While the Board examined its existing practice and revised PM 1.11 Chief Administrator: Selection, Authority and Term of Office on October 31, 2008, it does not have a written policy regarding the process of selecting the Chief Administrator. The selection and hiring of the Chancellor is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees.

IV.B.1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Questions:

- Is the governing board appropriately representative of the public interest and lacking conflict of interest? Does the composition of the governing board reflect public interest in the institution?
- Are less than half of the board members owners of the institution? Are a majority of governing board members non-owners of the institution?

As mandated by California Education code, the San Francisco Community College District is governed by a Board of Trustees, consisting of seven members elected by the voters of the City and County of San Francisco to represent the interest of the community at large. The Board has one student member elected by the Associated Students of City College of San Francisco to represent the interests of the student population of the college. The Student Trustee casts an advisory vote at Board meetings.

In addition, Board Policy Code of Ethics (PM 1.15) provides the following guidelines regarding decision making and reflecting the public interest of institution:

1. Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs.
2. Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively.
3. Recognize that the Board of Trustees exercises power through the decisions it makes as a group. Individual Board members have no legal standing. Trustee powers cannot be utilized in any individual manner.

City College of San Francisco is a public institution, all governing board members are non-owners of the institution.

IV.B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

Questions
• What policies, institutional goals or other formal statements exist that describe Board expectations for quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs and services?

The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and the fiduciary responsibility for the district. The Board reviews, evaluates, and periodically commissions studies, reports, and other documents related to the quality of student learning programs/services and how District resources are allocated to support learning programs. The Board reviews programs and budgets at regular meetings and work sessions.

The College’s Strategic Plan, Institutional Annual Plan (Resolution 100624-S12), Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan (Resolution 090326-S1), and College catalog (Resolution 100325-S1) are all reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Questions:

• Is the governing board independent – are its actions final, not subject to the actions of any other entity?

The governing board is independent and subject only to state and federal laws pertaining to post secondary education.

The Board is the ultimate authority for City College of San Francisco (as per California Education Code 70902, Title 5, as well as Board Policy Manual Section 1.09 and others) and is responsible to use that authority to create broad policies to insure the integrity of the institution in fulfilling its mission.

IV.B.1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

The Board of Trustees Policy Manual is available online. The Board Policy Manual addresses the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures (see PM 1.01 – 1.16). [Ref. CCSF District Policy Manual] Dates of approval and the number of revisions indicate that the Board has revised and adopted policy revisions on a regular basis.

IV.B.1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Questions:

• Do the records of board actions (minutes, resolutions) indicate that it acts consistent with its policies and bylaws?

• Does the board have a system for evaluating and revising its policies on a regular basis? Is this system implemented?
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In most cases, Board actions are consistent with its policies and bylaws. BP 2220 states:

“IV. Committee Duties. Committees shall consider matters which have been referred to them by the President or Board or which a majority of the committee membership determines should be considered by the committee. In the latter case, where a committee recommends the conduct of a study, the Board shall be notified of the proposed study. The committee shall not proceed with the proposed study unless the study is authorized by the Board.

When a specific matter has been referred to a standing committee, the committee chair will schedule a committee meeting as soon as practicable so as to consider the matter and make timely recommendations to the full Board. A committee recommendation or a report on progress made towards a recommendation will be required by the second regular Board meeting following the referral or forty-five (45) days following the referral, whichever is later. Any matter previously referred to a committee may be placed on a regular Board agenda by the President with the concurrence of one additional Board member at any time in accordance with the timelines for preparing such agendas.

An adequate record of all committee meetings shall be maintained.”

In the recent past, Board of Trustees Committee meetings have frequently failed to achieve quorum. Although no resolutions or formal recommendations have been approved at such ad hoc meetings, discussions that took place without quorum have been a basis for proposals at Board meetings.

In addition, some actions have been taken without proper shared governance review. On several occasions the Board of Trustees have proposed resolutions affecting educational programs in the absence of shared governance review. Examples of these actions include: Resolution 070823-S1: Resolution Establishing Residential Preference in the Nursing Program’s Admissions Policy; Resolutions 090625-S10, 090924-S8 and 091119-S1; Resolution to Create Community Access and Opportunity in City College’s Vocational Nursing Program; and Resolution 090430-S7: Student Achievement Gap and Social Equity Resolution.

Furthermore, Board policies regarding its Committees’ functions are fact finding, deliberative and advisory. The Committees are expected to report to the Board, in the case of the above referenced resolutions, 090625-S10 was referred to the Community Relations Committee. The Committee was scheduled to meet on September 10, 2009; however, no record of this meeting has been located. This resolution was reintroduced in September 2009 (090924-S8) without Committee recommendation and failed. In November 2009 a similar resolution (091119-S1) was proposed and passed. None of these resolutions included the shared governance review check off statement.

In January 2009, the Board put into place a process for review of all policies guiding the College contained within the Board Policy Manual (BP 2745). According to this policy, the Board assesses its own performance as a Board in order to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning. The self-evaluation is intended to address effective Board operations and dynamics as well as the achievement of Board goals and the fulfillment of its responsibilities that support the District’s success. It cites the 2006 Self Study IV.b.1 e & g as the basis for its adoption. The Board is committed to conducting a self-evaluation on an annual basis each Spring semester.
IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

**Questions:**

- What is the board’s program for development and orientation?
- Does the board development program address the board’s need to learn about accreditation standards and expectations?
- Does the board have a formal, written method of providing for continuing membership and staggered terms of office?

The Board does not have its own system for orientation and development; instead the Chancellor has taken on that role. Each Board member receives a personal orientation, involving the Chancellor, some of leaders of the college constituencies, and senior administrators. Topics such as the planning and budgeting system and all pertinent information are discussed and the Policy Manual and League’s New Trustees Orientation binder is distributed. Although participatory governance is discussed, there is no formal training on the district’s shared governance system. The Board also holds an annual retreat. In addition, there is an orientation for Trustees held in Sacramento during the month of August. The Office of the Chancellor (CCSF) serves as an ongoing resource to all Board members.

Board members are encouraged and provided with many different opportunities to attend both internal and external events, conferences, and other functions to improve and increase their understanding of policies affecting both the San Francisco Community College District and the state community college system.

The members of the Board of Trustees are elected by the voters of the San Francisco Community College district. The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that some of board members must face the electorate every two years. This ensures that the Board continues to be responsive to community concerns. Currently, five of the seven Trustees have served more than one four year term. The Student Trustee serves a one-year term. There are no term limits established for the Board of Trustees.

IV.B.1.g. The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

**Questions:**

- What is the board self-evaluation process as defined in its policies? Does that process as described likely to be an effective review?
- Does the policy call for regular self-evaluation? Does the institution’s board regularly evaluate its own performance?
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) recommends that Boards adopt and implement a policy on self-evaluation. The recommendation states that the Board of Trustees should “establish a method of self-evaluation, determine the schedule for this process, and complete self-evaluations on a regular basis.”

Resolution No. 090129-P21, dated January 29, 2008, outlines the Board Self-Evaluation process at City College. The resolution stipulates that each Trustee have the opportunity to provide his/her opinion regarding the performance of the Board. District shared governance groups also offer input to the Board. These groups are the Academic Senate, Administrators' Association, AFT 2121, Associated Students, Classified Senate, Department Chair Council, and SEIU 1021. Each group is asked to provide a single response based on its own determination of the best method for arriving at a single response. In order to maintain strict confidentiality, the Board President requested that the Office of Research and Planning collect and aggregate all responses. Responses are aggregated such that there is one “Trustees” response and one “College Groups” response.

The Board Self-Evaluation form is comprised of two parts: a quantitative section and a qualitative section. This approach is similar to approaches used by other California community colleges.

The quantitative portion includes an extensive series of items in the categories of Board Organization, Policy Role, Community Relations, Policy Direction, Board-Chancellor Relations, Standards for College Operations, Board Leadership, Advocating for the College, and Board Education. Respondents are asked to rate these items based upon a five-point scale.

- The qualitative portion is drawn from several open-ended questions:
  - What are the Board’s greatest strengths?
  - What are the major accomplishments of the Board in the past year?
  - What are areas in which the Board could improve?
  - What are the one or two most important change(s) you think we need to make to improve our Board meetings and/or other functions?
  - What issues do you feel the Board should make its priorities for the coming year?

According to Resolution No. 090129-P2, the results from the Self-Evaluation form are provided as a basis for the Board to assess its own performance, and to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning.

The Board shall provide an opportunity for District shared governance entities to offer input to the Board regarding their assessment of the Board’s performance during the prior year in conjunction with the Board’s self-evaluation. The President of the Board, or his/her designee, shall distribute the Board Evaluation Form to each of the District’s shared governance organizations at the same time it is distributed to Board members. Each District shared governance organization that wishes to offer input into the Board’s self-evaluation process shall complete the Form sufficiently in advance of the Board’s preparation of its self-evaluation to allow the results to be compiled either into a master copy or a summary and to be provided to the Board. The compiled results shall be reviewed by the Board prior to its completion of its self-evaluation.
BP 2745 passed January 29, 2009 calls for an annual Board self evaluation to take place no later than April 1 of each year. To date, the Board has conducted 2 self evaluation studies, one in 2009 and the second in 2010 which will be finalized in Spring 2011.

**IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.**

*Questions:*

- What is the board’s stated process for dealing with board behavior that is unethical? Is there any track record of the board implementing this process? What was the result?

The Board adopted a District Policy Manual which contains a code of ethics (PM 1.15) as noted in the response to Standard IV.B.1.a.

Because City College of San Francisco is a public institution, all of the governing board members are non-owners of the institution. However, voting members of the Board are required by California state law to make public their financial interests. To quote the District policy manual (PM 1.07B): “Designated employees shall file statements of financial interest with the Chancellor of the District, who shall serve as the filing officer for the District, and who shall retain the original of all statements filed in his or her office, unless otherwise directed by law or regulation to the contrary.” However, this language pre-dates the creation of the San Francisco Ethics Commission which now is the repository for each Board member to file a Statement of Economic Interest. Each year, the CCSF Chancellor’s Office sends each Trustee a memorandum and forms packet. The College never has physical custody of the completed Statements; they are filed directly with the San Francisco Ethics Commission by each Trustee.

Included in the SFCCD Policy Manual is a Code of Ethics and Responsibilities section (Number 1.15, p. 2) which state, “A violation of the Code of Ethics shall be subject to written censure charges by a Board member, a hearing held by the Board’s Personnel Committee and a resultant finding of recommendation to the full Board.” No such actions have had to be taken to date’ therefore, no track record exists.

**IV.B.1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.**

*Questions:*

- What kinds of training are provided to the board about the accreditation process, and Commission standards?
- How does the board participate appropriately in institutional self-study and planning efforts?
- How do board actions, including planning and resource allocation, indicate a commitment to improvements planned as part of institutional self-evaluation and accreditation processes?
- How do board actions reflect the commitment to supporting and improving student learning outcomes as reflected in the Accreditation Standards and expectations for institutional improvement?
• Is the board informed of institutional reports due to the Commission, and of Commission recommendations to the institution?
• Is the board knowledgeable about Accreditation Standards, including those that apply to the board?
• Does the board assess its own performance using Accreditation Standards?

The Board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process, status and documentation. The Board reviewed previous WASC Accreditation Reports, Mid-Term Reports, etc. The Board of Trustees has been informed about, and involved in the current accreditation self-study process. All Board members have attended Orientation and Training for Accreditation in Sacramento. This training is provided by the California Community College League.

Individual Board Members have volunteered to serve as a resource to the various Standard Teams and have attended the CCSF Accreditation Steering Committee and Standard Team Meetings. The CCSF Board of Trustee President serves ex officio as a member of the Steering Committee.

Section: IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Questions:
• What is the established board process for conducting search and selection processes for the chief administrator? Are those processes written?
• Has the board used these processes in its most recent searches?
• How is the board delegation of administrative authority to the chief administrator defined? In policy documents? In a contract with the chief administrator?
• Is this delegation clear to all parties?
• How effective is the board in remaining focused at the policy level?
• What mechanisms does the board use in its evaluation of the chief administrator’s performance on implementation of board policies and achievement of institutional goals?
• How does the board set clear expectations for regular reports form the chief administrator on institutional performance?
• How does the board set expectations for sufficient information on institutional performance to insure that it can fulfill its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity?
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The Board of Trustees is responsible for the recruitment and selection of the Chancellor. The Board of Trustees shall establish the qualifications for the position and the timeline for the search. The Board of Trustees, in its discretion, shall implement the appropriate recruitment method and may seek the services of an executive search firm in identifying and recruiting outstanding candidates for the position of Chancellor. The Human Resources Department assists and facilitates the process with the search firm.

In this hiring process, the Board of Trustees shall solicit input from representatives of the District's faculty, classified, administrative, and student constituencies.

As stated in BP 1.11 Chief Administrator: Authority, Selection, and Term of Office:

“The Board accepts and establishes the office of the Chancellor as that of Chief Executive Officer of the District, and delegates to this office all administrative authority within its power except that having to do with the Chancellor's own appointment or dismissal, or as otherwise especially provided in this manual.

The Chancellor shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees and serve for a term or terms not to exceed 4 (four) years at an annual salary to be fixed by the Board. The contract may be renewed at the discretion of the Board.”

The Personnel Committee of the Board is responsible for conducting the evaluation of the Chancellor. This process is based upon the annual goals and objectives that the Chancellor submits to the Board of Trustees.

Strengths and area for improvement:

1. The Board conducts an annual Self Evaluation. They also request evaluations from constituent groups throughout shared governance system.
2. The April 2010 Board Self Evaluation deadline was not met.
3. Currently, there are no established plans for acting on the findings of the April 2010 Board Self Evaluation (presented at the January 2011 Board meeting).
4. The college needs to address the areas of training in shared governance and accreditation for the Trustees.
5. The Board may want to revisit having a parliamentarian present to facilitate proper procedures and protocols during their meetings.

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

The Chancellor has served the college for 41 years starting as a Psychology Instructor and then Department Chair in the Behavioral Sciences Department, and progressing to Dean of Instruction, and Vice-Chancellor of both Academic Affairs and Student Development. He was appointed Interim Chancellor from March 2008 until December 18, 2008, when he was hired as Chancellor.

The Chancellor’s leadership and decision-making process is informed by a comprehensive and integrated set of planning documents which include: the Education Master Plan; a revamped
Technology Plan; the Student Equity and Achievement Plan; the Sustainability Plan; and, a newly reformatted Strategic Plan. Each plan was established and continues to evolve in collaboration with all College constituencies.

The Chancellor emphasizes the significance of the newly adopted Vision and Mission Statements (April, 2010) and its links to the Strategic planning and budgeting processes. The importance of the College Strategic Plan was made implicit when the Chancellor directed that the newly adopted Program Review process will contextualize, as appropriate, the Strategic Plan along with the College Vision and Mission. The goal is for the Strategic Plan, College Mission/Vision and the various Program Reviews to serve as a comprehensive and integrated evidence-based anchor for writing and updating the Educational Master Plan and to guide the budget process.

A key ingredient in the development of the College Strategic Plan has been the scrutiny and contributions from various constituencies and stakeholders. A series of Listening Sessions were held at the College in December 2009 and February 2010. Representatives from business, industry, organized labor, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco City and County Departments, San Francisco Unified School District, local universities and community members provided input on the role the College plays in the community. Over 35 community representatives participated in these sessions.

The Board of Trustees approved the 2009-2010 Annual Plan during its meeting August 2009. The Annual Plan serves as an operational version of the College’s plans for a one-year period; it consists of a set of institutional objectives that are to be achieved by the College through the efforts of the college units, departments, schools and administrative operations. At the end of each fiscal year, the College conducts an End-of-Year Assessment noting specific progress made in each area. The End-of-Year Assessment for 2008-2009 was finalized in December 2009 and will serve as the baseline to measure progress in 2009-2010.

The Chancellor works closely with administration to provide hands-on oversight and evaluation through weekly meetings with the Vice-Chancellors, bi-monthly meetings with administrators in the Student Development Division, Cabinet members, and regular meetings with shared governance and other groups.

The Chancellor reviews and evaluates the implementation of the college’s plans. He stresses a planning and evaluation process that promotes a coordination of effort that leads to student success and increased rates of program and degree completion. This includes linking the Strategic and Educational Plans to the Program Review and Planning and Budgeting processes.

The College worked on integrating the process of institutional planning and assessment by combining various planning efforts and linking those to annual budgets. The College’s Planning and Budgeting Council played a key leadership role in linking planning issues with the budget by its review and discussion of the College’s 2009-2010 Management and Budget Plan completed in November 2009. The Management and Budget Plan not only provides a composite document which contains both the summary Budget and the CCSF Annual Plan, but also includes the objectives of the divisions of the College – Academic Affairs, Student Development, Finance and Administration, and Institutional Advancement – as well as objectives of the Chancellor’s Office. The Plans include the primary performance measures or outcome indicators to be evaluated at the end of the academic year.
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The document brings together in one place the financial resources that the College expects to have available, many of the programs, services, and initiatives to be provided with those resources, and the means for evaluating results. The Chancellor’s Budget Message gives a general outline of how well the budget is likely to address the current planning priorities of the college and what resource challenges might be anticipated.

As a result of this Management and Budget Plan, the Chancellor’s funding recommendations and decisions for the General Fund Expense Budget are the result of extensive collaboration at the department level, the divisional level, the shared-governance level, and the executive level. The goals of the strategic plan and the objectives of the Annual Institutional Plan are the driving influences in the inclusive budgetary decision-making process. This integrated approach to planning and budgeting ensures the College carries out its mission with great purpose, focus, and commitment to the community.

The Chancellor has clearly articulated the college’s strategy for dealing with the budget crisis of the past three years. In addition to the Management and Budget Plan, an internal Fundraising Workgroup was established in May 2010 to develop alternate sources of funding to support the college. The Save the Class Campaign he launched raised $320,000 between July 1, 2010 and February 2011 to reinstate classes. CCSF’s Child Development and High School Diploma Programs are now participating in an Escrip Program.

The Chancellor serves on the Board of the City College of San Francisco Foundation and he participates in all of their fundraising initiatives. In the Fall of 2010, the Foundation sponsored a City College of San Francisco fundraiser at a San Francisco Giants Baseball Game. The Annual Basic Skills Luncheon is sponsored by the CCSF Foundation Auxiliary and is held in the Fall. He regularly meets with major donors and philanthropic organizations.

When the Chancellor began his tenure he emphasized that the College was experiencing an unprecedented financial crisis which required the input and cooperation of every member of the CCSF community. The goal was to reduce costs without resorting to significant layoffs or the decimation of instruction and support services. He continues to inform the college community of current and future budget challenges and encourages input from all groups.

IV.B.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

As of June 30, 2010, sixteen members of the administrative staff retired. The College’s administration is in a period of transition and only half of these positions are expected to be filled. A large number of the School and Campus Deans are recent appointments to their respective positions. While this transition period creates challenges for the College as new administrators gain experience in their positions, this transition also presents new opportunities for the College in that a new generation of administrative leaders is preparing to lead the college into the future.

The Chancellor recently re-aligned administration to create a more efficient and effective administrative structure. This re-alignment included the creation of a Chief Technology Officer and the creation of a Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs. The re-alignment has resulted in significant savings in administrative costs to the district. Reporting directly to the Chancellor are the Vice
Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the Vice Chancellor of Student Development (Vacant), the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research and Advancement (Vacant), the Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs (Vacant), and the Chief Technology Officer.

The Chancellor delegates authority to these administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are achieved. This administrative coordination and leadership are managed through direct contact with the Vice Chancellors as well as regularly scheduled meetings with the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and monthly meetings with the entire Administrative Staff.

A newly adopted Administrative Evaluation process includes administrative objectives with measurable outcomes. The Chancellor reviews all final evaluations with the Vice Chancellors and forwards the evaluations to the Administrative Evaluation Oversight Committee. The members of the committee include the Presidents of the Academic and Classified Senate, Presidents of the DCC, AFT and SEIU, the A.S. President, Co-Chairs of the Administrators’ Association. It is chaired by the Chancellor. After the committee review, the Chancellor presents the Board of Trustees with recommendations regarding appropriate Administrators’ contract extensions.

In addition, the Chancellor chairs the monthly College Council meeting, which is comprised of all administrators, department chairs and the presidents of the academic senate, classified senate, AFT 2121 and SEIU 1021. The Chancellor meets monthly with the College Advisory Council (CAC), a Shared Governance body comprised of the leadership of all the College Organizations: Academic Senate, Department Chairperson Council, Classified Senate, SEIU 1021, AFT2121, the Associated Students, the Administrator’s Association, and the Vice Chancellors. The Chancellor also meets at least once a month with the leadership councils of each of these respective constituencies. In addition the Chancellor is in daily contact with his senior staff on all issues related to budget control and expenditures as well as key College projects authorized by the College’s annual plan.

IV.B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; AND
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

**Questions:**

- What does the president do to communicate institutional values, goals and direction?
- How familiar is the president with data and analyses of institutional performance?
• How does the president communicate the importance of a culture of evidence and a focus on student learning?

• Where does the research office report in the institution – does it have easy access to the president’s office?

• What mechanisms has the president put in place to link institutional research, particularly research on student learning, institutional planning processes, resource allocation processes?

• How does the district chief executive officer follow the component parts of this standard in the role of providing effective district leadership?

The Chancellor communicates the institutional values, goals and direction in a multitude of arenas. He addresses the entire college every Flex Day and chairs key Shared Governance committees, such as College Council, the College Advisory Council, College Planning and Budget Council, The Diversity Committee, as well as monthly meetings with the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and major constituencies across the college. The Chancellor is accessible to all constituencies in the college, especially students.

The Chancellor interacts with the various constituencies, staff, faculty, students, board members and community and government agencies and citizens. The Chancellor relies on the administrative chains to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are met. He effectively works with these groups and actively listens and works to understand their concerns and issues. The college’s strategic plan has identified communication as a strategic priority throughout the college and the Chancellor believes that this is an area in which he needs to continue to improve.

He has actively participated in the student equity hearings in Spring 2010 and Fall 2010. The Chancellor’s Progress Report – Student Equity and the Achievement Gap was completed on June 24, 2010. Various Taskforce Workgroups were established to focus on Math, English, Placement and Testing, Counseling, Financial Aid and Student Employment.

The CEO continues to provide the leadership and direction to bring the college to the point where the community understands the linkages between the major College Plans, Program Review and the Planning and Budget process.

The Chancellor’s experience as Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Student Development gives him firsthand knowledge of academic, student development and budgetary issues. He has a keen understanding of enrollment issues. Regular reviews of issues are discussed in Executive Cabinet, with the Board and other constituency groups. The Chancellor reviews data, issue and proposed plans with the entire college community. He clearly explains the complex issues and challenges facing the institution.

During the Chancellor’s tenure the institution’s of the Program Review Process has been reorganized from a 5 year cycle to a biannual review process of over 133 units and programs. Program Review includes the assessment of student progress, the assessment and implementation of Student Learning Outcomes, and requests for budgetary items.

The departments completing their units Program Review are expected to link their programs goals and objectives to the College’s Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, Annual Plan, Sustainability Plan, Facility Master Plan, and Technology Plan. Program specific data provided by the Research
Office is included in these reviews. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are now an integral part of the Program Review Progress in which units must identify and update their progress in implementing SLO’s at both course and program levels.

All Program Reviews are submitted to appropriate school deans or supervisors, as well as to the Program Review Committee (PRC). The PRC prepares reports and develops budget recommendations based upon these Program Reviews. The recommendations are forwarded to the College Planning and Budget Council (CPBC). The CPBC conducts budget hearings and develops budget recommendations which are forwarded to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for final action.

Currently, the Office of Institutional Advancement (Research, Planning and Grants) reports to the Vice Chancellor of Finance. The Program Review Process, Strategic Planning and institutional research activities are regularly reviewed with the Chancellor. The goal is to better link program effectiveness and budgetary priorities based on accurate data and reports.

Additionally, the ARRC (Accountability Reporting for the California Community College) Annual report is reviewed by the Chancellor with the Executive Cabinet. This data along with other reports and plans are also presented to the Board for review.

IV.B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

City College is governed by a Board of Trustees and the Office of the Chancellor with support from various Shared Governance Committees and other advisory groups. The Chancellor’s responsibility and administrative authority as the Chief Executive Officer for the College is delegated by the Board of Trustees in accordance with policies approved by the Board. The Chancellor is responsible for recommending appointments, assigning functions, approving various College plans and initiatives, and the delegation and responsibilities to various administrators within the administrative divisions of the College. (SFCC District Policy Manual # 1.11 & 2.01).

The Chancellor is a leader who has demonstrated the ability to work in a complex and demanding environment. He understands the current and future needs of the College and in response has directed the effort to implement a strategic set of Shared Governance initiatives to address these needs and challenges. His approach to problems and challenges facing the College has been thoughtful and measured. In an atmosphere of dramatically reduced financial support for higher education and increasingly tough budget reductions he has worked closely with various internal and external stakeholders to find and develop effective, yet reasonable solutions.

The Chancellor maintains frequent and effective lines of communication with students, faculty, classified staff, administrators, the Board and the community. He oversees and works collaboratively with the Shared Governance Process to develop solutions aimed at maintaining and improving the College’s core values and mission. For example, the Chancellor facilitated the creation of a special Student Equity and Achievement Gap task force. The goal was to encourage the College to evaluate the planning and assessment of current and past College practices in this area and to assist in the implementation of a renewed commitment to student equity and closing the achievement gap. The Chancellor communicated to the entire CCSF family, “As a college we are...
committed to, and by implication recognize in our Vision Statement and Strategic Priorities the critical problem of Student Equity and the Achievement Gap.” (April 29, 2010)

The CCSF Annual Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System execution and implementation is a function of the Chancellor’s ability to lead and continually assess the College’s progress toward its goals and objectives as well as the Chancellor’s objectives which are developed in consultation with the Board of Trustees.

**IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.**

The Chancellor has effectively controlled the budget and expenditures of the college during one of the most uncertain financial periods in our history. The Chancellor oversees a comprehensive and integrated budgeting, planning, and assessment system, which are led by the College Planning and Budget Council (CPBC). The CPBC comprises representatives from students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators. The CPBC includes all the leaders of the college organizations. The College maintains an integrated system of planning development on an annual basis that is directly linked to budgeting and assessment. Each department conducts an annual program review that is directly linked to the budgeting process.

The Chancellor places the needs of students at the center of budget decisions. Through a policy of shared sacrifice on the part of administration, faculty, and classified staff, the Chancellor has effectively balanced the budget under most challenging circumstances. The Chancellor has reduced the administrative structure of CCSF and significantly reduced the number of college consultants resulting in significant savings in administrative costs. Plans have been developed to increase other sources of revenue in the areas of fundraising and grant development. While the Chancellor is to be commended for effectively controlling the budget and expenditures, the college is faced with serious budget challenges; (1) the state of California budget remains uncertain and the amount of funding apportioned to community colleges remains uncertain, (2) the cost of health care for both retired CCSF employees and current CCSF employees will continue to rise and place greater demands on the CCSF budget.

The District fully utilizes a three-year budget planning process. All budgets are prepared with his cycle foremost to provide a realistic context for budget planning. At all presentation, e.g. with Bargaining units, college constituents, and in Board presentations, the three-year budget planning process has brought into sharp relief the necessity of the College’s coming to grips with the short falls of the funding model used by the state for community college education.

Current economic conditions and state budget cuts have made it impossible for the College to continue spending at past levels. By working with the Board of Trustees, labor unions, and other shared governance groups, the College has maintained core academic offerings at all campus locations as resources have permitted, and has avoided the layoff of any full time employees. The three-year planning budget however indicates the next three years will present significant fiscal challenges.

The Chancellor works closely with the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and the Chief Financial Officer to review all major budget accounts at the district level including categorical programs on a regular basis. Revenue estimates are also reviewed on a continuing basis.
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and adjusted if data supports such a change. Any such changes are brought to the immediate attention of the Board of Trustees at their regularly scheduled meetings.

The funding recommendations and decisions for the General Fund Expense Budget are the result of extensive collaboration at the department level, the divisional level, the shared-governance level, and the executive level. The goals of the strategic plan and the objectives of the Annual Institutional Plan are the driving influences in the inclusive budgetary decision-making process. This integrated approach to planning and budgeting ensures the college carries out its mission with great purpose, focus, and commitment to the community.

**IV.B.2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.**

The Chancellor represents the College on several Boards, including the Workforce Investment Board, the Mayor’s Advisory Council and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. He meets regularly with local elected officials, business and labor leaders. He does an excellent job representing the interests of City College of San Francisco and is well respected in the community.

He has served on Congresswoman Jackie Speier’s Citizens Oversight Committee. He attends meetings in Sacramento with the State Chancellor and various California legislators, including Assembly Members Leno, Ma and Yee. As indicated in the Chancellor’s Monthly Report to the Board of Trustees, he also hosts meetings with foreign dignitaries, representatives from community and faith-based organizations, business and labor leaders.

He meets and confers regularly with the Presidents of San Francisco State University, the University of San Francisco, the Universities of California, San Francisco and Los Angeles, and the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District to discuss student completion and success issues.

**Strengths and areas for improvement**

6. The Chancellor informs the CCSF community concerning the problems and challenges the school must confront. He has been consistent in his focus and has designed and applied a clearly focused plan for leading the College in these difficult times. He understands the institution, its infrastructure, the students, and appreciates the people who work at the College.

7. The Chancellor has re-aligned the administrative structure of the College to become more efficient and effective. He has significantly decreased the reliance on outside consultants and has created and administrative structure that is more sustainable in light of decreased state funding to community colleges.

8. While the current budget crisis has been a strain on the college, the faculty, staff, and students continue to move forward in developing policies and procedures that support student success.

9. The Program Review process is more streamlined and manageable, yet there are still questions of how the budgetary requests of the departments are processed and allocated.

10. Progress has been made to better implement various plans, (e.g., Strategic Planning, Education Master Plan, etc.), but this work is in progress.
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11. The Chancellor is aware of his role, duty and functions in relation to the Board of Trustees, faculty, administrators, classified, students and the community. He works to bridge differences and seeks compromise to difficult problems. He has been transparent in dealing with all constituency groups and has demonstrated knowledge of and adherence to the statues, regulations, and policies of the Board of Trustees.

12. The Chancellor is to be commended for balancing the CCSF budget during one of the most challenging economic periods in the history of the nation, the state of California, and CCSF. The Chancellor and the leadership team of CCSF have been pro-active and to date have made budget cuts with the least impact on students and services.

13. The Chancellor’s office needs to provide prompt responses to (email) inquiries and requests.

14. Chancellor maintains frequent and effective lines of communication with students, faculty, classified, the Board and the community. He oversees and works collaboratively with the Board and Shared Governance groups to develop solutions aimed at maintaining and improving the Colleges core values and mission. He seeks to continuously improve these lines of communication.

References for Standard IV

- Vision and Mission Statements
- Board Policy Manual
- California Education Code 70902, Title 5
- Transcripts/DVDs of Board meetings
- Board agendas
- Board minutes: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCFA/minutes.htm)
- Board transcripts: [http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCF A/transcripts.htm](http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/VCF A/transcripts.htm)
- Audio tapes of Board Committee meetings
- Board Self-evaluation 2009, 2010
- Student Equity Hearings (audio/video tapes)
- Interview with Chancellor
- CCSF Employment Agreement for the Chancellor
- Chancellor’s Self Evaluation
- Faculty’s Instrument for Chancellor’s Evaluation
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- Strategic Plan Shared Governance and Community Review Process 8/9/10
- Audit Report
- Management Plan
- Technology Plan
- Mid-Year Assessment Reports
- End of Year Assessment Reports
- CCSF Institutional Annual Plan
- Student Equity and Achievement Gap 4/29/10
- City Currents Fact Sheet September 2009; City Currents 3/10/2008; City Currents August, 2008
- Institutional Annual Plan 2010/11
- Annual Plan: Developmental Objectives 2010/11
- Chancellors Flex Day Address August 13, 2010
- Annual Budget Report Recommendations for Board of Trustees: 2010/11; 2009/10; 2008/09
- CCSF College Catalog
- Shared Governance Handbook 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9; 2009/10
- San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual
- CCSF Mission and Vision Statement
- CCSF Technology Plan 2009
- Executive Summary of Sustainability Plan December 2009
- Strategic Plan
- Listening Session Impressions, December 9, 2009 and February 10, 2010
- Program Review Process and Documents
- Monthly Chancellor’s Reports to the Board of Trustees
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- College Council Meetings 2009-2010, 2010-2011
- Deans Meetings 2009-2010, 2010-2011
- CCSF Organizational Chart
- Chancellor’s Self-Evaluation
- Chancellor’s Monthly Reports
- Chancellor’s Website
- Office of Shared Governance
- Shared Governance Committees Minutes
- District Shared Governance Organizational Chart
- Chancellor’s Biography
- Office of Shared Governance Website
- Office of Research, Planning, and Grants Website
- San Francisco Community College District Policy Manual
- 2009/10 Preface: Links from Planning and Budgeting
- CCSF Annual Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System
- Planning and Budget Documents
- Office of Shared Governance Annual Report 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9 2010/11
- College Planning Documents
- College Advisory Council
- College Planning and Budget Council
- Chancellor’s College-Wide emails
- Flex Day Addresses