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http://tinyurl.com/orrbzpc

Standard IV.A.2: Written Policies specifying Processes for Participatory Governance
(for Recommendation 13. Governance Structures.)

Progress on these two standards ceased last spring after substantial work had been completed when Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman and ALO Momjian declined to take next steps. Two Board Policies (BP 2.08 and BP 2.07) concerning governance were established by the Board of Trustees in October and November of 2012. Each policy requires the establishment of processes. Below is the status of that work for each of the two policies.

BP2.08 Collegial governance (Academic Senate)
Last Spring, your Academic Senate Officers completed compiling and summarizing best practices in collegial governance from other California community colleges (http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/DiscussConsultationPractices.pdf http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/BestConsultationPractices.pdf). In May, I provided a status report on the development of written procedures required for BP 2.08. at http://tinyurl.com/StatCC. I will not repeat the content of that report here, but it has become apparent that my communication about the status of this accreditation requirement was insufficiently transparent. I did not plainly and directly state what had transpired at the April meeting between the Academic Senate officers and senior administration. At that meeting, Interim Chancellor Scott Skillman declined to take next steps with us, saying that this work needed to proceed “slowly.” I cannot explain what she meant by that, but she was very clear that discussion of the topic was over for that day. At the May meeting, she said that more discussion about collegial governance was needed, but she did not explain why the discussion could not be pursued there and then, nor did she suggest scheduling a meeting for that discussion.

Yesterday (7/15/13) we confirmed with ASCCC President Beth Smith that those preparatory documents developed last spring are a suitable basis for deciding on procedures for CCSF. We expect to receive ongoing guidance and support from President Smith and the statewide Academic Senate in this and other areas. That preparatory work is still available whenever the Interim Chancellor or the Special Trustee is ready to give us feedback or proceed towards next steps. If the administration provides no feedback about what practices that will be amenable, the Academic Senate could proceed to writing a recommendation without that input. That would not be a very collaborative way to proceed, although it would technically conform to the requirements of BP 2.08, clause C, which states “The Chancellor shall rely primarily on the Academic Senate’s recommendation to establish procedures to ensure effective collegial consultation…”

BP.2.07 Participatory Governance (PGC)
In regards to the Participatory Governance Council (PGC) and its committees, Student Trustee William Walker said on KQED (on July 7), the Participatory Governance Council has been chaired by Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman or, when she was absent, by ALO Momjian. They have utilized the meetings to provide information, field questions and hold some discussion. Many significant (and lengthy) documents were provided only at the meeting itself, so for those documents PGC members could only ask about what they could skim through while the meeting was in progress, or email questions at a later date. The PGC has made no recommendations, indeed, has no apparatus for making recommendations. Members of the PGC, especially the student members, asked repeatedly for more robust engagement and for procedures (such as voting) that would enable the Council to make recommendations as a body, in accordance with the purpose established by BP.2.07. The Show Cause Visiting Team was provided with full information about how the PGC operated.

After the Show Cause Visit, a workgroup of 4 PGC members (one from each constituency) were authorized to meet to develop draft operational guidelines for the council. (http://www.ccsf.edu/PGC/PGCDraftMay2013Operational.pdf) At the May meeting, a brief discussion about the draft process guidelines took place, but it is not yet clear when or whether any changes will be made in how Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman and ALO Momjian conduct the PGC meetings. BP 2.07 in the Authority paragraph clearly states, “The Chancellor, in consultation with the constituent leadership, is authorized to establish administrative procedures for implementing this policy.”

I noticed that full information about the PGC is not well reflected in the Show Cause Team report and Dr. Beno’s decision letter, readers of which conclude that it was the constituency leaders that failed to complete this work. Is it sinister or just silly to hold a body that cannot take actions or make recommendations responsible for not taking actions or making recommendations?