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.

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.1. Descriptive Summary. In its July 2012 determination letter, ACCJC recommended "that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college’s governance structure and consequent processes used to inform decision making for the improvement of programs, practices and services. The college must ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3)."

The Board of Trustees of the San Francisco Community College District established the City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System, in accordance with Title 5, Section 53200 in 1993. To support the Shared Governance System, the Chancellor and the Academic Senate, with the approval of the College Advisory Council (CAC), created the Office of Shared Governance in 1994.

Until Fall 2012, the CCSF Shared Governance organization consisted of three systems, each with a set of permanent committees:

- **Collegial Governance System**: The Academic Senate Executive Council was responsible for making recommendations to the Chancellor and Board based on input from the following committees: Academic Policies, Curriculum, Staff Development, and Student Prep/Success.
- **College Advisory Governance System**: Membership was comprised of senior administrators and elected leaders from student, faculty and classified organizations.
- **Budget and Planning Governance System**: The Planning and Budget Council met monthly and more often when needed to review budget and planning issues. Committees reporting to the Budget and Planning Council included: Faculty Position Allocation, Program Review, Research, and Facilities Review.

Comment [AcadSen1]: CPAC was defunct. It had not met in many years.
The Faculty Position Allocation Committee, established by the Faculty Hiring agreement, reported to the Budget and Planning Council for allocation purposes only. All constituent groups of the City College community—students, faculty, classified and administrators—were represented in Shared Governance committees. The committees established sub-committees and task forces, wherever needed and appropriate. Collectively, there were over 40 committees and other groups in which over 400 members of the college community participated. Among those were many of the institution’s 1600 faculty, since full time faculty have been strongly encouraged to participate in participatory governance and other professional work as part of their responsibility in addition to their main duties.

While the previous system was comprehensive and encouraged Collegewide participation, among other merits, the workgroup focusing on ACCJC’s Recommendations 12 and 13 identified a number of shortcomings and barriers inherent in the system that impeded decision-making. The workgroup also discussed the value of using the term “Participatory Governance” versus “Shared Governance” in that it more accurately reflects the advisory nature of college councils and committees. This process involved input from College leaders from all constituencies.

[evidence: Workgroup 12/13 minutes, Shared Governance reviews/surveys]

During this same time period, administrators, classified managers, faculty and trustees participated in training sessions to better understand roles and responsibilities within a Shared Governance environment as an advisory participatory governance process. Facilitators included: Dr. Barbara Beno (President, ACCJC) & Trustee William McGinnis (Butte-Glen Community College), Scott Lay (President, Community College League of California), Michele Pilati (President, Academic Senate for Community Colleges), Dr. Narcisa Polonio (Association of Community Colleges Trustees).

The workgroup responsible for Recommendations 12 and 13 reviewed sample policies on Shared Governance from other districts and established a list of the ideal criteria for a Participatory Governance system. Given the review activities taking place, the Fall 2012 CCSF Shared Governance committee meeting schedule was suspended. The review activities resulted in a proposal for a revised Participatory Governance system and draft policies.

On November 15, 2012, the Board of Trustees established two new separate governance systems through Governance Board Policies 2.07 and 2.08:

- **Policy 2.07** established a **Participatory Governance System** that replaces the College Advisory Council and Planning and Budget Council with a new Governance Council which will have 16 appointed members representing all college constituent groups.

  The new Governance Council comprises four appointed members from each stakeholder group and allows for the provision of alternate stand-in members for the student stakeholder group. Membership to the Governance Council is for two year terms; except for students who would serve a one-year term. The Chancellor has the sole responsibility of supporting the Governance Council, and the Council is charged with determining committees and their charge.

- **Policy 2.08** established a **Collegial Governance System** with the Academic Senate.
The Academic Senate in comprised of all full time and part time faculty represented by a 29 member elected Executive Council.

The Academic Senate Executive Council comprises 29 elected faculty members. Membership is for two-year terms. The Council elects officers each Spring for the following year. The Academic Senate has term limits. After a second two-year term, faculty must sit out at least for a year and then, if desired, may run for election to Council again.

The Academic Senate Executive Council discussed the Academic Senate committee structure and charge at Executive Council meetings on [dates of meetings/agenda and minutes as evidence].

The Academic Senate Executive Council is reviewing proposals for new committees with specific charges directly related to Accreditation Standards such as Educational Policies, Matriculation Advisory, Student Equity Strategies, Works of Art, Learning Communities & Career Pathways, Student Grade and File Committee and others.

IV.A.1. Self Evaluation. Since the inception of shared governance, the college had clearly written policies that delineated roles and responsibilities of all constituents in the decision-making process with formal structures for participation by staff, faculty, administrators, and students that facilitated cross-constituent communication. However, the College had difficulty maintaining a central repository of agendas, minutes and other records. The process was nonetheless mysterious and cumbersome to some, and some groups lost sight of the fact that shared governance was advisory and thought it was their role to make decisions rather than present recommendations to a parent committee or Council.

Although there was typically representation from all stakeholders, and participants worked together and respected one another across all constituent groups, at times some stakeholder groups in attendance were outnumbered on committees. This created an inequitable system where students, the main beneficiaries of much of what is deliberated in participatory governance, were left confused and feeling unsupported. Lacking at times adequate training or notice for student participants and assurance of without a process for equitable representation from all stakeholder groups, a level of distrust sometimes occurred, delaying the completion of committee business.

The fact that students have not been participating in Shared Governance at an optimal level was of particular concern. At one time, students received stipends from Associated Students for their participation, but that was stopped a few years ago and only recently resumed. The workgroup believes that this is a major contributor to the lower participation rates and recommended reinstating this practice of providing students with stipends to boost participation. The Associated Students have reinstated the stipends as of Fall 2012 and will discuss further ways to enhance student contributions to Shared Governance.

The College believes it has addressed the overarching concerns relating to governance structures through the development of the new Participatory Governance system. A number of concerns remain.

For example, the College has not clearly defined procedures for how the two separate systems will interact. Because At the same time, the membership on the Participatory
Governance Council includes elected leaders of each constituency, some are concerned that this continuity in membership from is largely the same as it was in the previous Shared Governance committees system. This may limit the emergence of new perspectives and practices. Others point to the desirability of having top level leaders of constituencies participate ex officio in a top level governance group—regardless of who they may be—in order to attach maximum legitimacy to the advisory input received on important college decisions.

Although the regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning and Budgeting Council and the College Advisory Council were officially suspended during Fall 2012. This has raised concerns that the College has been out of compliance with this Standard. However, the Accreditation Steering Committee served as a de facto governance council during this time given the representation of all constituencies on the Committee and until the Participatory Governance Council membership formed.

Given the streamlining of the Participatory Governance system, fewer individuals will have the opportunity to engage directly through participation in committees. Currently the system encompasses the Participatory Governance Council and four subcommittees. As the Participatory Governance system becomes more established, additional committees and workgroups may emerge which will provide more opportunities to serve.

**IV.A.1. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the advisory roles of Participatory and Collegial Governance systems, Ensure that recommendations be made through proper channels within these systems. Final authority rests with the Board of Trustees without exception.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get council and committee systems underway as soon as possible to ensure compliance with this standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to encourage student participation in Participatory and Collegial Governance systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue governance professional development activities for the college as a whole to support academic democracy and a culture of inclusion in the newly established governance systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore options for increasing opportunities for faculty, staff, students administrators to serve on governance councils and committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and clearly describe and publicize protocol for stakeholders to introduce proposals, concerns and new ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and assess governance systems periodically by conducting college-wide surveys. Expand on most recent survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

IV.A.2. Descriptive Summary. Board Policies 2.07 and 2.08 describe the College’s governance system. Prior to the July 2012 Show Cause determination, only Board Policy 2.07 “Shared Governance Policy” described the Shared Governance system along with then Board Policy 1.04, “Public Access Sunshine Policy,” which pertains to “providing the public with timely and wide-ranging access to its meetings, written records and information,” including meetings of any committees within the governance system.

On November 15, 2012, the Board adopted two new policies to replace the previous version of Board Policy 2.07, one that retains the number of the old policy (2.07) and a new policy numbered 2.08. These revised and new policies grew out of the work that the College undertook as described in Standard IV.A.1. above in assessing its governance system. The new version of Board Policy 2.07, now entitled “City College of San Francisco District Policy on Participatory Governance,” describes how the four constituent groups (faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students) can participate in the decision-making processes of the College. Board Policy 2.07 specifies that administration, students, classified staff, and faculty are equally represented with four members from each group on the Participatory Governance Council and that the Chancellor shall bring recommendations from the Governance Council to the Board of Trustees, including divergent views in the event of lack of substantial unanimity.

Representatives of the Academic Senate and the Administration developed the new Board Policy 2.08 “City College of San Francisco Collegial Governance: Academic Senate” based on Title 5, Section 53200. The Academic Senate has reviewed and made changes to its committees and the procedures for individuals to bring forward and work collaboratively on ideas relating to the purview of the Academic Senate.

On November 15, 2012, the Board of Trustees also replaced BP 1.04 with the new BP 1.16 “Public Access Sunshine Policy.”

[Evidence: BP 20.7]
[Evidence: BP 2.08]
[Evidence: BP 1.16]

IV.A.2. Self Evaluation. Since the inception of the Shared Governance system at City College of San Francisco, the College has had written policies in place. While there has been a genuine commitment of all constituencies to the creation and implementation of a governance system, constituencies generally agree that a lack of clarity existed about the distinction between recommending groups/individuals and decision-making groups/individuals. Many individuals found no clear pathway to bring forward ideas from their constituencies, and students were under-represented on Shared Governance committees. To a certain extent, these issues resulted in a lack of trust within and toward the governance system. Moreover, not all individuals or entities consistently followed the procedures within the Shared Governance Handbook; this included protocols regarding the posting of agendas/minutes/recordings.

Comment [k3]: How does BP 1.16 differ from BP 1.04 other than in the numbering?
The participation of constituent groups in training sessions in Summer and Fall 2012 relating to participatory governance yielded greater understanding of how an ideal system operates, although some groups, such as the Board of Trustees, did not fully participate in the training sessions. The College designed the new and revised policies with the intention of better capturing the spirit of participatory governance and creating greater clarity and levels of trust, specifically addressing the operational flaws outlined in the evaluation report from the ACCJC site visit that took place March 11-15, 2012. The implementation of the new policies is currently taking place, and, while the new system reflects best practice, the College will need to evaluate the effectiveness of the way in which the College puts into practice the new system and its associated committee structure.

IV.A.2. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plan(s) associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing training in governance roles</td>
<td>Biennial presentations on participating effectively in college governance, with the attendance of all governing board members, as well as administrative, faculty, staff, and student leaders. Annual retreat for senior constituency leaders. Participatory Governance Training from ASCCC for Academic Senate President.</td>
<td>?? ASCCC Annual Faculty Leadership Institute each summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete structures and procedures to support BP 2.07</td>
<td>See IV.A.2.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete structures and procedures to support BP 2.08</td>
<td>Procedure for governing board, with the assistance of senior administrative staff, to communicate when it intends to discuss or deliberate on “academic and professional matters”. Procedures for Committees of the Academic Senate. See IV.A.2.b.</td>
<td>February, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine BP 1.16 Public Access Sunshine Policy for applicability to governance structures</td>
<td>???</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate evaluate the effectiveness of the new participatory governance system and associated committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

IV.A.2.a. Descriptive Summary. The response to Standard IV.A. outlines historical issues relating to the role and voice of various constituents in institutional governance. From July 2012 through November 2012, the College developed new structures to define the roles of faculty, administrators, students, and staff in what the College now terms “participatory governance,” as contained within Board Policy 2.07 approved on November 15, 2012. The new policy is intended to clarify the role and level of input that faculty, administrators, staff, and students have in institutional policies, planning, and budget. During Summer and Fall
2012, a time of massive transition both in the governance structure and in the leadership of the College, the Accreditation Steering Committee served as the de facto governance council until the College could fully establish the new Participatory Governance Council (no meetings took place of the College Advisory Council, the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council, the Program Review Committee and several other bodies that had been the mechanisms for members of the constituent groups to participate in institutional governance). The Accreditation Steering Committee includes the leadership of all constituencies.

During this transitional time, the Interim Chancellors also consulted with appropriate administrators, brought issues to meetings of the Chancellor’s cabinet and other administrative meetings, and brought issues to the Accreditation workgroups appointed by the Chancellor with input from constituent leaders. Examples include the following:

- Members of Accreditation Workgroup 3 suggested an adjustment to the Program Review Template. Academic Senate leadership and other faculty and administration had the opportunity to respond to this suggestion and provide additional input.
- Staff associated with the Research and Planning Office and Accreditation Workgroup 7 recommended new administrative positions for the Research and Planning Office.
- Accreditation Workgroup 7 endorsed a proposal to create new associate vice chancellor positions in Academic Affairs. Outside of Workgroup 7, the faculty leadership does not believe they had the opportunity to provide input or feedback.

In addition, the Interim Chancellors also met periodically with leadership of the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, SEIU 1021, and Associated Students to discuss issues and receive input concerning institutional policies, planning and budget relating to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

The College has begun the initial stages of implementing Board Policy 2.07.

To encourage greater student participation in governance structures, Associated Students has reinstated student stipends. However, students who participated in training provided by the Community College League of California and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott Lay and ASCCC President, Michelle Pilati) identified “tension among the separately elected student governments for each of the campuses.”

**IV.A.2.a. Self Evaluation.** While the College’s previous Shared Governance system and its structures were clearly defined, the implementation of these governance structures was not fully effective. The College intends for the new participatory governance system to address the issues that ACCJC and the College itself have identified.

The transition to the new participatory governance system, coupled with changes in College leadership, has been challenging. For example, the College closed the Office of Shared Governance and reassigned the Shared Governance Coordinator to the Downtown Center (which was in need of administrative support). Although meetings of Shared Governance committees were generally on hold, some committees continued to meet and did not know to whom agendas, minutes and other committee information should be sent for posting online. The College needed clearer communication about expectations regarding institutional governance during the transitional time from July to November 2012. Going forward, the Chancellor’s Office will be maintaining a Participatory Governance website to post agendas,
minutes, and other committee information and will need to ensure that communication about this is clear.

Moreover, the utilization of the Accreditation Steering Committee as the de facto participatory governance council during the transitional time was may have been reasonable in that the Steering Committee includes leaders from all constituencies. On the other hand, managers and trustees make up about half the membership on the Committee and only 1 in 27 members is a student. The Chancellor leads five workgroups and chairs the steering committee. Faculty members co-lead 2 out of the 15 groups. This is a departure from past self-evaluation steering committees in which faculty typically co-chaired groups for all standards, and also co-chaired the steering committee. However, changes in the scheduling of the Steering Committee and its feeder workgroup meetings have at times resulted in students and faculty being challenged to attend these meetings due to conflicts with classes.

In addition, the procedures for faculty, classified staff, and students to provide input into decisions normally taking place through the governance system have been inconsistent during this transitional time. In some cases, the old systems continued to operate to provide opportunities for constituent groups to provide input, and in some cases, transitional ad hoc processes have provided appropriate opportunities for input. In other cases, however, appropriate opportunities for input have been lacking. Some have expressed that the institution’s governance is more top-down than it once was, with a perception that decisions are made only at the top with little consideration given to the degree of dissention, and with some decisions perhaps made even at a system level and only implemented locally. Evidence: special trustee’s contract. During this transitional time, the Interim Chancellors presented some significant institutional policies, planning, and budget issues to the Board of Trustees. Constituent groups felt that they were not included in a formal review process with respect to these issues, and specifically did not have sufficient opportunity to:

- Review the revised Mission Statement Draft in its entirety.
- Review the 2012-13 Budget.
- Provide input into the proposal to alter all instructional departmental structures, the numbers of instructional department chairs and deans, the affiliations of departments in schools, and the duties of deans and department chairs.

While student participation theoretically should increase as a result of reinstating student stipends, Associated Students will need to assess whether this takes place. In addition, Associated Students will need to resolve issues relating to the tension the separately elected student governments at each Center are experiencing.

**IV.A.2.a. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish process of putting new participatory governance into place.</td>
<td>Set guidelines for meeting day and times and committee conduct of business, Revise web presence for committee materials, Identify process for posting agendas, minutes, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures need to be established for each</td>
<td>Write committee self-evaluation procedures and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [k5]: Are there any plans in place to address this?
committee to assess and evaluate their work | recommend timelines
---|---
Evaluation of participatory system needs to be planned, conducted, completed and results published | Collect information on levels of participation by constituency group, clarity of governance role, and access to information. Assess effectiveness of input by constituency, governance role, availability of communication.

Effective student governance structures need to be put into place
Obtain and include appropriate input for reorganization of instruction departments before it is implemented | Dialogue with constituency groups, including students, regarding the proposed system. Examine and analyze workload issues
Assess impact of structural reorganizations on student outcomes, achievements and completions

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.

IV.A.2.b. Descriptive Summary. The policy for this standard has been revised. It had been a part of the old Board Policy 2.07 but is now a stand-alone policy, Board Policy 2.08, adopted by the Board of Trustees on November 15, 2012. In both the old BP 2.07 and the new BP 2.08, the Board elects to rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all academic and professional areas defined by Title 5, Section 53200:

- Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
- Degree and certificate requirements
- Grading policies
- Educational program development
- Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
- District and College governance structures, as related to faculty roles
- Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
- Policies for faculty professional development activities
- Processes for program review
- Processes for institutional planning and budget development
- Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Academic Senate

Other faculty structures that the institution relies on for recommendations about student learning programs and services include

- **Curriculum Committee.** Includes 18 faculty, six administrators, two students, and one classified member, all of whom are appointed by constituent groups. It reviews and determines the academic merit of curriculum proposals, as well as ensuring that they conform to the requirements and guidelines for form and style. Recent (Fall 2012) actions include reviewing program-level outcomes and the mapping of courses to

Comment [khc6]: Review submission from Karen on Dec 27, appear to have cut out too much and need to revisit. Academic Senate made many structural changes in response to Recommendation 12; need to make sure we reflect this somewhere, if not here.
program-level SLOs for every instructional program in both credit and noncredit offered by the College.

- **Bipartite Committee on Graduation Requirements.** Includes the Executive Council of the Academic Senate and Academic Administrators. Makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees on associate degree policies and on the addition of specific courses into area graduation requirements. Recent actions (Fall 2012) include reviewing General Education Outcomes (GEOs) and the mapping of GEOs to draft Institutional Learning Outcomes. The committee made recommendations and plans for GEO assessments.

- **Department Chairs.** Multiple roles include providing primary day-to-day responsibility for coordinating the work of other faculty; providing resources and making recommendations to foster program success and development; collaborating with groups and individuals within the college and out in the community to implement discipline-specific improvements to student learning programs and services; and serving as a resource to students and faculty to foster student success. Recent (Fall 2012) actions relating to student learning programs and services include:
  - writing and submitting plans for SLO assessment for every course being offered;
  - submitting outcome mapping for every Program SLO and GE applicable course;
  - coordinating assessment, gap analysis and improvements for SLOs;
  - fostering SLO professional development and dialogue within and among departments;
  - documenting SLO activity online;
  - researching and correcting data for program review and submitted reports in accordance with new requirements; and
  - responding to a proposal approved by the Board of Trustees on October 25, 2012 to alter all departmental structures, the numbers of department chairs and deans, the affiliations of departments in schools, and the duties of deans and department chairs.

**IV.A.2.b. Self Evaluation.** The new Board Policy 2.08 has not changed the fundamental decision of the Board of Trustees to rely primarily on recommendations concerning the academic and professional matters articulated in Title 5 Section 53200. Instances of the misunderstanding of this policy were documented in the report of the March 15th ACCJC visiting team.

In July and August 2012, members of the Board of Trustees and members of the Academic Senate participated in training opportunities provided at City College by the ACCJC, by the Association of Community Colleges Trustees, and sessions provided jointly by the Community College League of California and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (facilitated by CCLC President, Scott Lay, and ASCCC President, Michelle Pilati). It is hoped that improved understanding on both sides will lead to more productive relations.

However, faculty concerns remain about the extent to which they have had the opportunity to
provide input into the recent restructuring of the Academic Affairs Division. The following statement captures their concerns:

“A proposal for restructuring Academic Affairs was adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 25th. The proposal to alter the structure of departments and the role of chairs was made public only three days before the Board meeting. The authors of that proposal did not invite input from the Academic Senate, members of the faculty, nor from the academic deans. Although members of the Academic Senate were provided with an opportunity to speak about the proposal at 12:30 am when the Board considered it, the brief discussion of the Trustees before adopting the proposal did not acknowledge concerns raised by members of the Academic Senate. Members of the Academic Senate perceive this decision of great magnitude made in three days with insufficient evidence and no input from constituent groups as an action that is out of compliance with numerous accreditation standards, including I.B.3, I.B.4, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, and IV.A.3.”

IV.A.2.b. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet accreditation standards for governance.</td>
<td>Pervasively apply the standards, such as setting goals, basing decisions on evidence, and working collaboratively.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information to Board of Trustees about effectiveness in encouraging and supporting participatory governance</td>
<td>Survey for constituent groups to offer input on Board performance in accordance with BP 1.23</td>
<td>May, 2013?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding of governance roles</td>
<td>Board/Constituent Leadership retreat</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess effectiveness of Department Chair Structures</td>
<td>For Academic Affairs, employ same process used for Student Development — set goals, collect evidence of impacts on student learning, conduct focus groups, collaborate in the proposal of improvements.</td>
<td>March, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Effectiveness of Participatory Governance</td>
<td>Conduct full scale evaluation of participatory governance structures</td>
<td>May, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

IV.A.3. Descriptive Summary. Per Board Policy 2.07, the new Participatory Governance Council has begun meeting regularly with multiple representatives from each constituent group to discuss and represent ideas from their constituents with the Chancellor. [Participatory Governance Council agendas and minutes] In addition, the overarching
Participatory Governance Council and the Chancellor have created Standing Committees, each of which include a Chancellor-appointed Chair; constituent groups will be naming representatives for these Standing Committees. [Board policy 2.07] While the committees are being developed, the accreditation workgroups have taken over some of the advisory functions of discontinued committees under the previous shared governance structure. These Standing Committees include the following four Standing Committees: Enrollment Management, Accreditation, Planning, and Diversity. At this time, the Accreditation Committee currently has 15 Subcommittees (Steering Committee Workgroups) and the Planning Committee has seven proposed Subcommittees (Annual Plan/Budget/Program Review, Educational Master Plan, Human Resources Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Sustainability, and Program Review). The Subcommittees are subject to change depending on the College’s needs. For example, the 15 Subcommittees reporting to the Accreditation Committee may evolve in the coming years as the College reorganizes itself to continue meeting the Accreditation Standards.

Theoretically, feeding into the Participatory Council and its associated committees will be proposals from the Administrators’ Association, Classified Senate, Academic Senate, and Associated Students Executive Board, all of which meet regularly to discuss relevant policies and issues in alignment with institutional priorities. [evidence: representative agendas]

The Academic Senate will continue to have a number of committees reporting directly to its Executive Council, in a flatter committee structure under its new reorganization.

The Chancellor takes recommendations from the Participatory Governance Council to the Board of Trustees when necessary for the Board’s discussion and approval. The Chancellor will refer recommendations not subject to Board of Trustee approval to the administrator(s) with authority over a given area for implementation.

Communication from these governance structures, including the constituent groups, to the larger CCSF audience takes place through the posting of agendas, meeting times, and other information on the appropriate sections of CCSF’s website as well as through email communications and meetings with constituent stakeholders. Policies, procedures, and updates for these processes are available online as well. [evidence: website, sample documents, sample emails from all groups]

The purpose underlying all activities, including discussions and communication, of the Participatory Governance entities is to continually improve the College and its impact on students.

IV.A.3. Self Evaluation. The previous Shared Governance system was large and inefficient, often holding up important issues with limited administrator authority and effectiveness. Students have been generally insufficiently informed about governance structures and ways to get involved with the Participatory Governance process; some have indicated that there was not enough student representation built into the institutional governance, which the new Participatory Governance process should mitigate. Similarly, some classified staff members have felt disenfranchised in the institutional governance structure both in terms of participation and communication. [evidence: 2012 Shared Governance Evaluation; Shared Governance Appointment Roster]
Historically and recently, many constituents feel that there is not enough communication on a school-wide level and that they are not adequately informed of the governance and future of the school. [evidence: Student Focus Group Report; others?] Some governance structures have not regularly posted minutes, agendas, or meetings online, further exacerbating the general concern about the lack of communication.

The current Participatory Governance system is in the early stages of implementation, and the College cannot yet analyze its effectiveness overall or with respect to how well it promotes a forum in which everyone can work together for the good of the institution.

**IV.A.3. Actionable Improvement Plans.** The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans associated with this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create effective communication with constituents through online posting.</td>
<td>Re-design Participatory Governance website with input from all constituent groups to ensure usability.</td>
<td>Summer 2014 public debut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all constituents understand and utilize established governance structures.</td>
<td>Implement FLEX day governance structure training for all faculty, staff and administrators.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure effective communication from governance structures to all constituent groups.</td>
<td>Outreach to constituent groups to locate weaknesses and breakdowns in two-way communication. Address these with improved e-mail and web communications schoolwide.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure full accessibility of public documents from all governance structures.</td>
<td>Post all agendas, meetings and other public documents to websites in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure constituent participation in Participatory Governance.</td>
<td>Conduct outreach and evaluation to fill all vacancies at least once a semester.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 evaluation and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

**IV.A.4. Descriptive Summary.** Upon notice of ACCJC’s Show Cause determination, the College immediately assembled workgroups to address the ACCJC Recommendations. The October 15 Special Report captured the plans for, and in many cases, the initial progress made on, responding to the 14 Recommendations based on the activities of the workgroups. The changes the College is implementing as documented in this new Self Evaluation better address the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Standards, policies, and guidelines. Of particular note is the CCSF Board of Trustees’ passage of a new policy with the title, “Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 21, Standard IV.B.1.i” on October 25, 2012. [Policy Manual 1.33] The College is not only addressing the deficiencies noted by the 2006 evaluation team and those noted by the 2012 evaluation team in July 2012, but also additional deficiencies discovered during the Self Evaluation activities that have taken place since July 2012.
The College is especially concerned with honestly communicating all deficiencies relating to the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Standards, policies, and guidelines. In that spirit, in its October 15 Special Report, the College noted a deficiency related to substantive change. Specifically, in December 2011, the College prepared a substantive change proposal for submission to ACCJC concerning a shift in the percentage of online instruction offered. The College never submitted the proposal due to administrative transitions, and it is aware that this is a requirement it must address.

With respect to public disclosure of the College’s accreditation status, the College immediately posted on its website the July 2012 ACCJC determination and has continued to update all accreditation information on the website, including making available the October 15 Special Report and March 15 Show Cause Report. By posting all accreditation information on its website, and given the focused media attention on the College’s accreditation status, other accrediting agencies have had access to this information. These entities include the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), the California Board of Registered Nurses, State Fire Training, and the National Registry (Emergency Medical Technician and paramedic training). The College specifically provided information directly to the Commission on Dental Accreditation, and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology conducted a special site visit to CCSF in the wake of the accreditation determination having been released.

IV.A.4. Self Evaluation. To fully exhibit honesty and integrity in its relationship with the accrediting commission and other external agencies, the College must first be honest with itself. To that end, the College has begun to engage in honest and at times difficult, if not conflicting, assessments of its own policies, procedures, and practices. The actions the College has taken since July 2012 testify to its ability to mobilize quickly to move toward achieving a common goal of better meeting all ACCJC requirements. This Self Evaluation attempts to capture progress made as honestly as possible, acknowledging where necessary that differing perspectives remain along with work that the College must continue to carry out.

Despite the institution’s efforts at educating the College community about the Show Cause determination and the associated shortcomings, members of the College community have at times, perhaps unintentionally or in an effort to help the College, communicated misleading information in a variety of venues about ACCJC and its findings. The College recognizes that these actions, however well-intentioned they might be, undermine the College’s efforts to maintain an honest relationship with ACCJC and the community about accreditation issues.

IV.A.4. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans for this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in more regular and consistent communication to the college community about accreditation and associated actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase participation by members of the college community in ACCJC-sponsored events and trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nominate members of the College community to participate in accreditation site visits in an ongoing manner

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.

IV.A.5. Descriptive Summary. The College evaluated the Shared Governance system bi-annually through an online Shared Governance questionnaire. However, there was a gap from 2007 to 2012 in which the evaluation did not occur bi-annually. In prior years, College Advisory Council members reviewed the survey results, which the College also shared with the entire college community as well as the Board of Trustees.

The College conducted the most recent evaluation in Spring 2012, the College conducted an evaluation of its Shared Governance system. This evaluation occurred after the College submitted the Self Study but prior to issuance of the Show Cause sanction.

After the Show Cause sanction, the workgroup responsible for addressing ACCJC Recommendations 12 and 13 took into consideration the results of the Spring 2012 evaluation while also gathering additional data and input. The review resulted in the new Participatory Governance system.

With respect to evaluating the role of leadership in the institution beyond Participatory Governance, the Board evaluates the Chancellor annually per Board Policy 1.24. Board Policy 1.24 pertains to the Board’s self evaluation, which will now occur annually during Summer. See also the response to Standard IV.B.1.

IV.A.5. Self Evaluation. While the College has conducted evaluations of the role of leadership and the governance system, it has struggled to conduct these evaluations regularly and to make improvements based on the evaluation results. This has been particularly true for evaluations of the governance system and the Board of Trustees. The Principles of the Participatory Governance system as detailed in Board Policy 2.07 include a focus on evaluation. Moreover, the new Participatory Governance Council is charged with regularly assessing its accomplishments and outcomes. Given that this is a new system, the College will have to assess the extent to which this takes place going forward.

IV.A.5. Actionable Improvement Plans. The table below summarizes the actionable improvement plans for this Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Goals and Actions for Recommendation IV.A.5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop evaluation process for new participatory governance model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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