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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

NOTE: The organization of Standard IV.B.1 begins with a descriptive summary of each subsection and then discusses all subsections within one self evaluation.
Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.a. As described in CCSF Board Policies 1.01, 1.02, and 1.17, the CCSF Board of Trustees is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions and that acts as a whole once it reaches a decision.

[BP 1.01, BP 1.02, BP 1.17]

Beginning in July 2012 and in the following months, the Board participated in various training activities and presentations on board roles and responsibilities. Dr. Barbara Beno, ACCJC President, and William McGinnis, Butte-Glenn Community College District Trustee, facilitated a three-hour workshop on the topic of accreditation, covering its purposes, processes, and standards; the roles and responsibilities of trustees; and advice for board excellence. Subsequently, Dr. Narcisa Polonio, Vice President of Board Services for the Association of Community College Trustees, facilitated a two-part retreat designed to enhance board performance. The focus was on roles and responsibilities of the Board, a Board Self-Assessment, and the drafting of Board goals. During these events, Board members expressed concerns, and at times disagreed with presenters and each other, about their role and conduct. As evidenced by the Board’s own self evaluation, the Board has begun demonstrating greater awareness about its performance. The Board President and Vice President also attended a ACCT conference in Boston during Fall 2012.

The Board goals for 2012-13 are:

1. Ensure appropriate responses to the recommendations of the Accrediting Commission.
3. Support the acquisition of a stable, highly qualified senior leadership team.
4. Conduct a comprehensive review of board policies related to board organization and operation, administrative authority, and Participatory Governance.
5. Implement a professional development plan for the Board of Trustees that leads to increased board effectiveness and a cohesive and collegial team.
6. Do whatever it takes to save City College and best serve our students and community!

These goals are consistent with the Board’s responsibility for advocating for the institution, and the Board has been working toward completing these goals.

evidence: December 13 Board meeting handout

The self-evaluation section of this Standard addresses the extent to which “the governing board advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.”

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.b. Given ACCJC’s findings that the College could not sustain its mission statement as written at the time of the 2012 Self Study, the CCSF Board of Trustees revised the Mission Statement in Fall 2012 that now emphasizes a focus on student achievement, student learning outcomes, and links to resource allocation processes.

[BP 1.00 DISTRICT VISION AND MISSION STATEMENT]

In Board Policy 1.00, the Board has also included a statement about conducting an annual review of the mission statement. The Board Goals and Board priorities for the Annual Plan 2012-13 focus on meeting the accreditation recommendations, providing quality programs,
and obtaining fiscal stability, all of which are in line with the current mission. Following the revision of Board Policy 1.00, the Board revised Section 1 of the Board Policy Manual as well as prioritizing other policies relating to governance and the role of the Academic Senate that needed to be revised to meet ACCJC’s Recommendations and ultimately provide for meeting the mission of the College. Because the revision of the mission was the first policy that the Board of Trustees revised, the Board’s subsequent revisions reflect changes to the mission. With the guidance of Dr. Betty Inclan, the consultant assisting with Standard II, the College is continuing to review its policies within Section 6 of the Board Policy Manual (Instructional Programs), and the Board of Trustees will be adopting revisions throughout Spring 2013.

**Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.c.** The responsibility of the Board for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity is defined in Board Policy 1.02, Powers and Duties of the Board.

In September 2012, the Board began reviewing all of its policies related to Board Organization, and the Board adopted new and revised policies in October 2012. Board Policy 1.02, Powers and Duties of the Board, describes the role of the governing board as follows:

- Determine broad general policies, plans and procedures to guide its officers and employees;
- Establish administrative policies by which authority and responsibility for services will be defined and determined;
- Conduct all business in open and public meetings, except in those matters as specified by the Brown Act and the Education Code that may be dealt with in Closed Sessions;
- Select, hire and evaluate the District’s chief executive officer, the Chancellor;
- Deliberate with its chief executive officer upon matters initiated by its own members and grant or withhold its approval of proposals brought before it by its executive officer by application of the principle of pre-audit;
- Focus on deliberations on policy determination, broad District planning, hiring and evaluation of the Chancellor, and maintaining fiscal stability;
- Be responsible for developing a balanced annual budget;
- Determine and control the District’s operations and capital outlay budgets;
- Delegate authority in all administrative matters to the Chancellor, including, but not limited to, hiring or promotion of specific individuals;
- Approve construction contracts and contracts for services and equipment in conformance with the Education Code and Public Contract Code;
- Evaluate and criticize, and by veto, correct and revise policies and actions as need may arise as provided for in Section 1.05.; and
- Order elections as authorized by the Education Code.

Other policies which specifically relate to the duties of the board and their conduct include the following:
Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.d. The Board Policy Manual is published on the City College website, which the College updates when new policies are adopted or amended. Several sections of the Board Policy Manual are still outdated and are in need of review. The following policies specify the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures:

- BP 1.01 Election and Membership
- BP 1.02 Powers and Duties of the Board
- BP 1.03 Organization of the Board
- BP 1.04 Officers – Duties
- BP 1.05 Regular Meetings of the Board
- BP 1.06 Closed Sessions
- BP 1.07 Special and Emergency Meetings
- BP 1.08 Quorum and Voting
- BP 1.09 Agendas
- BP 1.10 Public Participation at Board Meetings
- BP 1.11 Speakers at Board Meetings
- BP 1.12 Decorum
- BP 1.13 Minutes of Meetings
- BP 1.14 Recording Meetings
- BP 1.15 Policies and Administrative Procedures

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.e. As noted in the response to Standard IV.B.1.a., the Board engaged in a variety of training workshops focused on their role and responsibilities in response to Recommendation 14 of the ACCJC that “the board act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws.” These trainings included a focus on professional codes of conduct. The self evaluation for Standard IV.B.1. addresses this further.

As described in sections above, the Board has begun the regular evaluation of its policies beginning with Board Policy Manual Section 1 on Board Organization. The College has also
revised other sections that pertain directly to accreditation recommendations, including Board Policy 2.07 and 2.08 on Participatory Governance and Collegial Governance with the Academic Senate. As noted above, a consultant is reviewing Board Policy Manual Section 6, Instructional Programs, for its currency and effectiveness.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.f. In response to ACCJC’s recommendation that the Board of Trustees “develop and implement a plan for board development,” Board members participated in several training workshops as noted above. In addition, in October 2012, the Board adopted a new policy and a professional development plan for continuous improvement.

[BP 1.35]
[Board’s professional development plan]

In January 2013, six of the seven Board members participated in the California Community College League Effective Trusteeship Workshop. The Board President and two additional trustees also participated in the League’s Board Chair Workshop as well as in an accreditation workshop organized by the California Community College League and the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges in February.

The Interim Chancellors met with two new Board members to provide them with an orientation and materials published by the California Community College League as well as accreditation information from the CCSF Chancellor’s Office. In the case of Rodrigo Santos, Dr. Pamila Fisher provided the orientation (the Mayor of San Francisco appointed Trustee Santos to replace the late Milton Marks; Trustee Santos served until December 31, 2012). Subsequently, Rafael Mandelman was elected to the Board in November 2012; Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman provided his orientation.

The members of the Board of Trustees are elected at large by the voters of San Francisco. The seven publicly elected Trustees serve four-year terms; the terms are staggered so that a subset of Board members’ terms expire every two years. Board members serve four-year terms with the exception of the Student Trustee, who is elected for a one-year term. Trustees are not subject to term limits.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.g. Board Policy 1.23, “Board Self Evaluation,” specifies that the Board will conduct a self-assessment process every summer. In August 2012, the Board participated in a two-day retreat conducted by Narcisa Polonio in which the Board evaluated its performance and conduct with respect to its roles and responsibilities. Based on this self assessment, the Board developed its professional development plan. The purpose of the retreat was also to provide guidance on how to improve the Board’s internal relationships and dialogue to better advocate for the institution.

In October 2012, the Board adopted revisions to streamline the existing Board Policy on self evaluation (BP 1.23).

[BP 1.23 BOARD SELF EVALUATION]

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.h. The following governing board policies pertain to a code of ethics:

- BP 1.17 Governing Board Code of Ethics and Responsibilities
- BP 1.18 Institutional Code of Ethics
BP 1.19 Conflict of Interest

The self evaluation for Standard IV.B.1. addresses the extent to which the Board adheres to these policies.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.i. When the Accreditation Steering Committee formed in July 2012, the Board President and Vice President were appointed to serve as the Board constituent representatives. Every month, the Accreditation Liaison Officer provides accreditation updates to the Board. In addition, Board members volunteered to serve on various workgroups addressing the ACCJC’s 14 Recommendations; participation levels varied. As referred to above, Dr. Barbara Beno, President of ACCJC, facilitated a workshop for Board members regarding accreditation and the Board’s responsibilities in relationship to accreditation. The President of the Board of Trustees also participated in the accreditation institute of the California Community College League and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges that took place in February 2013.

Descriptive Summary of IV.B.1.j. Per Board Policies 1.24 and 1.25, the Board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor of City College of San Francisco. Board policy specifies that the Board delegate to the Chancellor the full administrative authority to implement and administer Board policies. Most recently, the Board selected and hired Interim Chancellors Dr. Pamila Fisher and Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman. The self evaluation for Standard IV.B.1. addresses the extent to which the Board adheres to these policies.

IV.B.1.a-j, Self Evaluation. While the Board has sufficient policies in place that inform its conduct, roles, and responsibilities, and has received training in widely established best practices for governing boards, the Board is still struggling with the following specific aspects of its own code of ethics and responsibilities as contained within BP 1.17:

- Code of Ethics Items 1 and 2. Board meetings provide examples of how Trustees, while clear in their commitment to providing high-quality education, at times resist fiscal limitations by favoring particular interest groups over the institution as a whole. In some cases, even after the Board has arrived at a decision, individual Board members have publicly expressed viewpoints that contradict the Board decision.

- Code of Ethics Item 3. The Board of Trustees generally functions better as a team since receiving the Show Cause sanction and subsequent training evidenced by unanimous voting on all issues since the August 2012 Board meeting, with the exception of the vote to request that the State Chancellor’s Office place a Special Trustee on the CCSF Board. However, the tone of Board meetings is often still disrespectful. While the Board seeks to remain informed, members at times seek and rely on information from particular groups or individuals other than the Chancellor.

- Code of Ethics Item 5. Board members have not always maintained confidentiality of privileged information.
• **Code of Ethics Items 6 and 7.** Disrespectful communication at Board meetings continues. This is particularly true when deliberation about controversial issues takes place.

• **Code of Ethics Item 8.** Board meetings do not always follow Board Policy 1.10 with respect to time limitations and the process regarding public input.

In recognition of its challenges, the Board unanimously approved the acceptance of Dr. Robert Agrella as Special Trustee in October 2012. This individual has been working closely with the Board and the Chancellor to continue addressing the issues noted above with the goal of meeting the ACCJC Accreditation Standards and addressing the FCMAT findings.

The Board has also continued to have limited success in delegating authority for implementing and administering Board policies to the Chancellor, per Board Policy 1.25. At times, the Trustees continue to undermine the Chancellor’s authority to execute Board directives by publicly questioning or not supporting the decisions that they made as a Board.

In addition, individual Board members sometimes attempt to micromanage aspects of the College’s operations by contacting the Chancellor and other administrators directly with special requests. Board meetings continue to focus on the implementation of policies, which draws Board members into discussing a level of detail that is neither appropriate nor effective and results in meetings continuing late into the night, and, on several occasions, into the next day.

By approving the plans contained within the October 15 Special Report, the Board has created a pathway to realizing the priorities it has set for 2012-13. This work is still in progress but holds promise for completion if the Board is able to withstand public pressure.

The Board had little turnover for a number of years, and then gained several new members in quick succession four a few years ago, and has had little turnover since. This led to a divided Board that has struggled to become a cohesive team. This has perpetuated an undercurrent of distrust, which sets the tone for the governance system overall. The Board’s failure to provide appropriate financial oversight to the district during the economic downturn severely damaged the College. Recently, a new Trustee was elected to the Board. It is hoped this new member will bring vitality and fresh perspectives.

**IV.B.1.a-j. 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>Continue training with external agencies such as CCLC, AACC, ACCJC, and ACCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Board development plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue reviewing and updating Board policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

NOTE: The organization of Standard IV.B.2 begins with a descriptive summary of each subsection and then discusses all subsections within one self evaluation.

IV.B.2. Descriptive Summary. Per Board Policy 1.25 and as specified in the Chancellor’s contract, the Chancellor has administrative authority to implement and administer Board policies. With this directive, the Chancellor is ultimately responsible for the quality of the College, which relies on effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

BP 1.25 Chief Administrator: Authority, Selection, and Term of Office

IV.B.2a. Descriptive Summary. Since April 2012, City College of San Francisco has experienced significant leadership changes. Dr. Don Q. Griffin, who had served as Chancellor for four years, retired earlier than expected due to illness. The Board of Trustees immediately moved to identify and appoint an Interim Chancellor to serve the College while it prepared for a permanent Chancellor search. In May 2012, the Board appointed Dr. Pamila Fisher as Interim Chancellor, who only agreed to stay until October 31, 2012. The Board suspended plans to continue the permanent Chancellor search after receiving the ACCJC Show Cause determination in July, with the recognition that finding a qualified candidate for the permanent Chancellor position would be challenging under the circumstances.

With Interim Chancellor Fisher’s departure scheduled for the end of October, the Board appointed Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, who had been serving as Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Services, as Interim Chancellor for a one-year period beginning on November 1, 2012.
Confounding the turnover in Chancellors, when Interim Chancellor Fisher came on board, there were a number of interim senior-level administrators as a result of a large number of retirements of long-term administrators that occurred in 2010. Dr. Fisher hired three retired community college CEOs to help the College address the ACCJC Recommendations and to mitigate the loss of seasoned leadership. Members of the College community and leadership have been uneasy about the hiring of consultants to fulfill various roles and have questioned the underlying motives for bringing these individuals on board.

During Interim Chancellor Fisher’s appointment, she began reorganizing the administration in response to the ACCJC Recommendation 7 regarding administrative capacity and FCMAT findings to ensure that an appropriate structure is in place to administer all aspects of the College to support the purpose (mission), size, and complexity of the institution.

In carrying out the plans for administrative change as described in the October 15 Special Report, the Board approved the following organizational change:

- The Chancellor’s Office direct reports now include three Vice Chancellor positions (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Finance/Administration) as well as a number of deans and other administrators responsible for overarching institutional areas. (October 2012)
  [http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix_C.pdf]

- Direct reports to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs now include three Associate Vice Chancellors. In addition, the College has separated responsibilities of School Deans from Center Deans. (October 2012)
  [http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix%20D.pdf]

- The College will reduce FTE allocations for Department Chairs to incur cost savings in response to FCMAT recommendations and ACCJC’s general concerns about administrative capacity and authority; in light of this, selected responsibilities will shift from the Department Chairs to the School and Center Deans. (October 2012)
  [http://www.ccsf.edu/BOT/2012/October25/Appendix%20D.pdf]

- The Vice Chancellor of Student Development will directly oversee all four deans within the division, which include the Dean for Matriculation and Counseling Services; the Dean of Admissions, Records, and Outreach; the Dean of Financial Services and Scholarship; and the Dean of Students Affairs and Wellness.

- All counselors will report to the Dean for Matriculation and Counseling Services (until now, counselors reported to three different deans)

At the outset of Interim Scott-Skillman’s appointment, she directed Human Resources to develop job descriptions with more authority and clarity of responsibility for administrators as part of the organizational restructuring. The College is undergoing a massive hiring process for all of the administrative positions within the Division of Academic Affairs given the changes in authority and responsibility of those positions. All current administrators in Academic Affairs have been given notice that their positions will end in June, 2013. The
Division of Student Development has also begun a hiring process in line with the changes made to its structure. In both Divisions, the hiring process began with the posting of the Vice Chancellor positions. While administrators currently serving in each Division are encouraged to apply for positions for which they qualify, the search is national in scope. The Division of Finance and Administration will undergo a review beginning in February 2013. The College will revisit the organization of the Chancellor’s Division in Summer 2013.

The Chancellor has also been working with Legal Counsel to develop contracts for administrators. Until now, the Board has granted administrators rolling three-year contracts on the basis of satisfactory annual performance evaluations, but administrators have never received a written contract detailing the terms of their employment. The College is currently reviewing practices relating to the evaluation of administrators as well.

[contracts or new evaluation procedures as evidence]

IV.B.2.b Descriptive Summary. The focus of the Interim Chancellors has, by necessity, been on resolving the fiscal crisis and responding to the ACCJC Show Cause determination. This context has driven the priorities of the Interim Chancellors as they carry out their obligations as the chief administrator of the College. Doing so has included making dramatic changes within an institution that has had a long-standing, independent, and, at times, isolated, culture for over 20 years. Institutional planning has been a key focus given that integrated planning and resource allocation must serve as a foundation for all decision making and resulting actions within the College.

One of the first activities that Interim Chancellor Fisher undertook was to add resources to the Research and Planning Office to begin increasing staffing that better serves institutional needs. At the same time, the Research and Planning staff were charged with establishing an integrated, data-informed planning and budgeting system that incorporates Student Learning Outcomes. In concert with this, the Division of Academic Affairs was also charged with responding fully to the ACCJC requirements regarding the development, documentation, assessment, and evaluation of SLOs. Subsequently, Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman assigned an SLO Coordinator to continue leading and guiding this effort.

Interim Chancellor Fisher established a new process for participatory governance with the goal of creating a collegial process for discussing matters pertaining to institutional priorities, policies, planning, and budget development. The Participatory Governance Council first convened under Dr. Scott-Skillman’s direction.

Both Interim Chancellors have communicated Collegewide on the status of the institution, its priorities, and goals to remain accredited. To ensure that administrators can carry out College priorities and in response to ACCJC Recommendations, the Interim Chancellors have implemented a series of professional development workshops on a variety of management topics for the management team which includes administrators and classified managers.

IV.B.2.c. Descriptive Summary. Board Policy 1.25 and the Chancellor’s contract direct the Chancellor to carry out the mission of the College by implementing and administering Board policies. In the recent past, the previous Chancellors did not always take action that was consistent with the Chancellor’s own role, the role of the Board, policies, and the governance structure. For example, the process that led to the development of the “Blueprint of College-
Wide Policy and Implementation Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection” was not consistent with policies and procedures.

[evidence: Blueprint document and email communications regarding concerns about the process]

The primary focus for the Interim Chancellors has been to respond to the fiscal crisis and ACCJC Show Cause determination. With this in mind, the Interim Chancellors have focused on reviewing institutional policies and procedures to ensure that actual practices align with these policies and procedures and are consistent with the mission of the College and meet the ACCJC Standards. As pointed out in the ACCJC evaluation report and further reflected on by the accreditation workgroups, the Interim Chancellors have noted a number of cases in which the College has not been in compliance with its own policies and procedures. Constituent groups have also raised concerns about recent Board actions they believe to be out of compliance with the governance process.

IV.B.2.d. Descriptive Summary. Working with the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, a key focus of the Interim Chancellors has been on addressing the fiscal crisis by implementing FCMAT and ACCJC recommendations to ensure a return to fiscal stability. The Chancellor has taken a number of steps to reduce costs as is outlined in Standard III.D., Financial Resources.

IV.B.2.e. Descriptive Summary. Given the current crisis mode of the College, the Interim Chancellors have focused efforts on working closely with the San Francisco Mayor’s Office and other agencies including donors to keep them apprised of the status of the institution and to enlist their continued support. Historically, the Chancellor’s level of engagement with the community has varied. During the 10-year term of Chancellor Philip R. Day, Jr., there was a high level of engagement with government, business, and educational agencies at the local, state, and national levels. Chancellor Don Q. Griffin focused on developing relationships with local public, private, and community-based organizations representing neighborhoods within the San Francisco Community College District.

The Interim Chancellors have also engaged the support of their statewide and national networks to assist in resolving the fiscal and accreditation issues. Given media attention on the College at this time and declining enrollments, the Interim Chancellors have contracted with two consulting firms to more effectively communicate with the public and current and prospective students. There has been frequent harsh criticism of the public relations effort by members of some constituencies, who have expressed that the college could have done much more to maintain a more positive tone in interviews with the press.

Historically, the Chancellor’s level of engagement with the community has varied. During the 10-year term of Chancellor Philip R. Day, Jr., there was a high level of engagement with government, business, and educational agencies at the local, state, and national levels. Chancellor Don Q. Griffin focused on developing relationships with local public, private, and community-based organizations representing neighborhoods within the San Francisco Community College District.
IV.B.2.a-e. Self Evaluation. The College has experienced an inordinate amount of turnover in its senior leadership beginning with the departure of Chancellor Griffin in May 2012, following on the heels of substantial turnover in senior administrators due to retirements beginning in 2010. Accompanying these personnel changes have been changes in leadership style that have yielded two-way challenges in acculturation and communication. While at the same time fulfilling the core mission of the College, the primary focus for the Interim Chancellors has been to respond to the fiscal crisis and ACCJC Show Cause determination. This challenge and the changes it demands have not been readily accepted by all and at times have met with resistance. The Interim Chancellors have not been successful in fostering mutual trust and open communication between and among constituent groups at the College. The challenge also takes place in a context in which the Board has not yet fully recognized its appropriate role.

At this juncture, the Board of Trustees and Interim Chancellor’s assessment is that the administrative reorganization reflects best practices elsewhere and are in the best interest of the College in order to promote administrative and fiscal soundness. Changes have occurred rapidly; the stringent timeline for enacting these changes has resulted in what some of the internal constituent groups view as insufficient communication. Many do not share the Interim Chancellor’s assessment of excellent administrative adherence to Accreditation Standards. Interim Chancellor Fisher failed to seek any analysis of impacts on student learning and workplace efficiencies, provide citations for so-called best practices, or plan adequately for continuity before restructuring Academic Affairs. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has failed to justify the Administration’s unwillingness to explore alternatives for cost-savings to their plan. The focus on cost-cutting first, and planning after the fact is in direct contradiction to accreditation standards and to the Recommendations from ACCJC. Furthermore, the constant downward-blaming by the Interim administration is shows poor management skills and ineffective leadership. The Administration had stated that decisions reflect “best practices” but has not provided information that indicates what practices are being described as best, nor evidence such as studies, professional literature, or the identification of similar institutions that have found benefits from the practices.

Not only administrators but some members of other constituencies are made uneasy by the wholesale termination of administrators, the demotion of several, preference for hiring retired administrators for Vice Chancellor positions [evidence - job announcements] and changes in their evaluation process. The criticism is that such sweeping actions are leading to increasing instability at the college, such as was criticized by the ACCJC in their finding that CCSF had too many interim positions. Many feel that administrators under such intense pressure are thereby silenced— are made too insecure by this situation to be able to speak freely in normal dialogue about any concerns or differing opinions they may have about matters important to the institution’s survival.

IV.B.2.a-e. 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>Increase communications to keep college on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task with shared goals, values, priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire permanent Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop outcomes to measure effectiveness of administrative structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>