FROM THE INTRO MATTER
p. 7
Organization of the Self Evaluation Process
Kristin, Some kind of honest admission is needed that not all was hunky dory in terms of getting all parts written according to timelines. Also, feel free to say that when the drafts were circulated to constituent groups, the Academic Senate collated feedback from over 200 members of the faculty.

I.B.1. Self Eval
p. 27
Events such as those that took place on September 12 and November 21, 2012 (described above) exemplify dialogue that engages the College at an institutional level as well as at a departmental/programmatic level. However, these types of activities will need to occur more regularly and frequently. In addition, these activities need to and more of the dialogue will move beyond creating and documenting assessment processes and toward the ultimate goal of exchanging ideas on how to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (based on collected data).

The 2013-14 Budget developed during Spring 2013 will demonstrate some strong, transparent connections given a successful implementation of the new process. However, some department chairs and other faculty have not found the process so far to be transparent, largely because the process of ranking priorities based on Program Review is still in the administrative stage; it will enter the Participatory Governance stage in early March.

However, the Academic Senate has raised the following concern:

“Discussion between administrators and others on institutional processes has been very limited in Fall 2012 and early Spring 2013. Communication and discussion was expected to flow through very few individuals, very rapidly, with inadequate notice of meetings and robust documentation of discussion and efforts. Although the October 15 report for the ACCJC was detailed, but, some sections relating to institutional processes represented the input of very few people.

Given the inadequate connection between planning and budgeting, only a few units have used the program review process to gain new resources to make improvements, although there are many departments that have embraced Program Review as a planning tool they could use to internally reallocate their existing resources and implement new services, courses, and resources to improve student learning. Many departments have used these Program Review documents to pursue funding
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from donors. [provide as evidence, examples from program review of how existing budgets have been used to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness]

II.A.2.c. Descriptive Summary.
p. 59
There is non parallel language for noncredit courses. For non credit courses, the following requirements of Title 5 section 55002 (c) (2) are used:
• number of contact hours
• objectives in terms of a specific body of knowledge
• instructional methodology
• examples of assignments and/or activities
• methods of evaluation

KRISTIN, I MAY GET EVEN BETTER LANGUAGE TO GO HERE

ADDITION REFERENCES TO NON CREDIT COMING

II.A.3.a. Descriptive Summary.
P75
At this time, the College does not have a system for evaluating how well students who have completed general education coursework are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors.

KRISTIN, PLEASE REMOVE COMMENT. LERN DOCUMENTATION NOT READY IN TIME FOR THIS REPORT.

II.A.6.b. Descriptive Summary
p. 82
The College is currently engaged in developing a program closure policy. On December 12, [The Academic Senate recommended Policy and Procedures for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance. The administration is currently reviewing these drafts has had this on the agenda on the October 24, November 7, and November 28, 2012 meetings.

Comment [khc1]: Elizabeth Stewart can provide LERN documentation of its process for these assertions. Other programs with similar SLO assessments were not identified by the group.

(from Academic Senate)

Comment [khc2]: Need to update where we are on this.

II.A.6.c. Descriptive Summary.
p. 84
The College website provides information on the College’s mission, instructional programs, support programs, and administration, and can be translated into a number of languages. ….. The College now has a “Webred” working group that has been reviewing the transition from old to new formats and providing support for improving web pages. The College has no ongoing centralized effort to keep webpages current or provide support for improving web pages.

KRISTIN, EMAIL SENT TO YOU AND TO AARON HOLMBERG ABOUT THIS.

II.A.6.c. action plan
p. 85
Identify funding and personnel to support all College units in updating and improving web pages.
II.B.

Almost every one of the edits that the Academic Senate seeks for the current draft of II.B.
stoems from its temporal perspective. II.B. seems to have been written in early November,
2012. It sometimes uses the present tense in talking about how things were done prior to
July, 2012, and it sometimes uses expressions of future or "just beginning" to describe
activities that have occurred since October, 2012. This perspective results in an
inaccurate underreporting of the accomplishment of Student Development, AND it is
very inconsistent with the other standards. In most of the standards, steps taken last week,
even actions that are expected for next week are reported as done. In some of the
other standards, events prior to July, 2012 are treated as history, rather than continuous
with the present. To bring consistency to the Show Cause Report, I think it will be easier
to change II.B. rather than change the others.

Instead of my pointing out all the instances of this problem in II.B, I’ve dipped in and
pulled out some examples.

Thanks,


In response to this recommendation, the College began conducting a comprehensive review and
assessment of all student support services across the entire District, including the Ocean Campus and
all Centers. Some of the findings are as follows:

Why does this not just say “conducted”?

II.B.3.c. Descriptive Summary.

NOW SAYS:
Student Services has made major improvements to the Student Learning Outcomes process during Fall 2012. Each
counseling department within Student Services not only has SLOs in place, but the SLO process is documented and
displayed on a 13-item matrix for each counseling program…. Beginning in Spring 2013, the College centralized SLO
reporting and regularly updates SLOs through the SLO semester reports.

TO BE CONSISTENT WITH OTHER STANDARDS, SHOULD SAY:
Student Services made major improvements to the Student Learning Outcomes process during Fall 2012. Now, each
counseling department within Student Services not only has SLOs in place, but the SLO process is documented and
displayed on a 13-item matrix for each counseling program…. The College now centralizes SLO reporting and
regularly updates SLOs through the SLO semester reports.

II.B.3.c. Self Eval

NOW SAYS:
As noted in the descriptive summary above, a number of changes hold promise for the improvement
of the College’s evaluation of counseling services and continues to provide ample opportunities for
preparing faculty responsible for the advising function, in alignment with the institutional mission
and the Board Planning Priorities. During Fall 2012, counseling units aggressively responded to the
deficiencies in the above areas. All counseling programs have developed SLOs; a majority will reach
proficiency or continuous quality improvement on the WASC rubric by Spring 2013. Regular semester meetings providing a forum for robust dialogue concerning measurement, data analysis, findings, and new ideas for service and productivity will ensure a continuous, integrated cycle of improvement across counseling programs. Regular collection and storage of evidence, and up-to-date web pages including assessment links and updated SLO semester reports showing the progress of each SLO will support a shared and transparent process.

TO BE CONSISTENT WITH OTHER STANDARDS, SHOULD SAY:
As noted in the descriptive summary above, a number of improvements have been made to the College’s evaluation of counseling services, providing ample opportunities for preparing faculty responsible for the advising function, in alignment with the institutional mission and the Board Planning Priorities. During Fall 2012, counseling units aggressively responded to the deficiencies in the above areas. All counseling programs have developed SLOs; a majority have now reached proficiency or continuous quality improvement on the WASC rubric. Regular semester meetings providing a forum for robust dialogue concerning measurement, data analysis, findings, and new ideas for service and productivity ensure a continuous, integrated cycle of improvement across counseling programs. Regular collection and storage of evidence, and up-to-date web pages including assessment links and updated SLO semester reports showing the progress of each SLO now supports a shared and transparent process.

III.A.1./III.A.1.a. Descriptive Summary
p. 134 The Human Resources Department drafts the criteria and job announcements for administrative positions in consultation with the Chancellor and the Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) Officer, with input from other senior administrators where appropriate.

FACTUALLY INACCURATE -> As a courtesy, the Academic Senate also reviews administrative job announcements.

In accordance with the current Administrative Hiring Policy [SEE IN EVIDENCE], the Academic Senate reviews administrative job announcements and provides Human Resources and the Chancellor with recommendations and suggestions.

Current Hiring doc is online at:
http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/ccsf/images/academic_senate/AS_Docs/Committees/1-AdministrativeHiring.pdf

p. 135 These processes yield faculty and administrators who are highly qualified professionals chosen for their qualifications and competence. The College employs over 800 full-time faculty and slightly more than 1,000 part-time faculty. [Comment: In checking number, please use number of part-time faculty still employed – many past part-time faculty are no longer on our payroll.]

P. 136 Changes Addressing ACCJC Findings.
MISSING FROM DESCRIPTION – THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE HIRING PROCEDURES WILL SOON BE REPLACED WITH NEW PROCEDURES.

P. 137. In March 2011, the District and AFT 2121 agreed to revise a process for temporary faculty employee and substitute hiring. Included in this review was the implementation of an expedited upgrading procedure (above 67% of a load for part-time faculty) for short-term temporary or long-term temporary vacancies that would address unforeseen circumstances where the day-to-day substitute or the long-term-substitute hiring processes would not satisfy/fulfill the emergency situation, such as long-term illness or death. In theory this process should meet fair hiring processes that comply with Title 5 and the Education Code; however, in practice no safeguards are currently in place to ensure that a fair, equitable hiring process is followed at the departmental level. In fact, the HR department has no active role in this process.

[COMMENT KS IS WAITING FOR INPUT FROM AFT2121 about this paragraph]

The Chancellor and senior administration have also been meeting to address a much-needed classified staff reorganization that addresses the recommendations raised by the ACCJC and FCMAT; the College has already several individuals into high-need areas. Addressing classified staff reorganization is all the more critical now that the College laid off more than 30 classified staff members, some of whom had bumping rights into other College positions, and the administrative reorganizations will likely dictate additional changes.


p. 137

Overall, the permanent hiring processes are rigorous, equitable and fairly administered in accordance with the requirements of Title 5 California Code of Regulations and the California Education Code ....... On November 15, 2013, the Board approved Policy Manual 3.04 that authorizes the Chancellor to make changes to this administrative hiring process. [COMMENT THIS IS NOT ACCURATE. The new Board Policy authorizes the Chancellor “to establish procedures for the recruitment and selection of administrators.” The Chancellor is authorized to replace the current procedures with new ones. However, to make changes to or modify the current procedures instead of replacing them requires mutual agreement from the bodies that established the current policy.]

On November 15, 2013, the Board approved Policy Manual 3.04 that authorizes the Chancellor to to establish procedures for the recruitment and selection of administrators, make changes to this administrative hiring process. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has reviewed this-current procedure and new procedures are being developed that will has identified changes to better streamline the process. The Academic Senate has expressed concerns that the proposed new procedures will diminish rigor, equitableness and fairness for administrative hiring. [EVIDENCE WILL BE AVAILABLE THURSDAY, 2/21/13]

The College needs to adopt a process for administrators to be reassigned or transferred and enforce the processes for reassigning personnel in all employee groups, which includes: administrative upgrades, lateral transfers, reclassifications, and additional temporary duties; the faculty expedited upgrading process; and classified reassignments. COMMENT Does the College already have process for administrative transfers, etc.?? I can’t find this on Employee Relations web page. If we already have process, it needs to be made readily available.
With respect to the administrative reorganization, there has been substantial opposition to the administrative changes taking place, largely focusing on concerns about the process of doing so, although many have questioned the advisability of some of the changes. Reasons for doing so, and the process has not moved as quickly as planned. Individuals have raised concerns about the increased authority of administrators as contained within the new administrative job announcements.

The College’s recent necessity to quickly lay off more than 30 classified staff members underscores the need to develop processes to ensure that planning for classified staffing needs is fully integrated with institutional planning, as recommended by ACCJC.

### III.A.1./III.A.1.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>Implement clear, consistent, and transparent processes for the appointment of reassignment positions for all employee groups Recognizing that the Chancellor has authority under Title 5 § 53021 to upgrade, reclassify, rename, reorganize, ammend, appoint, implement clear, consistent, and transparent processes in the appointment of reassignment positions for all employee groups is strongly recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to ensure that future administrative job announcements clearly define roles, responsibilities, and expectations of management personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and implement new Administrative Hiring Procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that trained EEO monitors are present for all hiring to permanent faculty and administrative positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a process fully integrated with institutional planning to Review the classified personnel structure to better assess the effective use of staffing resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.A.1.d. Self Evaluation

CCSF has written policies and procedures pertaining to professional ethics intended to promote a supportive work environment that ensures healthy and collegial working conditions and fosters an environment of respect, trust, and collaboration. The College keeps all policies and procedures up to date with current law. However, since
implementation of the changes resulting from ACCJC and FCMAT recommendations, members of the College community have felt that the environment currently does not reflect these positive intentions.

THE COLLEGE NEEDS TO TAKE ACTION TO ADDRESS THIS!!

III.A.2. Descriptive Summary.

p. 144

Under the direction of the Interim Chancellor and the Accreditation Liaison Officer, District employees began implementing plans to address the ACCJC’s show cause letter of July 3, 2012. Workgroup 7 was assigned to examine Recommendation 7, Human Resources. Issues examined by the workgroup included the administrative organization for Academic Affairs and Student Development. The workgroup did not discuss numbers of department chairs needed or possible changes to department chair duties, was tasked with: (1) addressing possible options for more effective and efficient organizational structure to determine logical reporting lines and structures that support timely decision making and accountability; (2) reviewing the appropriate number of administrators needed to support and manage the District’s instructional programs and services; (3) examining issues relating to the reassignment of personnel; and (4) proposing new practices designed to clarify and enhance the roles and authority of deans and department chairs.

At the same time, as noted in the response to Standard III.A.1., the Board of Trustees directed the Interim Chancellor to propose a new instructional structure, congruent with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) findings. The reorganization is currently in progress with a goal for completion by July 1, 2013.

P 144

Staffing needs and allocation are identified at the unit or departmental level, whereby deans with recommendations from department chairs prioritize staffing needs within their programs, departments, and division by connecting staffing levels and adequacy to District planning priorities.

In assessing the adequacy of staffing example of factors that are considered may be: (1) support needed to provide a specific function/service/course and the quality of that service; (2) the health and safety of students, faculty, staff, and District assets; (3) staffing required by law and/or to provide critical support of tasks required of regulatory bodies; (4) support needed to perform critical technology services; and (5) support needed to maintain facilities and physical operations. As stated above, the yearly Program Review process is the tool used by department to address staffing needs.


p.144

KRISTIN, HERE IS AN EXAMPLE WHERE A CHANGE IN TONE WOULD MOVE THIS DOCUMENT CLOSER TO BEING ONE THAT “reflects the nature and substance of this institution” so the Academic Senate isn’t disputing every sentence.
Instead of
The District needs to fully implement a new instructional administrative structure that includes academic integrity and increased administrative oversight and accountability, while at the same time aligning with budget restrictions.

Better language would be
The District needs to ensure that its instructional administrative structure supports academic integrity and administrative oversight and accountability, while at the same time aligning with budget restrictions.

Writing new job announcements for every administrative position and hiring all administrative personnel through open hiring processes is likely to further exacerbate the lack of administrative stability identified as a serious concern by both ACCJC and FCMAT.

Staffing plans are not sufficiently linked to institutional planning. The College’s recent necessity to quickly lay off more than 30 classified staff members without fully considering appropriate criteria underlines this deficiency. Better linkage will help assess more effectively the adequacy of staffing and how the institution’s personnel work to support its programs and services.

The institution successfully ensures that all state, federal, local, and other relevant personnel policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered and reviewed regularly. Through the collective bargaining process, the District and Employee Labor groups work collaboratively to find common ground regarding policies affecting their respective members. However, given the magnitude of the changes currently taking place, many would not at this time describe the process as collaborative.

On February 23, 2012, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 120223-S5, “Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection.” The resolution called for the Chancellor’s Office to develop a comprehensive College-wide policy and implementation strategy.
for improving equal opportunity in faculty recruitment and selection. The Chancellor formed task force workgroups who met and reviewed the hiring data and diversity statistics contained in the Human Resources Hiring Data and Employee Data Reports. Without prior review by the Academic Senate, the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, or the Diversity Committee, Chancellor Griffin placed the “Blueprint of College-Wide Policy and Implementation Strategy for Improving Equal Opportunity in Faculty Recruitment and Selection” on the April 2012 Board of Trustees meeting agenda. Because the document had received no shared governance review prior to being sent to the governing board and serious inaccuracies in the document were a source of concern, a “Diversity Blueprint Workgroup,” including the Dean of Human Resources and representatives from the DCC and the Academic Senate, reviewed this document. This group came together on April 23, 2012, and a summary of their findings, corrections, and timeline for implementation was presented by the Academic Senate to the Interim Chancellor Fisher in May 2012. Many of the groups’ recommendations regarding the hiring process are already in place (i.e., copies of transcripts versus original transcripts), and those recommendations were stated as areas of concern regarding recruitment are reasonable (i.e., letters of recommendation) and can be accommodated and adapted into the current hiring process.

The recruitment of classified employees for the San Francisco Community College District is governed by the SFCCD/SEIU 1021 CBA and the City and County of San Francisco Civil Service System.

p. 151

While the Blueprint document generated much dialogue, members of the College community raised concerns about the process leading to the development of the document and about some of its recommendations. See also the response to Standard IV.B.2.c.

III.A.5.a.
p.153

Another issue related to offering an extensive array of FLEX Day programs is the reduction in the number of days devoted to FLEX. Prior to 2003, the Fall semester FLEX event took place over three days, and the Spring semester events were two days. This allowed for a varied and quality offering of workshops. Negotiations between the College and Collective Bargaining Units have reduced the programmed FLEX Days down to one day each semester. Faculty received the other four days as independent FLEX Days to attend conferences or pursue individual developmental activities. However, due to severely limited travel budgets, it is increasingly difficult for faculty to attend conferences or off-site workshops.

[COMMENT KS IS WAITING FOR INPUT FROM AFT2121 about this paragraph]

The Chancellor has primary responsibility for the allocation of the Administrative structure. If a new administrative position is needed to ensure the effective operations of the District, top administration work with the Human Resources Department to conduct a job analysis survey to determine the administrative level, i.e., dean, associate dean, director, etc., and related job duties and
responsibilities. The Chancellor and top administration work with the budget unit to determine funding and the draft job description is shared with the Academic Senate Executive Council for their feedback.

In accordance with the current Administrative Hiring Policy [SEE IN EVIDENCE], the Academic Senate reviews administrative job announcements and provides Human Resources and the Chancellor with recommendations and suggestions.

III.D.1.c Self Evaluation

Major budgetary and structural decisions have been made at the College based on the costs of non-instructional faculty work without data connecting costs to types of work performed being readily available in formats that can be tracked consistently over time. Cooperative work between personnel responsible for faculty assignments, for personnel records in order to adjust coding will provide information that is relevant, accurate, and timely for future decision making.

[COMMENT KRISTIN, THIS PASSAGE DOESN’T HAVE TO GO IN III.D.1.c, BUT IT MUST GO INTO THE REPORT SOMEWHERE WITH ACTION ITEM.]

Office of Instruction HR, Business Office, and ITS will develop data methods for tracking Faculty non-instructional expenses.


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, there had not been consistent clarity 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. Finally, the Board of Trustees and administration failed to provide leadership and guidance in clarifying policies and procedures, in some cases encouraging groups and individuals to circumvent the appropriate channels for recommendations.
Show Cause Report Issues in process of resolution 2/18/13 p. 11


Moreover, the utilization of the Accreditation Steering Committee as the de facto participatory governance council during the transitional time was reasonable in that the Steering Committee includes leaders from all constituencies, although the Academic Senate has raised concerns that the Steering Committee and accreditation workgroups were more heavily weighted with administrators. Changes in the scheduling of the Steering Committee and its feeder workgroup meetings have at times resulted in students and faculty being unable challenged to attend these meetings due to conflicts with classes.


The previous Shared Governance system was large and some felt that it was inefficient, perceiving it as often holding up important issues with limited administrator authority and effectiveness.

COMMENT – THERE IS PLENTY OF EVIDENCE THAT IT WAS LARGE, LESS ACTUAL EVIDENCE THAT IT WAS INEFFICIENT, BUT SHOW ME EVIDENCE FOR SHARED GOVERNANCE HOLDING UP THINGS UP FOR MORE THAN ONE OR TWO ISSUES?

IV.A.4. Descriptive Summary

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. Furthermore, to advocate and demonstrate honesty and integrity to the citizens of San Francisco who approved with 72.9% of the votes a parcel tax to be used for specific purposes, the College is establishing a citizen’s oversight committee, in order to comply with the intent and spirit of the ballot measure.


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 communicated misleading information in a variety of venues about ACCJC and its findings. The College recognizes that these actions undermine the College’s efforts to maintain an honest relationship with ACCJC and the community about accreditation issues. The institution has, at times, failed to communicate how plans and actions will help address the shortcomings found in the ACCJC report. This has caused a great deal of anxiety, mistrust, and confusion. The institution recognizes that more transparency is needed and has begun to invite the college community to events that provide a basis for dialogue. More conversation could take place so that all members of the College Community can share

Comment [KS6]: Interesting that the institution and the College community are different entities.
Show Cause Report  

Issues in process of resolution  

2/18/13  

p. 12

perspectives and reach common process and understandings of the actions the College has undertaken and still needs to undertake.

IV.B.

IV.B has a structural problem. In all other part of the standards, each Descriptive Summary section is followed by a Self-Evaluation section and an Action Plan directly related to it. However, in IV.B.1, there are 10 Descriptive Summaries, and one Self-Evaluation and Action Plan table. In IV.B.2, there are 5 Descriptive Summaries, and one Self-Evaluation and Action Plan table. Why is so little space allotted to Self Evaluation and in a manner that discourages focusing on each part of the standards??

IV.B.1.c. Descriptive Summary

P.211

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.

Prior to receiving the Show Cause Report, The Board of Trustees fulfilled this responsibility by closely monitoring educational and financial matters and providing direction to the Chancellor to correct perceived problems.

COMMENT – SEE THE 2012 SELF STUDY REPORT FOR EVIDENCE. THE TRUSTEES WERE VERY ASSERTIVE ABOUT INCLUDING THIS IN THE 2012 REPORT

IV.B.1.c. Self Evaluation

p. 215 (should be with Descriptive Summary for that section)

While the Board has sufficient policies in place that inform its conduct, roles, and responsibilities, it had experienced difficulty in understanding its oversight role in exercising ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. On the one hand, the Board approved a budget for 2011-12 that depended on reducing the reserves without aiming to meet the enrollment levels required to maintain apportionment funding. The Board’s failure to provide appropriate financial oversight to the district during the economic downturn severely damaged the College. On the other hand, Board members sponsored hearings on educational policy and operational concerns and approved resolutions that directed specific actions, such as Board Resolution 120426-S10 approved April 26, 2012, that directed specific changes and a specific implementation schedule for English course placement practices.

Since receiving the Show Cause Report, the Board of Trustees and has received training in widely established best practices for governing boards. Board members understanding of their role has improved, although the Board is still struggling with the following specific aspects of its own code of ethics and responsibilities as contained within BP 1.17:

IV.B.2.a-e. Self Evaluation.

P.221

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 styles 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 and distrust. 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. Many do not share this 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 continued to focus on cost-cutting first, and planning after the fact in direct contradiction to accreditation standards and to the Recommendations from ACCJC. The Administration had stated that decisions reflect “best practices” but has not provided information to indicate what practices are being described as best, nor evidence such as studies, professional literature, or the identification of similar institutions that have found benefit from the practices in question.

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 concern is that such sweeping actions are leading to lack of continuity in the management of college operations and increasing instability at the college, such as was criticized by the ACCJC in their finding that CCSF had too many interim positions. 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 about how the changes will yield results that demonstrate that the College meets the ACCJC Standards.