SECTION I: Overview of the Co-Chair Report

The Standard IV Committee, working in sub-groups, reviewed the CCSF Shared Governance System (SGS,) documents and policies related to broad-based participation in SGS, the collaborative efforts of the Board and College constituencies, the College’s relationships with outside agencies, and the integrity of SGS processes. Also investigated were the independence of the Board of Trustees and its reflection of the public interest, the Policy Manual and Board by-laws and whether Board actions are in compliance, Board development and self-evaluation, the Board’s code of ethics, its involvement in the accreditation process, and its process for selection of the chief administrator (the Chancellor.) Finally, the Committee investigated the performance and leadership of the Chancellor.

All sub-group reports resulted in templates which were reviewed by the entire Standard Committee, resulting in consensus documents. The ratings given on these consensus documents were Superior for 83% and Satisfactory for the remaining 17%. Therefore, it is reasonable to state that the overall rating for Standard IV is Superior, in that the College exceeds the standard by utilizing the contributions of leadership by all segments of the College community for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles facilitate decisions that support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness.

This rating reflects the widespread, broad-based approval for the College’s experience over the past six years in making the Shared Governance System work. SGS used to be an ideal, a goal, but in recent years it seems to have progressed into a working practical reality. College constituencies have learned to feel confident in the strength of the system as the College methodology for dealing with new challenges as they occur.


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.

IV.A. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

The CCSF vision statement calls for "a working environment for all faculty, staff, and administrators where everyone is valued and the climate is supportive, positive, and productive." This vision is embodied in the College’s Shared Governance system adopted in September 1993 by the CCSF Board of Trustees. Over the past ten years, the College’s shared governance system has demonstrated its durability by successfully meeting numerous educational and fiscal challenges facing the institution. The level of trust and collaboration has grown each year as faculty, classified staff, administration and students sit together in numerous shared governance venues to discuss issues, resolve problems and recommend policies for adoption by the Board of Trustees. Evidence of the level of mutual respect and collegiality can be found in the Shared Governance Evaluation Report of 2004 where participants in the shared governance system affirmed that “their committee environment encourages honesty among the participants.”(4A-1, page 9) In that same report, 91% of respondents felt that their opinions were usually or always respected (4A-1, page 24).

The City College Shared Governance System developed from a series of conversations between the CCSF administration and representatives of the major College constituencies during the 1992/93 academic year. The resulting agreement was brought before the Board of Trustees as a set of policy recommendations for the operation of the Shared Governance system at City College of San Francisco and approved in September 1993. Accompanying the policy document
was an appendix listing the College’s Shared Governance committees, their role and function and the membership composition. An office to coordinate the Shared Governance system was established soon after the Board’s approval of the new policy. Also included was a provision for the periodic review and evaluation of the work of the College Shared Governance system.

The College 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 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 Academic Senate for review and approval before being sent to the Vice Chancellors and the Chancellors.

2. **The College Advisory system** in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from committees including Information Technology Policy, Communication, and Diversity. The committees report directly to the College Advisory Council and are composed of representatives from the all major College organizations—students, faculty, classified staff and administrators; the CAC is chaired by the Chancellor.

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 the College constituencies—students, faculty, administrators and classified staff. The PBC is also chaired by the Chancellor. The PBC oversees the development 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. PBC also oversees the annual College Performance Indicator Report. Additional committees reporting to the PBC include Facilities Review Committee, Program Review Committee, Faculty Position Allocation Committee and Classified Position Allocation Committee. Recommendations from these committee are advisory to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

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 City College policy. The Board Policy Manual (Revised September 29, 1998) gives the College’s constituent groups—students, faculty, classified and administrators – the right and responsibility to serve on committees and to address all facets of the college’s mission. It delineates the committees of the Shared Governance System, including the number of representatives of each constituency, 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 with recommendations for improvements.
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(s)* 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 organization 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 City College Shared Governance system is organized in compliance with this Title 5 regulation.

Two examples of the level of trust and collaborative that infuses the College’s governance system illustrates how far the College has progressed since the shared governance system was established in 1993. To alleviate the growing financial strain on the College due to state cuts in the College’s budget, College constituency groups within the Planning & Budgeting Council as well as College Advisory Committee discussed and resolved to support the decisions of the College’s unions (AFT 2121 and SEIU 790) to defer all contractual and step increases for all CCSF employees for eighteen months starting in 2002. This collective decision was a critical factor for the College to avoid layoffs and cutbacks in class offerings. This collective decision saved the College millions of dollars during one of the worst downturns in funding the College experienced in a decade. A second example of the commitment to collaboration and trust within the College is the 2004 agreement to support the Administrators’ Association as a shared governance organization representing the interests of the administrators within Shared Governance system.

College-wide discussion and communication is facilitated in committees throughout the shared governance system. 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 weekly newsletter distributed to all employees. Information is readily available regarding roles of constituent groups and committee mission statements on the college's Shared Governance website. The Shared Governance Office posts information on the website it receives from constituent groups and committee chairs regarding committee membership updates, meeting schedules, meeting agendas, and approved meeting minutes.

**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.

City College of San Francisco has a continuing history of integrity and honesty in its relations with the accrediting commission. CCSF achieved a six year re-accreditation in year 2000 as a result of its self-study and its productive working relationship with the accrediting visiting team. Since the last self-study, CCSF has provided annual reports to the commission in a timely fashion, specifically in its annual audit and a report on new programs at the college. CCSF submitted a mid-term report in a timely fashion in 2002 and since that date continues to submit reports to the commission as requested. During the 2002/3 and 2003/4 academic years, CCSF hosted two different workshops on the new accrediting standards and student learning outcomes sponsored by the Research and Planning Group in collaboration with the ACCJC.

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. For example the Office uses a ”News Release Distribution Form” which requires documentation as to when a news release was proofed and by the source of the information whether it be CCSF faculty, staff, or administrators. The media uses City College press releases without inquiry as to the accuracy of content and, on occasion, will run the story exactly as is provided to them.

The college’s relationship with the US 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. For example, the CCSF Financial Aid office established a staff development training program four years ago 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, 2009.

City College of San Francisco’s Office of Workforce and Economic Development relationship with the US Department of Education has been excellent as well. The Office regularly reviews US Department of Education publications regarding current and future policies and legislation, particularly as it relates to Carl Perkins/VTEA; it also subscribes to Vocational Training News and Education Weekly, and staff attend national and state conferences. All information is communicated to CCSF’s Career and Technical Education Department Chairs, Faculty, Vocational Education Steering Subcommittee, Academic Policies Committee and Executive Council of CCSF Academic Senate. Input from CCSF is provided via surveys generated from both the State Chancellor’s Office and the US Department of Education on VTEA Reauthorization and reporting requirements. City College of San Francisco applied for and received many grants (see Template 4.A.4). Former Assistant Secretary in the Office of
Vocational and Adult Education, Carol D'Amico came to the college to discuss basic skills activities at CCSF.

Since the last accreditation visit in 2000, all of the recommendations have been addressed. Among these are the reorganization of the counseling departments, and formation of a collegewide and campus-by-campus Associated Students structure. Also the college has institutionalized its planning, budgeting, and program review processes. There are many others, (see Template 4.A.4).

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.

Since its inception by the Board of Trustees in September 1993, the Shared Governance system has been evaluated three times. Each time the evaluation process has been improved. The initial evaluation in 1994 used a survey of participants to assess and improve the shared governance system; another survey was conducted in 1997 with modifications. In 2004, the College conducted its most comprehensive examination and evaluation of its shared governance system. Overseen by the College Advisory Council, a shared governance body representing all of the major college constituencies organizations, the evaluation included an online survey to over 400 past and present participants in the CCSF Shared Governance System and a series of Listening Sessions in three different locations at a variety of times and open to all members of the college community to hear concerns about the shared governance system. Based upon a common set of agreed-upon study questions, each college organization produced its own assessment and recommendations of the shared governance system using the data from the survey and listening sessions. The results of the evaluation have been distributed in print and electronic format to various groups throughout the college. In addition, the evaluation and its website location have been placed in City Currents, the college-wide newsletter.

The report contains many written comments from surveys about the valuable community building function of the shared governance system. Respondents indicated how positive connections between different employee groups and students were made possible with shared governance. In the Survey for the 2004 Shared Governance Evaluation, 84% of the respondents (faculty, administrators, and staff) indicated that the Shared Governance committee work is usually or always interconnected to other college decisions and events (4A-1, page 25). More than 75% of the respondents indicated that their opinions are valued and respected (4A-1, page 24).

Based upon the surveys and the self-studies of each of the organizations, the College Advisory Council developed a set of recommendations for improving the Shared Governance System. These 13 recommendations included provisions for reviewing and clarifying the role of each shared governance committee; establishment of a simple, clear system for tracking recommendations and improving communications to all College constituencies as well as the efficient operations of the committees. To ensure the continuing commitment to promote a
college climate of inclusiveness, the Chancellor will make an annual call for full participation in the system for students and College employees, especially classified staff. (4A-1, page 10).

IV.B—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.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.

The San Francisco Community College District is governed by a Board of Trustees, consisting of seven members elected at large by the voters of the City and County of San Francisco. The Board has one student member elected at large by the Associated Students of City College of San Francisco. The student member casts only an advisory vote in Board meetings. The Board in its conduct lives up to its Policy Code of Ethics (PM 1.15) which states, “The Board of Trustees shall: Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs; Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively; [and] 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.” Since the last accreditation in 2000, the Board has increased its commitment and its workload with the establishment of monthly working sessions supplementing the Board’s monthly regular meetings, and the holding of periodic Board retreats to identify and discuss Board priorities.

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.

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

The Board commissions, reviews, and evaluates 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 meeting and work sessions and Board members pose thoughtful, detailed, and at times, critical questions to gather information, analyze current issues, and apply Board policy to meet the mission of the College. Their questions demonstrate interest in, attention to, and acceptance of responsibility for the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. Moreover, the Board has always assumed full responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Board
demonstrates its own commitment to accountability to the College’s mission through an appropriate delegation of tasks to the Chancellor and through the ongoing oversight of the financial and academic goals of the District.

Since the 2000 accreditation, the Board has reviewed and adopted a College Strategic Plan, an Education Master Plan and Annual Plans for each fiscal year. The Board has also reviewed and approved plans for facilities, technology and educational programs. The Board also reviews the annual Management Plan, the Mid Year and End of Year Assessment Reports and the annual College Performance Indicator Report. The Board also reviews and discusses reports prepared by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants related to improving student success and student learning in areas of pre-collegiate and multi-cultural infusion into the college curriculum.

The Board also reviews and adopts modifications and revisions to the College catalogue containing all of the College’s courses and programs. The annual budget is reviewed and approved by the Board as well.

The Board is the ultimate authority for City College of San Francisco (California Education Code 70902 as well as Board Policy Manual sections 1.07, 1.09, 6.01, 6.02, 6.03, 6.04, 6.06, 6.12, 6.14, 6.15, 8.01, 8.02 and 8.03), and uses that authority to create broad policies to insure the integrity of the institution in fulfilling its mission. The City and County Election Code sets the terms, timing and eligibility of Trustees to serve on the Board.

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 published and available throughout the district. The Board Manual addresses the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures (see PM 1.01 – 1.15). 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.

The Board actions are consistent with the CCSF Board policy manual and bylaws. There is no evidence that Board actions are not final or that they are subject to the actions of any other entity. The Board addresses policy changes based upon shifts in federal, state or local laws and regulations, or when a recommendation is presented through the College’s Shared Governance system. The Board does not currently have a schedule for review of all policies guiding the College contained within the Board Policy Manual. But the Board has recently decided (December 2004) to subscribe to the CCLC Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service that will enable the Board and the administration to establish a regular review of the CCSF Policy Manual.
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.

The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that some board members must face the electorate every two years. This ensures that the Board continues to be responsive to community concerns. However, since Board members are chosen by the public and not by their colleagues, the Board as a whole has no control over its composition or the expression of dissenting opinions by individual members. Currently, the Board consists solely of Trustees who have served more than one four-year term. The Student Trustee serves a one-year term; although he/she is eligible to run again, only one student trustee has been elected more than once.

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, leadership of all college constituencies and senior administrators. Issues such as Shared Governance and the Planning and Budgeting system are discussed and all pertinent information, such as the Policy Manual and the League’s New Trustee Orientation binder, is distributed. The Chancellor serves as an ongoing resource to the new board member.

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.

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.

There is no codified self-evaluation processes for the governing board since the Board felt that the elections themselves act as a de-facto evaluation; however, the Board recently met and reviewed its current practice of self-evaluation and has decided to establish a written policy (December 2004).

The current practice of the Board is to schedule periodic retreats with an external facilitator in which discussions are conducted about the work of the Board and where improvements can be pursued. The retreats also enable the Board to identify three annual priorities.

Additional practice includes the sharing of information and knowledge that Trustees gather at any external conferences or functions to help promote the collective development of the Board.
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.

The Board has adopted a District Policy Manual which contains a Code of Ethics (PM 1.15) which among other items states, “The Board of Trustees shall: Represent all segments of the community in advocating for their particular needs; Function as a team seeking to stay well-informed and to act objectively; [and] 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.”

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 states, “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.

The Board receives information and updates regarding the accreditation process, status and documentation. The Board has previously reviewed WASC visiting team reports and reviewed and endorsed the 2002 CCSF Mid-Term Report. The Board of Trustees has been informed about, and involved in, the current accreditation process since February 2004 when two of the WASC Commission staff conducted an orientation workshop at City College about the new standards and their emphasis on student learning outcomes. In March 2004 at a Board retreat, the WASC Self-Study was on the agenda as one of the Board priorities. The Accreditation 2006 website (http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/study.html) has been a major source of ongoing and detailed information to keep the trustees informed about the structure, timelines and progress. Moreover, the Work Group (the organizing/planning group) of the Self-Study process attended two Board of Trustees meetings in 2004 to provide documentation and make brief presentations about the process and progress of the Self-Study.
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Also significant is the appointment of a Board of Trustees member to serve on the Standard IV Committee as well as serving as the liaison from the Board to the Steering Committee of the Self-Study. As Board liaison this trustee is a member of the Self-Study Steering Committee and attends Steering Committee meetings. At the October 12, 2004 Board Work Session, the trustee-liaison to the Self-Study involved the trustees in a dialogue by facilitating a discussion of the content and potential responses to those standards that relate to the Board of Trustees (Oct. 12, 2004 transcript). This discussion increased their awareness not only of the WASC standards and the Board role, but also of how specific standards relate to areas of Board operations and policy that are, or need to be, formally documented.

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.

The Board hires a Chief Executive Officer, with the title of Chancellor, and delegates to him/her the day-to-day operation of the District and the drafting of the multi-year plans required for the future of the College. The documents attesting to the search, hiring and retention of the Chancellor demonstrate that the Board takes the ability and autonomy of the chancellor very seriously, and that in so doing it considers the many community stakeholders in the selection process. Documents such as the Board Self Evaluation show how board responsibility is delineated from executive authority through workshop, retreat, instruction and acculturation. Second, documents from the Policy Manual and the Employment Agreement show full delegation of authority to the Chancellor. Third, documents from the annual Management Plan and the Chancellor’s Monthly Reports to the Board indicate that the Chancellor bears full administrative responsibility for setting goals, objectives, performance standards and evaluation for all segments of College instruction, services, operations, finance and management. Fourth, evidence from the Chancellor’s Self Evaluation and from sample instruments used by faculty and administrators, show that the interests of the Board, Community, Faculty, Classified and Administrators have been incorporated into the assessment of the Chancellor, his goals, objectives and performance. The documentation reflects how seriously CCSF accepts the appointment of its chief executive, how carefully it examines the executive’s performance and how valued to the enterprise the principal of executive authority is within the shared governance system. The evidence presented clearly demonstrates that CCSF has a superior track record in meeting or exceeding both demands of this standard. In the future, the Board’s selection process for new chancellors will be described in its Administrative Regulations.

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.
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.

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.

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.

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

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

The City College Chancellor has shown considerable leadership, both philosophical and executive. The Chancellor’s responsibility and authority are apparent, as is the delegated administrative, faculty, staff and student structures supporting the institution, the means of communication with constituencies, and the delegation of responsibility to appropriate administrative divisions that, in turn, effectively integrate educational and resource planning.

Chancellor Philip R. Day Jr, arrived at City College of San Francisco in September 1998. During the ensuing six years, he has provided effective leadership for the College in all aspects of the operations of the CCSF. The following is a summary of the evidence of his exemplary leadership:

The Chancellor established a comprehensive and integrated budgeting, planning and assessment system which is led by the Planning and Budgeting Council, a shared governance organization of which he is chair. The PBC comprises representatives from students, classified staff, faculty and administration. The PBC 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. The College produces a mid-year and end-of-year assessment of the status of its objectives each year. Consistent with the requirements of the planning and budgeting system, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants produces a College
Performance Report that assesses the progress of performance indicators linked to the eight strategic priorities of the College. The College is also guided by an annual management plan that is comprised of the college budget and the operational and developmental objectives for each of the 26 major cost centers in the college.

The Chancellor has also established an extensive array of planning initiatives that includes an Education Master Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and a Strategic Plan. Each plan has been developed in collaboration with all college constituencies.

Led by the Chancellor, the College’s strategic planning process involves all college constituencies as well as representatives from the community, business and other educational institutions. The planning process was informed by an extensive set of environmental scanning reports on both the internal and external realities of the college. The Chancellor led the planning process through an extensive series of conversations that resulted in the development of a revised mission statement, a new values statement and eight strategic priorities with supporting objectives that is now the core of the College’s planning and performance evaluation system.

The Chancellor oversees the research function of the college which produces a series of annual reports and assessments for the College planning and budgeting system. The research office also maintains an online Decision Support System that enables members of the college community to access the college data base for information about student enrollments and registrations, student success and department productivity.

The Chancellor’s administrative structure is highly efficient yet one of the smallest per employee within the California community college system. Fewer than 40 administrators are responsible for oversight of 2800 employees and more than 100,000 students in nine campuses. The Chancellor relies upon three administrative chains, in addition to his own, to ensure that all annual operational and developmental objectives are achieved; these chains are student development; academic affairs; and finance and administration. Coordination and leadership is managed through direct contact with the Vice Chancellors as well as bi-weekly meetings of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, monthly meetings of the College Council—comprised of all administrators and department chairs; and the College Advisory Council, a shared governance unit comprised of the leadership of all the College organizations: Academic Senate; Department Chairperson Council; Classified Senate; SEIU 790; AFT 2121; the Associated Students; the Administrators 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.

The Chancellor also communicates with a quarterly e-bulletin to the community and with periodic messages to CCSF employees through the wide area email system, City Currents, and a monthly report to the Board of Trustees.

In 2002, City College of San Francisco received an overwhelming endorsement from the voters in the City and County of San Francisco who approved by 72% a facilities bond issue.
The endorsement of CCSF by the electorate is part of the growing amount of evidence of the success of the college in reaching a great diversity of constituencies in the city. Among the outreach activities directed by the Chancellor are regular meetings with City and County officials; participation on the Board of Directors of the SF Chamber of Commerce and the Workforce Investment Board; direct communication with local community organizations and regular meetings with leadership of other educational institutions in the region. The Chancellor also distributes an annual report on the college to all residents of San Francisco.

SECTION II(b): Commendations and Plans for Improvement

Suggested plans for improvement reflect the high level of satisfaction with leadership and governance that the College community feels. The recent (October, 2004) biennial evaluation of the Shared Governance System included several recommendations for improvement, which the Standard IV Committee supports. These recommendations focus on expanding participation in the Shared Governance System and continuing the biennial evaluation process.

The Standard IV Committee also recommended updating the Policy Manual in regard to Statements of Economic Interest and annual Board evaluation, improving the connection between Program Review and other College planning processes, and having the Board accept reports by means of a formal resolution process. In addition, the Board should adopt a calendar for regular systematic review and updating of its policies.

In general, these recommendations reflect small improvements that can be made to a functioning system of governance. The team was quite appreciative of the Chancellor’s leadership efforts in bringing about a fully functioning governance system which is supported by and informed by a structured system for planning based on research, inclusive communication, and consensus building.

SECTION III: Key Findings and Relation to Themes

Theme 1: Institutional Commitment to High Quality Education

The inclusiveness of the College Shared Governance System is perhaps the most important facilitator of the College commitment to providing high quality education. Broad-based discussions are focused on or informed by the College Mission. Discussions in all venues are the vehicle by which the College reaches consensus on how to make progress toward realizing its goals. Equally important is that the results of discussions are shared in a variety of written and oral reports so that the Board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are aware of the work that occurs in parts of the College other than their own. Another way of saying this is that our Shared Governance System keeps us honest, insuring that no one group gets to make decisions from a narrow perspective because the participation of the larger college community forces decisions to have a clear relation to our institutional commitment to high quality education.
Theme 2: Student Learning Outcomes and Student Achievement

Although the measurement of student learning outcomes occurs at the course and program levels, the model of shared governance and strong leadership focused on the Mission of the College is at work here as well, both in deliberations among the involved faculty and in the attention paid by the entire college to the research and information that are shared and discussed well beyond the boundaries of the course or program level.

Theme 3: College Dialogues Promote Institutional Improvements

Theme 4: College Planning and Budget System Promotes Continuous Improvement

Theme 5: Institutional Resources Support Learning and Student Access

For all three of the above themes, the Shared Governance System has proven to be an excellent vehicle to help the College in its quest for excellence. For example, as a result of the Enhanced Self-Study, a process started by the Chancellor and conducted on a shared governance model, groups of faculty, staff, students, and administrators have developed proposals for wide-ranging improvements, most of which have been implemented. Similarly, the allocation of resources is decided through a broad-based participatory process informed by our mutual commitment to the College Mission.

Theme 6: Institution Demonstrates Integrity and Honesty to all Stakeholders

Within the institution, the changes in leadership and governance that have been brought about by our current Chancellor and Board and by our continuing development of the Shared Governance System are recognized as providing the foundation for integrity and honesty. The general public may be unaware of how we have created this foundation, but we know, from surveys, from our very high participation rate, and from the votes of the electorate, that we are perceived as an important and respected contributor to the well-being of the City.
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