Clarity in governance roles in respect to the Academic Senate needed
Lack of clarity in governance roles was among the issues that led to the Show Cause finding from ACCJC last year. We won’t know until early July how the Commission will judge our current efforts and progress in this area, but our March 15th Show Cause/self-assessment report identified several standards connected to this for which we have not yet completed the work that we need to do. The visiting team asked about governance roles in many of the meetings that included faculty. In one meeting, Dr. John Nixon, former President of Mt. Sac and current Associate Vice President of the Commission, pointedly asked members of the Participatory Governance Council how the Council facilitates the City College policy to rely primarily on the Academic Senate for processes for institutional planning and budget development.

Several sections of Standard IV.A. ( appended to the end of this report) that apply to the Academic Senate speak to the need for clearly defined roles and established procedures. This need was partly met by the Board of Trustees last November when it adopted Policy 2.08 City College Of San Francisco Collegial Governance: Academic Senate. The same Board Policy called for the establishment of procedures to implement the policy, saying “The Chancellor shall rely primarily on the Academic Senate’s recommendations to establish procedures to ensure effective collegial consultation with respect to Areas 1-10 in Section A of this policy.” The officers of the Academic Senate have been reviewing best practices in use at other community colleges and seeking dialogue with our administration towards making recommendations for procedures that will be mutually agreeable.

Our March 15 Show Cause report listed as an actionable improvement plan to be completed April 2013: “Complete procedures to support BP 2.08: 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.”

Status of completing the actionable improvement plan
The April 2013 date for the action improvement plan was chosen by the Academic Senate officers in anticipation of progressing on this item at a March meeting with the Chancellor which unfortunately had to be cancelled. Since the work will not be completed by the end of this month, we want to report on the current status of this item.

- The Academic Senate officers have investigated best practices in collegial consultation at other California Community Colleges, and reviewed the results with the Academic Senate Executive Council.
- These materials concerning best practices have been shared with Chancellor Scott Skillman and senior administration.
- Collegial consultation was discussed by the Academic Senate officers with Chancellor Scott-Skillman and senior administrators at a meeting on April 8th.
- The Participatory Governance Council will be taking steps to develop written procedures for that Council and for its committees. These procedures may include at least some aspects of collegial consultation.

Current practices for collegial consultation
Although we have not yet developed written procedures, our current practices in regards to collegial consultation include the following:

- The Chancellor and senior administrators meets with officers of the Academic Senate about once a month – the Academic Senate President and the Chancellor bring issues to this meeting.
• Senior administrators may contact the Academic Senate President for specific issues, such as the review of administrative job announcements.
• The President of the Academic Senate sends information about specific actions of the Academic Senate to the Chancellor and administrators – usually by email.
• For recommendations concerning actions or policies of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Senate President may provide recommendations in writing to the Chancellor and to the Board.
• The Academic Senate President has occasional direct, informal contact with Board members about specific issues.

What more is needed?
From the perspective of the Academic Senate officers, several elements of sustainable, effective procedures for collegial consultation are missing from our current practices. In order to establish procedures that are fully compliant with accreditation standards and board policies, the following elements are needed:

• **A reliable process for the Academic Senate to receive advance information about academic and professional matters that are headed towards consideration by the Board of Trustees, as recommended by CCLC/ASCCC.** In September, 2012, Interim Chancellor Fisher terminated the past CCSF practice of open Agenda Review meetings for Board of Trustees at which the Academic Senate President or other officer was welcome. There have been several occasions this year when the Academic Senate had no information that the Board of Trustees would consider an issue until a few days before the meeting when the agenda was publicly posted as required by the Brown Act.

• **Shared understanding of which issues should receive review or recommendations by the Academic Senate.** The Academic Senate understands Board Policy 2.08 as directing the Academic Senate to provide recommendations for issues in all ten of the academic and professional matters listed in Title 5. Chancellor Scott-Skillman and Special Trustee Agrella assert that the Academic Senate is not the primary advisor on some of these matters, such as processes for institutional planning and budget development. The Academic Senate does not understand how current practice is consistent with Board Policy 2.08 or with Title 5 which requires the governing board to rely primarily on, or arrive at mutual agreement with, the Academic Senate in the ten areas.

• **Improve trust and rapport between members and officers of the Academic Senate and members of the Chancellor’s executive team.** Lack of trust was cited as a problem by the 2012 ACCJC team visit report. We believe that the adoption of some of the informal and formal practices that are common at other community colleges would build trust and improve the effectiveness of communication.

• **Written procedures.** Both BP 2.08 and ACCJC Standard IV.A.3. require “established procedures.” An appropriate mode for transparently establishing procedures is to record written procedures and post them online.

Next steps
Although procedures have not yet been fully developed or recorded in writing, the Academic Senate will continue to seek to meet the accreditation standards and to fulfill its responsibilities articulated in Board Policy BP 2.08.

• The Academic Senate officers will engage in the communication processes currently in use, continuing to meet monthly with the Chancellor, subject to her availability.
• Adopting a practice in use at other colleges, the Academic Senate officers will seek regular meetings with the Vice Chancellor of Student Development and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.
• The Academic Senate will offer recommendations on issues in the 10 areas of academic and professional matters articulated by BP 2.08, in full understanding that these are recommendations – the district is not required to take actions recommended by the Academic Senate.

• Explore possibilities for professional support in developing procedures and improved communication in the form of Technical Assistance services offered jointly by ASCCC and CCLC or other opportunities.
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ACCJC Accreditation Standard IV.A.

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.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making process. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward the ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

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.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.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. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

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 respond to recommendations made by the commission.

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.