Once feedback for the Show Cause Report had been gathered and compiled, the process of providing that input included several stages.

1) Texts of first draft with desired tracked changes were provided to ALO Gohar Momjian and Dean Kristin Charles.

2) The Academic Senate President Karen Saginor reviewed the next draft, identifying which changes had been accepted and which had not. From those changes which had not been accepted, President Saginor compiled a list of about 50 items which in her judgment:

   - had not been adequately addressed by the draft.
   - were significant
   - for which either the obstacles to addressing them were low, OR the importance of addressing them was high.

3) Dean Charles met with President Saginor and with Fred Teti to review the list together. President Saginor learned that many of the issues would definitely be addressed in the next draft, and they discussed possible resolutions for the more difficult issues, coming to agreement about many, but not all.

4) When the second draft became available, President Saginor again reviewed it and again met with Kristin Charles (on Friday, Feb. 22) to discuss remaining issues.

5) Now the Preliminary Final Draft has been published online.

From the list of about 50 issues, about 38 have been addressed in a manner that President Saginor considers at least adequate. About 2 have either become moot (because the text was removed) or About 8-10 have not been resolved.

**Here are EXAMPLE of difficult issues that were addressed.**

**I.B.2. Self Evaluation. Addition incorporated into the draft AND action plan.**

Having multiple institution-level reports (EYA, CPI, ARCC) leads to confusion about measures and goals. The difference between the EYA and CPI has been unclear to most members of the College. Moreover, the lengthy reports have had a limited audience. To date, the College has not used any of these reports to set targets, only to track trends or to report progress in a given year. The forthcoming ARCC 2.0 provides an opportunity for the College to focus on state-specified targets for improvement. The Academic Senate considers it important to fully implement Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) Certificates for noncredit students using progress indicators so that the ARCC metrics will reflect more fully the effectiveness of noncredit programs.

**Action plan: Implement process for the award of Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) Certificates, establishing eligibility based on Noncredit Progress Indicators.**

**III.A.1./II.A.1.a Self Evaluation. Change incorporated into the draft.**

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 Academic Senate has raised concerns that the College has not fully examined the effects of implementing the administrative changes per FCMAT findings prior to carrying out the reorganizations, and has specifically stated the following:

“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.”

III.A.4.b. Addition included

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….. 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. …..

III.D.1.b. Self Evaluation. ADDED to text with corresponding action plan.

The College has at times made major budgetary and structural decisions based on the costs of faculty reassigned time using financial data that does not connect the costs of that work to the types of work that faculty performed. Better tracking is required. 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.

IV.A.4. Self Evaluation. Most of compromise change made

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 administration’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 process
and understand-share perspectives and reach common understandings of the actions the College has undertaken and still needs to undertake.

IV.B.2. Self Evaluation. Compromise text inserted:

The Academic Senate has grave concerns about the administrative reorganization’s impact on student learning. Interim Chancellor Fisher failed to seek an analysis of consequences on student learning and workplace efficiencies or to plan adequately for continuity before restructuring Academic Affairs. No advance opportunity was provided for constructive dialogue to take place concerning the radical diminishment of the role of chairs for instructional departments. Interim Chancellor Scott-Skillman has continued to state that the reorganization represents "best practices" without communicating which practices are being described as best nor sharing her vision for how these practices will work at City College. The wholesale termination of administrators, the demotion of several, preference for hiring retired administrators for Vice Chancellor positions, and changes in the evaluation process raise concerns that such sweeping actions will lead to lack of continuity in the management of college operations and increasing instability at the college, such as was identified by ACCJC in their finding that CCSF had too many interim positions. The Academic Senate recognizes the authority of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to make rash changes, but cannot agree that this reorganization is in the best interest of the students of City College.

Issues that have not been resolved.

II.A.6.b. Descriptive Summary. Confident that this will be resolved.

The College is currently engaged in developing a program closure policy and released the first draft on February 22, 2013. The Academic Senate has had this on the agenda on the October 24, November 7, and November 28, 2012 meetings. [NOTE ON THIS THAT IT WILL BE UPDATED – WE SUGGESTED LANGUAGE FOR THE UPDATE].


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. This contract language was carefully designed to include specific procedures and notices in order to meet fair hiring processes and ensure HR's role; in practice, further analysis should be done to determine whether these equitable processes are being followed at the department level. 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.

Administrative Hiring Process – this is in several places in the draft The draft now talks about new procedures in at least one place, but in other places is not made clear that new procedures are substantially different from the procedures that have been in use up until now..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that trained EEO monitors are present for all hiring to permanent faculty and administrative positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.A.2. Descriptive Summary. NOT changed.

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.

IV.A.3. Self Evaluation. Requested Changes Partially Accepted and Partially Rejected

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.

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

IV.B. Structural change rejected

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 Rejected

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.
IV.B.1.c. Self Evaluation. Addition Rejected

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. Change Request Rejected

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.

Report on Centers and Sites. No substantial changes and additions were accepted. Reason given was that this section is report on work group activities, rather than responses to standard. Substantial changes could be taken to Workgroup #15 and emanate from them. Academic Senate encouraged to submit “white paper” into evidence.