To assess its effectiveness in academic year 2016-17, the Academic Senate Executive Council conducted two surveys. An internal evaluation survey was sent to all Executive Council members who served during the 2016-17 academic year. An external evaluation survey was sent to all faculty members.

This is a report summarizing the findings from the Academic Senate Executive Council Internal Evaluation Survey. The members of the Academic Senate Executive Council who served during the 2016-2017 academic year were asked to provide an evaluation of the Academic Senate Executive Council during the 2016-2017 academic year. The evaluation period covers the time period from July 2016 to June 2017. The internal evaluation survey in May 2017. There were a total of 11 members responded to the survey.

Q1: I am familiar with the governing documents of the Academic Senate (Operational Guidelines, Bylaws, and Constitution)

11 responses
Q2: I believe the Executive Council adheres to the governing documents.
11 responses

Q3: I find the Academic Senate Executive Council effective in its mission of providing recommendations on academic and professional matters.
11 responses
Q4: I understand and utilize the process of bringing items forward to the Academic Senate Executive Council and then developing recommendations.
11 responses

Q5: I am able to convey the work of the Executive Council to my colleagues and solicit input.
11 responses
Additional Comments and Suggestions for Improvement:

- I gave Q5 a 3 not because of any fault in the Council but because many of my colleagues aren't interested.

- It's been a really great learning process being on the Senate. I have learned a lot about my colleagues and their programs across campus, in addition to an immersion in the administration of the College. My biggest suggestion for improvement is about equity of participation. I know it is not possible for everyone to participate in the same qualitative and quantitative ways, but it seems like if you agree to sit on the Senate EC, you should do your part by showing up to meetings and actively engaging for the duration of the meeting, offering a collegial space for dialogue, and supporting your colleagues. It's a trend I've noticed on campus in other areas, but that doesn't seem like a good reason to justify it on the EC. I do not think other folks on campus understand the processes of the EC. This is evidenced by the fact that sometimes we have faculty and staff come to the meeting and suggest ideas or resolutions in the Public Comments or ask about the process should work. There have even been people on the Senate who ask "How do I do this? Should I just email Mandy?" I have also spoken with folks outside of the EC who are literally afraid of coming to speak at the Senate EC meetings. They have shared with me some of the experiences they have had in the past (not this year), and their frustration
with some of the tone and style of our conversations. I'm curious to see how the external evaluation for 2016-17 compares to earlier years.

- I have not followed the AS Committees on a regular basis, other than the Facilities Committee, on which I am an alternate member. I've enjoyed my term on the ASEC, and I've learned a great deal about the processes of governance at CCSF through this experience. Thank you very much for all of it.

- I appreciate Mandy's open-door policy for listening to the concerns of the Ex. Council. I also appreciate how efficiently and collegially the committee has been working this year. All the officers have done a stellar job! I have heard, from people presenting, that they felt worried about presenting in the past because they felt the Ex. Council was hyper critical and even unwelcoming. That is not the case now. I applaud Mandy for her leadership to alleviate this issue. Thank you!

- Some of my responses here are my sole responsibility, in the sense that I should be more pro-active, and be more informed about processes and committee priorities. On the other hand, the fact that the EC recommends on new items (almost) all the time, makes it hard to slow the pace, converse more in depth about decisions and processes, reflect upon consequences, and get input from other constituents. It would be good to have a once a month session dedicated to discussion, without items to vote on. We need to have a more organic understanding of the college, and our duty as EC members, but we also need to have time to discuss items that pertain to the college but are not brought to us by other constituents. It would be good if we as AS could also propose or recommend items to PGC and Trustees.