

## **Standard IV: Leadership and Governance**

---

*The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the college.*

### **Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes**

**IV.A.1.** *Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for 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 planning and implementation.*

#### **IV.A.1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Consistent with the principles outlined in both its Vision and Mission Statements of creating an environment that is inclusive of all of its diverse communities and one that will foster student success, the College continues to encourage innovation leading to institutional success. The Participatory Governance system created in November 2012 (revising the former Shared Governance system) and the Collegial Governance system of the Academic Senate, together with the Associated Students and Classified Senate, provide the mechanisms through which innovation that leads to institutional success is implemented. Board Policy 2.07 (District Policy on Participatory Governance) and the Participatory Governance Council (PGC) Operational Guidelines define how the PGC operates to ensure that all College constituents have an opportunity to voice their perspectives, and to provide the framework for constituents to engage in College governance and decision-making processes. Board Policy 2.08 (City College of San Francisco Collegial Governance: Academic Senate) and Administrative Procedures 2.08 (Methods for Collegial Consultation) define the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate and how the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems interact with one another. Both of these systems are captured in the “Roles, Responsibilities, and Procedures” decision-making charts and narratives (RRP

Handbook) produced during extensive consultations beginning in Spring 2015 through Spring 2016.

**Institutional Leaders Create Opportunities for Innovation.** The College's Education Master Plan identifies innovation as a key goal, and institutional leaders create a wide variety of opportunities for innovation that leads to institutional excellence. One example of the intentional creation of opportunity for innovation is the year-long Leading From the Middle (LFM) professional development program run by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. This year, Leading From the Middle brought together teams of faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators all from City College of San Francisco. Teams were formed in Spring 2015 and met off site for an entire day once a month in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. Teams engaged with leadership curriculum, benefited from assigned team mentors, and worked together on projects of their own design aimed at finding new ways to deliver education and services to students. On May 6, the College's administrative team, including the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs and Student Development, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Workforce Development, several Center and School deans, and several department chairs, attended a presentation of the LFM team projects. Pilot projects included:

- **Expansion of GED/HISAT Testing** – helping students who have just completed the GED or passed the HISAT test enroll in classes at CCSF.
- **Bringing Student Services into Basic Skills Classes** – piloting a program involving the inclusion of representatives from counseling, DSPS, library, etc. in basic skills classrooms to increase student use of support services.
- **Gateway to College Pathway** – added the I-BEST model to basic skills classes for students in pathways in Child Development and Automotive Technology.
- **Library Technology Services** – exploring the benefits of increasing basic skills students' participation in library workshops.
- **Bridging the Gap: Supporting ESL Students in the ESL-English Sequence** – strengthening the collaboration between ESL and English courses to assist students transitioning from ESL to English classes.
- **Streamlining the Infrastructure of Allied Health Education Programs** – identifying and streamlining redundant activities and services needed by Allied Health Education students in order to increase efficiency and allow more students into impacted programs.
- **First Year OnRamp to Success** – exploring the potential benefits of creating a guided pathway model at the College.
- **Culinary Assessments and E-Portfolios** – coordinating and streamlining assessments to ensure all students have the necessary skills to graduate; provide the spaces and time

necessary for students to learn effectively; and help students document a body of work of their accomplishments. This program aspires to serve as an inspiration to other departments at the College as a good example of using assessments to make improvements.

Some of these teams, such as the Culinary Assessments and E-Portfolios team, are already implementing their projects. Other teams will have the opportunity to continue developing their leadership skills and continue working on their projects next year.

### **Institutional Leaders Support Constituents Taking the Initiative to Improve Practices.**

Institutional leaders support all constituents in taking initiatives to create improvement. Two specific examples of this are the “Role, Responsibilities, and Processes” flowcharts and decision-making narratives (RRP Handbook) and the Equitable Access to Success Emergency (EASE) Task Force.

**The Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes (RRP) Handbook.** The RRP Handbook began as an Academic Senate initiative in Spring 2015 with the recognition that the policies and procedures for decision making at the College needed further clarification. The Academic Senate identified this need in its Fall 2014 Program Review as a key goal for improvement. During Summer 2015, the Academic Senate and the new Chancellor engaged in discussions about College-wide decision making and reviewed the initial Academic Senate draft of the project. In Fall 2015, the Chancellor continued directly supporting the Academic Senate’s efforts by facilitating the collaboration of the project in order to ensure the broad participation and input of all constituents. This was a valuable process for the entire College to engage in. In 2012, the Shared Governance system had been replaced by Participatory Governance without a substantive discussion about the impact of such a change on all governance processes. Over the course of the 2015-16 academic year, all constituents had the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the draft RRP Handbook. All constituents brought valuable insights about how the College had changed and how to combine the best parts of the Shared Governance system with some appreciated benefits of the Participatory Governance system.

The resulting RRP Handbook describes four procedures for the planning and development of processes, roles, and responsibilities for all constituent groups:

1. development of Program Reviews;
2. development of College-wide plans associated with categorical funding;
3. development of College-wide plans without attached funding;
4. development of College-wide initiatives, Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, that deal with four types of matters:
  - a. matters that solely pertain to Academic and Professional matters within the purview of the Academic Senate;
  - b. matters that pertain to both Academic and Professional matters, as well as also pertaining to students;

- c. matters that solely pertain to students; and
- d. matters that are more general in nature, that do not pertain to either Academic and Professional matters or student matters.

These charts also describe three processes, roles, and responsibilities for resource allocation, namely:

1. resource allocation of College-wide supplemental general funds;
2. resource allocation of College-wide categorical funds with state plans, and
3. resource allocation of divisional categorical funds.

During the review of the draft RRP Handbook, participants recognized that the processes for ensuring the rely primarily relationship of the Board of Trustees with the Academic Senate needed further codification. This prompted a revision of Administrative Procedure 2.08 (Collegial Consultation) to include a section that describes the steps to take when Participatory Governance committees are dealing with academic and professional matters (forthcoming). In addition, the process also highlighted areas where the consideration of the student perspective needed codification. As a result, the Academic Senate now includes a description of effective participation, with a specific identification of any areas of legislatively identified student interests (9+1), on all items considered for recommendation. The developers of these charts made an intentional effort to ensure that Classified Senate representation is included in all appropriate areas. Both the Participatory and the Collegial Governance systems have seats for classified representatives, and the Classified Senate President is included on key workgroups.

**The EASE Task Force.** In response to the widespread desire of student services faculty, classified staff, and students to participate in the review and revision of the delivery of student services at the institution, the Chancellor convened the EASE Task Force in Summer 2015, which serves as another example of institutional leadership support for innovation and improvement. The creation of the EASE Task Force was also in response to the ACCJC’s January 14, 2015, Action Letter, which included comments related to the provision of student services (see Standard II.C.). The goal of the EASE Task Force is to ensure “equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate comprehensive and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method ....” The EASE Task Force membership comprised all four constituency groups led by three co-chairs (“tri-chairs”), which included a classified staff representative, a faculty representative, and an administrative representative. The tri-chairs’ selection relied on the input and direction of each constituent group and the Chancellor.

The 35-member task force comprised students, classified staff, department chairs, counseling faculty, and the Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Development. Student Development deans (Admissions and Records, Counseling and Matriculation, Financial Aid, and Student Affairs and Wellness) also participated in the Task Force. Center deans and a School dean were also

members of the EASE Task Force. Resource members from the Office of Research and Planning provided data to help inform the creation of a plan.<sup>1</sup>

The EASE Task Force had three goals to accomplish within a rigorous timeline by late Fall 2015: (1) identifying core student services, (2) identifying gaps in services at specific locations, and (3) creating an implementation plan to address the deficiencies. Each meeting was well attended by representatives from each constituent group.

Implementation of the resulting EASE Plan took place beginning with the Spring 2016 semester, including:

- The creation of a 1490 Student Service Specialist classified position to coordinate the provision of essential student services (admissions, financial aid, registration and matriculation) at the each of the Centers.
- The hiring of five new Student Services Specialists employees in March and April 2016, and assigning them to the following Centers: Evans/Southeast, Mission, Downtown, John Adams/Civic Center, Chinatown/North Beach. While all Centers (except Evans/Southeast) previously offered admissions and records and financial aid services, the role of the Student Services Specialist at each Center will coordinate the provision of services at the Centers.
- The addition of financial aid services at the Evans Center in Fall 2015; the Specialist there will work with students to process applications for financial aid applications and other student services such as matriculation (testing and registration.)

**Systematic Participative Processes Ensure Effective Planning and Implementation.** The College uses systematic procedures in both its Participatory and Collegial Governance systems.

**The Participatory Governance system (PGC).** Modeled after the advisory nature of college councils and committees, PGC seeks the input and participation of all College constituents to provide recommendations to the Chancellor (who, in turn, makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees) on matters pertaining to institutional priorities, policies, planning, and budget development that do not fall under the purview of the Collegial Governance system overseen by the Academic Senate. For the last four years, the PGC has provided an opportunity for active participation and engagement in systematic decision-making processes that ensure effective planning and implementation. Created through Board Policy 2.07, the PGC consists of 16 members (and additional alternate stand-in members), who represent all College constituent groups—administrators, faculty, classified staff, and

---

<sup>1</sup> [EASE Plan](#)

students.<sup>2 3 4 5</sup> The Chancellor appoints administrators. Faculty, classified staff, and students all use their internal procedures to appoint their representatives.

The PGC oversees several standing committees created simultaneously with the PGC, each with its own specific description and purpose. The standing committees include the Accreditation, Diversity, Enrollment Management, and Planning Committees.<sup>6 7 8 9</sup> The standing committees also provide College constituents an additional opportunity to have a voice and actively engage in systematic decision-making processes. The standing committees are responsible for providing regular updates to the PGC on the progress of their charges and on other issues of College wide significance discussed within each Committee. Each committee has a description and purpose outlining the type of committee, membership, goals, purpose and responsibilities, meeting dates, and frequency, as well as the ACCJC Standards to which each committee contributes. The goals of each standing committee are as follow:

- **Accreditation Committee:** To meet Accreditation Standards at all times.<sup>10</sup>
- **Diversity Committee:** To promote and cultivate College diversity initiatives.
- **Enrollment Management Committee:** To ensure enrollment goals are aligned with the College’s mission, including student learning achievement and outcomes, as well as Board priorities and College plans.<sup>11</sup>
- **Planning Committee:** To improve the institutional effectiveness at the unit level and in the College overall, and ensure the integration of all plans.<sup>12</sup>

In addition, as a result of discussions during both the PGC and other constituent meetings, the Chancellor officially added two new standing committees to the Participatory Governance structure in Spring 2016. The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) oversees the development of policy/procedures as they relate to technology at the College.<sup>13</sup> The Capital Projects Planning (Facilities) Committee oversees discussions regarding the planning, construction, use and maintenance of College facilities.<sup>14</sup> A third committee currently under consideration by the Chancellor is the Budget Committee. The College anticipates making a

---

<sup>2</sup> [Board Policy 2.07](#)

<sup>3</sup> See, [Title 5, CCR § 53200](#), which makes a provision for faculty of a college to consult collegially with college administration on academic and professional matters. The PGC provides a vehicle, in addition to the Academic Senate, for faculty to participate in college governance.

<sup>4</sup> See, [Title 5, CCR § 51023.5](#), which provides that classified staff shall be provided an opportunity to participate in college governance.

<sup>5</sup> See, [Title 5, CCR § 51023.7](#), which provides that students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in college governance.

<sup>6</sup> [Accreditation Committee Webpage](#)

<sup>7</sup> [Diversity Committee Webpage](#)

<sup>8</sup> [Enrollment Management Committee Webpage](#)

<sup>9</sup> [Planning Committee Webpage](#)

<sup>10</sup> [Accreditation Committee Webpage](#)

<sup>11</sup> [Enrollment Management Webpage](#)

<sup>12</sup> [Planning Committee Webpage](#)

<sup>13</sup> [Information Technology Advisory Committee webpage](#)

<sup>14</sup> [Facilities Committee \(Capital Projects Planning Committee\) webpage](#)

decision regarding establishing a Budget Committee under the Participatory Governance structure in 2016-17; until then, the PGC will continue to act as the Budget Committee.

The PGC demonstrates how processes are systematic, participative, and effective, and serves as a key forum for improving practices, programs, services, processes, and operations of the College. For example, standing committees of PGC, such as Enrollment Management and Planning, draft Board policy and administrative procedures, College-wide plans, and other matters of College-wide significance. If appropriate, the appropriate constituent councils review these policies and plans in order to gain additional feedback. The revised policies and plans are then brought from the standing committees to the PGC for discussion. The PGC makes a recommendation to the Chancellor, who in turn makes recommendations to the Board, for further action (e.g., final adoption).

**The Collegial Governance system.** The Collegial Governance system, which handles all academic and professional matters (A&P/10+1), follows similar systematic processes. Board Policy 2.08 establishes the Collegial Governance system through the Academic Senate, where the Board elects to rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all Academic and Professional matters as defined by Title 5, California Code of Regulations section 53200 (see also Standard IV.A.3.).<sup>15</sup> Administrative Procedure 2.08 describes the implementation of this relationship.<sup>16</sup>

The Academic Senate and the Collegial Governance system work in concert with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to review and develop policies, procedures, and initiatives that pertain to curriculum, educational Program Review, student preparation and success, grading and degree requirements, faculty roles in governance, and institutional planning and budgeting processes.<sup>17</sup> (For further discussion of the Academic Senate and Collegial Governance systematic processes, see Standard IV.A.4.)

Through these various venues, members of the community are not only invited to participate in Campus wide events and meetings, but are also asked to evaluate and give feedback on their effectiveness for the institution and to bring forward ideas for improvement.

#### **IV.A.1. Analysis and Evaluation**

Innovation is at the heart of the programs and services that CCSF offers to its students. All constituent groups—faculty, administrators, students and classified staff—play key leadership roles within the College, coming together as a learning organization to experiment and find new ways to meet changing student needs. Leading From the Middle provided an opportunity and space for teams of faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators to work together to create innovation at the College. The EASE Task Force demonstrates the commitment of the College to allow for constituent-led implementation of improvements. And the systematic

---

<sup>15</sup> [Board Policy 2.08](#)

<sup>16</sup> [Administrative Procedure 2.08](#); see also, [Academic Senate Web Page, re "10 + 1" Items](#).

<sup>17</sup> [Administrative Procedure 2.08](#)

participatory processes practiced by both the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems provide pathways for discussion and implementation of new ideas by all constituents. The College would benefit by making the evaluation of the RRP Handbook and the review of the processes more formal through regular evaluation processes.

**Response to Findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action**

**Letter.** The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

*Clarify structures and processes to insure representative and consistent student participation on the Participatory Governance Council (PGC). Improve dissemination of information as well as processes to receive input and issues for consideration at the PGC in order to broaden participation in college governance. Demonstrate the routine evaluation of PGC and its subcommittees. (2002 Standard IV.A.1.)*

The January 14, 2015 Action Letter from the ACCJC also modified the 2014 Visiting Team Report, Page 157, the first sentence of the last paragraph, as follows:

*The College should engage in clarifying and strengthening structures and processes to ensure representative and consistent student participation in the PGC.*

**Clarification of Structures and Processes to Encourage Consistent Student Participation**

**on PGC.** CCSF students have every opportunity to participate in discussion of matters of College wide significance. Board Policy 5.02 delineates that students shall have the opportunity to participate in the development of policy and procedures which have a significant effect on them.<sup>18</sup> The College includes students as members of the PGC, consults them on “9+1” items of Title 5 section 53207.5, which affect only students, and includes them on Academic Senate committees when “10+1” matters overlap with student “9+1” matters.<sup>19</sup> In addition, non-student members of the PGC have provided regular updates and reports to the Associated Students Executive Council on upcoming topics of discussion at the PGC.

Students’ opportunities to participate and engage in governance are described in the RRP Handbook. Student leadership had the opportunity to participate in the development of this handbook and to provide feedback on the opportunities for students described in the RRP Handbook. Students also have the opportunity to participate on the committees that review and develop Academic and Professional/student interest matters within Academic Senate committees before they are brought to PGC. The standing committees of the PGC, as well as College-wide forums where issues of College-wide significance are discussed also provide an opportunity for students to participate in the discussion of College-wide issues.

The College takes several other steps to encourage student participation on the PGC and in governance as a whole. First, College leadership, including the Chair of PGC, the Academic

---

<sup>18</sup> [Board of Trustees Policies, Including Board Policy 5.02](#)

<sup>19</sup> [Title 5, section 51023.7](#)

Senate President, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Chancellor maintain intentional and regular communications with the leadership of the Associated Students. The Academic Senate President included information to faculty in regular emails about how to encourage student participation in governance, on committees, and in clubs. The College assigned an administrative liaison to the Associated Students in order to facilitate engagement in governance. And students were included in the evaluation of the Participatory Governance structure as a whole and the ongoing revision of the PGC governance structure and processes (Administrative Procedure 2.07).

**Improvement of Dissemination of Information.** The College informs all constituents of issues of College-wide significance and encourages them to participate in college governance through a variety of means. Multiple venues of communication exist at the College such as College-wide emails, City Notes, the Chancellor’s Flex Day address, the Chancellor’s Mailbag, the Chancellor’s (and Vice Chancellors’) “Town Hall” meetings, the “College Conversations” webpage regarding accreditation, the Academic Senate News, and all constitutional groups’ regular reports to the Board of Trustees.<sup>20</sup> Individuals who are unable to attend College-wide forums can provide feedback and suggestions through their constituent leadership, “Ask CCSF” for students, and the Chancellor’s “Suggestion Box.” In addition, most institutional plans issued a College-wide survey that included both specific questions and the opportunity for open ended feedback.

**Improvement of Processes to Broaden Participation in College Governance.** The College has improved its processes to broaden participation in college governance in several ways:

- **Demonstrating the Routine Evaluation of PGC and its Standing Committees.** First, PGC conducted an internal and external evaluation of its PGC and the PGC standing committees. Based on the evaluation results, each standing committee reviewed their results and provided a written set of improvement goals to PGC.
- **Conversion of Operational Guidelines to Administrative Procedure 2.07 Participatory Governance.** The PGC decided to convert its Operation Guidelines into an Administrative Procedure to go along with Board Policy 2.07 Participatory Governance and to review and revise these structures. During the 2015-2016 academic year a PGC Administrative Procedure 2.07 workgroup met several times to create a draft document. The draft Administrative Procedure 2.07 was discussed several times at the PGC and preparations are being made to complete this activity in Fall 2016.
- **Creation of Decision-Making Charts and Narratives.** In addition, the College created decision-making charts and corresponding narratives that describe the roles and responsibilities of each constituency, the RRP Handbook, to assist all College

---

<sup>20</sup> [President's Reports](#)

constituents in understanding how to engage in the governance processes of the College.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.1.

**IV.A.2.** *The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.*

#### **IV.A.2. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**Institutional Policies Authorize Administrator, Faculty, and Staff Participation in Decision-Making Processes.** CCSF has a system of policies and procedures that establish the structure for participatory and collegial decision-making processes at the College. Importantly, students are included and welcomed as a voice in the decision-making process. Ideas are brought forth in a systematic and recognized way to provide meaningful dialogue about merits of the new concepts.

**Broad participation in Board and councils' decisions.** In addition to Board Policy 2.07 (Participatory Governance),<sup>21</sup> and Board Policy 2.08 and Administrative Procedure 2.08 (Collegial Governance - Academic Senate),<sup>22</sup> the College has other policies and procedures specifically designed to encourage and engage the participation of administrators, faculty, staff, and students in decision-making processes. Board Policy 1.15 (Board Policy and Administrative Procedure), speaks to the authority of the Board to adopt policies that are authorized by law; it also speaks to the Chancellor issuing administrative procedures that state the method to be used in implementing Board Policy.<sup>23</sup> Board Policy 1.16 (Public Access Sunshine Policy) ensures that meetings of the Board, PGC, and Academic Senate, where actions will be taken, are sufficiently noticed in advance and that all written materials used to support a decision, and all subsequent decisions made, are accessible to the entire College community and to the public.<sup>24</sup> In addition, each such meeting provides opportunities for public comment. This level of transparency allows for broad community participation in decision-making.

**Roles, responsibilities, and processes that develop decisions and plans.** The RRP Handbook illustrates the processes in which matters of College-wide significance allows all College constituent groups to engage in and “weigh in” on the development of draft policies and

---

<sup>21</sup> [Board Policy 2.07](#)

<sup>22</sup> [Board Policy 2.08](#); [Administrative Procedure 2.08](#)

<sup>23</sup> [Board Policy 1.15](#)

<sup>24</sup> [Board Policy 1.16](#)

procedures, plans, initiatives, and the allocation of resources.<sup>25</sup> Board Policy 1.15 contains a basic flowchart describing the process of drafting policies and procedures to passage by the Board, but the RRP Handbook provides greater detail and explanatory narrative.

**Provisions are Made for Student Participation and Consideration of Student Views.** The College makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in a number of ways, as described below.

**Students are encouraged to participate on the Board.** The Board of Trustees includes a student representative elected by the students. The Student Trustee is included in all aspects of Board business (including orientation, making motions, and voting), except for closed session items.

**Students are included on the PGC and all standing committees.** Students have four representatives on the PGC, giving them an equal voice to other constituents. Students also have seats on all PGC standing committees. In addition, in a further effort to engage students in matters of College-wide significance, members of the PGC have presented at Associated Students Executive Committee meetings in order to apprise student governance officers of policy and procedures and other matters coming before the PGC, to provide information and an opportunity for students to engage in a discussion of such matters.

**Students are included in the development of Academic and Professional matters.** The Academic Senate also provides the opportunity for student participation and input on most of the committees under its purview. Most of these committees deal with topics that directly impact students under the Student “9+1” of Title 5, CCR section 51023.7, including academic curriculum, and are regularly evaluated for their effectiveness in carrying out the purpose of the committee.<sup>26 27</sup> For example, because the Academic Senate Student Equity Strategies committee considers the prioritization of projects intended to close achievement gaps, five students are included on this committee. The Academic Senate also describes on its “Committees” webpage the procedure for students to be appointed to a committee by the Associated Students Executive Council.<sup>28</sup> Students are able to join any committee that does not discuss student records, and the Associate Dean of Student Activities acts as a “liaison” between the Students’ Council and the Academic Senate to facilitate student appointments.

**The Associated Students internal procedures encourage student participation.** Also, during Fall 2015, the Associated Students Executive Council, which represents all Associated Student Officers at the Ocean Campus and Centers, agreed to draft similar Bylaws for all other Centers other than the Ocean Campus, all of which contain a reference to student participation and engagement in Participatory Governance (PGC, standing committees, other committees) in

---

<sup>25</sup> [RRP Handbook](#)

<sup>26</sup> [Title 5, California Code of Regulations, section 51023.7](#)

<sup>27</sup> [Academic Senate 2016 Committee Evaluation Report](#)

<sup>28</sup> [Academic Senate Committee webpage](#)

matters of College-wide concern. In addition, the Associated Student Executive Council updated its Associated Students Executive Council Constitution which specifically includes participation by students in Participatory Governance, as well as the PGC or any of its standing committees.<sup>29</sup> In addition, the Associated Students Bylaws for the Ocean Campus reference student participation in Participatory Governance.<sup>30</sup>

### **Policies and Procedures Detail Collaborative Idea-Sharing and Decision-Making Processes.**

Beginning in Spring 2015 and continuing into Spring 2016, in response to concerns raised by constituents in both the Spring 2014 PGC Internal Evaluation and the External College wide Evaluation, the Academic Senate and the Chancellor, with input from all constituent groups, collaboratively developed the RRP Handbook to focus more specifically on the process of College constituent groups' participation in the development of issues of College wide significance.<sup>31 32</sup> This handbook specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

Even prior to formal adoption and implementation of the RRP Handbook, the preliminary charts and narratives were successful in facilitating more systematic discussions of matters of College-wide significance and improved effective cross-constituent communication. Constituent groups have been more successful in working together to bring matters forward that benefit the College. For example, the Academic Senate Program Review committee was able to use the processes to successfully bring improvement recommendations that fell under Academic and Professional matters through the Academic Senate to the PGC Planning Committee; conversations between constituent groups about policy revisions at PGC have been facilitated; and the Academic Senate and Assessment Planning Team (a subcommittee of the PGC Planning Committee) jointly reviewed and recommended a revised Annual Assessment Plan.<sup>33</sup>

### **IV.A.2. Analysis and Evaluation**

Board Policies 1.15 (Board Policy and Administrative Procedure), Board Policy 2.07 (Participatory Governance), and Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2.08 (Collegial Governance), along with the RRP Handbook, work together to ensure and clarify the means by which all constituents have the opportunity to participate in decision making. Both the PGC and the Academic Senate make provisions to encourage student participation and to consider student viewpoints. The Associated Students Executive Council Bylaws outline the processes for widespread student participation in student governance. The RRP Handbook describes how all constituents bring forward ideas and work together.

---

<sup>29</sup> [Associated Students Constitution](#)

<sup>30</sup> [Associated Students Bylaws - Ocean Campus](#)

<sup>31</sup> [PGC Internal Evaluation, Spring 2014](#) - (See comments to Questions 2, 3, & 4.)

<sup>32</sup> [PGC External College-Wide Evaluation \(Quantitative\), Spring 2014](#); [PGC External College-Wide Evaluation \(Comments\), Spring 2014](#) - (See comments to Questions 7, 8, & 9.)

<sup>33</sup> [March 17th, 2016 PGC Minutes - discussion of draft Board Policy 2.07 Participatory Governance](#)

**Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.**

The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

*Continue to develop and employ assessment tools to assess the effectiveness of the PGC and its subcommittees in support of continuous improvement. Effectively communicate procedures to participate in the PGC and how it interfaces with the Collegial Governance system. (2002 Standard IV.A.2.a.)*

**Assessment of the PGC and its subcommittees in support of continuous improvement.** The PGC continues to conduct annual internal and external evaluations of the PGC and the subcommittees in order to assess effectiveness. A Spring 2016 Internal and External evaluation, based on a College-wide survey, is ongoing. As a result, the College is revising the PGC Operational Guidelines and converting them into Administrative Procedure 2.07. This administrative procedure takes into consideration improvement suggestions resulting from the 2015 internal and external review of PGC. For example, PGC and its standing committees now have uniform templates for agendas and minutes and the standing committees now provide regular written updates to PGC.

**Effectively communicate procedures to participate in PGC.** The Participatory Governance Council webpage includes numerous items that facilitate participation. The Operational Guidelines are published. There is a form for submitting items to the agenda, a spreadsheet for tracking items in the PGC Agenda Queue, along with a tracking sheet for all decisions made. In addition, upcoming PGC agendas are emailed in advance College wide and all reading materials are linked to the PGC website in advance of meetings so that all College constituents have the opportunity to review them in advance. In addition, the RRP Handbook makes clear the progression of steps as items move through the Participatory Governance system and how to engage at each step of the process.

**Describe the interface between Participatory and Collegial Governance.** Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2.08 were revised in Spring 2016 and now articulate the interface between the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems. Administrative Procedure 2.08 identifies the steps taken when academic and professional matters (10+1) are under consideration by Participatory Governance committees. In collaboration with the Academic Senate, these items are clearly identified and sent to the Academic Senate for review, feedback, and/or recommendation. Collegial consultation steps are clarified to facilitate any necessary reconciliations and how to implement the “rely primarily” relationship between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees.

**This system is working.** For example, in the RRP Handbook, Chart D1, Development of Program Reviews, identifies the flow of Program Review development from the multiple sets of information that inform Program Review through the validation process all the way to the beginning of resource allocation. These steps include roles by faculty and department chairs to use their expertise in the development of the Program Review, the role of administration in

validating the Program Review, the role of the College's Office of Research and Planning in coordinating and distributing the completed documents, and the role of the Academic Senate in reviewing and revising Program Review processes for academic and professional Program Reviews, in coordination with the Planning Committee for non-academic and professional Program Reviews. Over the last two years, the Academic Senate Program Review Committee, in collaboration with the Planning Committee, has reviewed the College's annual Comprehensive Program Review processes. In Spring 2016, using the RRP Handbook, the two committees proposed and jointly recommended changes to the College's Program Review processes that separate Annual Plans from triennial Comprehensive Program Review. The PGC recommended this joint proposal to the Chancellor in May 2016.

In addition, because the RRP Handbook as a whole includes matter pertaining to faculty roles in governance, the Handbook went through the processes of the Academic Senate for review and recommendation.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.2.

**IV.A.3.** *Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, 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.*

#### **IV.A.3. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The system of policies and procedures in place at CCSF not only build the structure of the governance process, but also set forth the roles of the constituent groups in the process. The policies also provide for the voice in important matters as budget development, resource allocation, and planning.

**Administrators and Faculty, through Policy and Procedures, Have a Substantive and Clearly Defined Role in Institutional Governance.** Board Policy 2.07 (Participatory Governance) and the PGC Operational Guidelines, combined with Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2.08 (Collegial Governance) set forth the principles and procedures of Participatory and Collegial Governance systems with regard to administrative and faculty roles. The RRP Handbook operationalizes those roles within the various decision-making opportunities at the College.<sup>34</sup>

**Board Policy 2.07: Participatory Governance and the PGC Operational Guidelines.** Board Policy 2.07 defines the Participatory Governance system led by administrators. All constituent groups have seats on the PGC and on PGC standing committees and have the opportunity to provide input and feedback on College-wide planning

---

<sup>34</sup> [Effective Participation Specifically Defined by Title 5](#) (Source: [Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes Handbook](#), pages 2-5)

processes. The administration implements the recommendations that come through the Participatory Governance system. For example, the Enrollment Management Committee, a PGC standing committee, is chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA), and it was her administrative responsibility to develop an institutional Enrollment Management Plan. The PGC had the opportunity to review, provide feedback, and recommend the Enrollment Management Plan. The VCAA, with the support of various areas of institutional expertise, has the overall responsibility to oversee and implement the plan.

**Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2.08: Collegial Governance.** The Academic Senate oversees the Collegial Governance system with purview over all academic and professional matters. For example, the Academic Senate reviews and recommends all instructional policies, such as Board Policy 6.03 (Curriculum and Program Development). In addition, PGC standing committees that are developing plans containing academic and professional matters send those portions of the plans to the Academic Senate for review and recommendation. Some plans, such as the Basic Skills and Student Equity plans, are substantially academic and professional in nature; Academic Senate committees develop these plans. Barring extraordinary circumstances, the recommendation of the Academic Senate is accepted. In addition, the Academic Senate appoints all faculty who participate in PGC committees or taskforces.

**The RRP Handbook.** The RRP Handbook identifies the roles of administrators and faculty in governance (and includes opportunities for Associated Student and Classified Senate participation). Each initiative, policy, or procedure that the College reviews or develops begins with administrative facilitation of the process. A beginning step in each chart and narrative is to identify each of the groups, based on their expertise, that need to review and provide feedback. For example, Chart D4a “Development of Collegewide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures *Unrelated* to A&P and Student Matters (General)” describes the initiation of a policy by the College’s Legal Counsel or the review of an initiative by an administratively led Participatory Governance committee without a separate review and revision through the Collegial Governance system overseen by the Academic Senate. Participatory Governance committees or task forces propose the items, and the PGC reviews and recommends them. In comparison, and illuminating the clear identification of appropriate administrative and faculty roles, Chart D4b “Development of Collegewide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures with Some Content Related to Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) (“rely primarily”) and Student Matters” describes a process where the College relies upon the Academic Senate to consider student feedback in Academic Senate committees and make a recommendation based on faculty expertise. That recommendation, because it is based on faculty expertise, goes to PGC as information only.

With regard to the faculty and Academic and Professional matters, the College relies primarily upon the Academic Senate for consideration of such matters through the Collegial Governance

system, codified as Board Policy 2.08 and Administrative Procedure 2.08.<sup>35</sup> Thus, the Academic Senate reviews and recommends items pertaining to curriculum, educational program development, Program Review processes, faculty roles in accreditation, budget and planning development processes, and other pertinent areas through its own processes.<sup>36</sup>

**Administrators and Faculty Exercise a Substantial Voice in Policies.** Board Policy 2.07, Board Policy 2.08 and Administrative Procedure 2.08, Board Policy 1.16, and the RRP Handbook identify the principles and procedures the College uses to review and develop policies.<sup>37 38 39</sup> These principles and procedures provide for a substantial voice by both administrators and faculty.

For example, in RRP Handbook Chart D4c “Development of Collegewide Initiatives, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures with Some Content Related to Academic & Professional (A&P/10+1) (“rely primarily”) Matters (not Students),” an administrator initiates policy review and development and develops a revised or initial draft. The Academic Senate then reviews the draft. Within the Academic Senate, most committees have seats for administrators so that they can participate in the further development of the policy.<sup>40</sup> An administrator then checks the proposed policy for Title 5 compliance, the Academic Senate then reviews and recommends the policy, which the Chancellor reviews prior to its receipt by the PGC as information only. The Chancellor then presents the policy the Board of Trustees for approval.

**Administrators and Faculty Exercise a Substantial Voice in Planning.** The RRP Handbook illustrates the collaborative planning process of the College and how the expertise and responsibilities of administrators and faculty are relied upon appropriately. These are highlighted in Charts D1 to D3. For example, Chart D2 “Development of Collegewide Plans Associated with Categorical Funding” demonstrates how constituent groups play a role in the development and implementation of plans that improve the College.<sup>41</sup> For example, plans such as the Basic Skills, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), and Student Equity Plans require the reliance on both faculty and administrators in their areas of expertise. In order to facilitate this, the College uses faculty coordinators, co-appointed by the administration and the Academic Senate, and under the supervision of administrative liaisons, to work with Academic Senate committees or Participatory Governance task forces, to develop plans. The faculty coordinator is responsible for obtaining feedback from the Academic Senate. The administrative liaison works closely with the administrator who has ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the plan.

---

<sup>35</sup> [Board Policy 2.08](#) - Collegial Governance: Academic Senate; [Administrative Procedure 2.08](#) - Methods for Collegial Consultation

<sup>36</sup> See also, [Academic Senate Constitution](#), Article II

<sup>37</sup> [Board Policy 2.07](#) - Policy on Participatory Governance

<sup>38</sup> [Board Policy 2.08](#) - Collegial Governance: Academic Senate; [Administrative Procedure 2.08](#) - Methods for Collegial Consultation

<sup>39</sup> [Board Policy 1.16](#) - Public Access Sunshine Policy

<sup>40</sup> [Academic Senate Education Policies Committee](#)

<sup>41</sup> [Chart D2](#) (Source: [Decision Making Flowchart](#))

In addition, because the goals of many of the College’s plans overlap, the College initiated the “Fantastic Five” (aka “Fan5”), a workgroup of faculty coordinators and administrative liaisons, and including the Classified Senate President, to discuss and assist in the implementation of categorically funded programs in five areas: SSSP, Student Equity, Adult Basic Education (via the Adult Education Block Grant, formerly AB86), Professional Development, and Basic Skills.

**Administrators and Faculty Exercise a Substantial Voice in Budget.** In conjunction with Board Policy 8.01 and Administrative Procedure 8.01 “Budget Preparation,” Program Review is an annual, College-wide process that determines the fiscal needs and allocation for all units of the College. These needs, in turn, play a major role in shaping the Annual Budget, and how the College allocates funds.

For example, RRP Handbook Chart D1 “Development of Program Reviews” demonstrates the procedure for including appropriate perspectives and roles in funding requests that derive from Program Reviews.<sup>42</sup> In Spring and Summer 2015, the Academic Senate and the Planning Committee reviewed this process and made improvements to the Program Review questions and format to facilitate department-level budget planning. Each Fall, all faculty experts within each department work with their department chairs to evaluate their program and devise strategies for improvements. Departments and Centers used the new format in Fall 2015 and submitted their Program Reviews, also outlining their fiscal, staffing and budgetary needs, to the supervising administrator over the department. The vice chancellor over each division reviews and prioritizes the Program Review requests. The vice chancellors then present their recommendations to the Chancellor’s Cabinet.

The RRP Handbook Charts R1-R3 describe the funding allocation prioritization processes for further resource allocations (Supplemental General Funds, Categorical Funds with State Plans, and Divisional Categorical Funds).<sup>43 44 45</sup> These charts describe the additional roles administrators and faculty play in the allocation of funds institution wide. These processes include funding prioritization activities that include faculty and classified staff, as appropriate, on committees as decisions are made. In addition, in 2016, the Academic Senate Officers were invited to participate in the prioritization of Program Review prior to presentation at PGC.

All of these decisions roll up into the annual College budget. Discussions regarding development of the Annual Budget typically begin in Spring after Program Review is completed, and the finance team produces the first draft of the Annual Budget for presentation to all constituents at the PGC in May. The PGC receives it again in the Fall after the Summer break, and before it is presented to the Board of Trustees in September for final adoption.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> [Chart D1](#) (Source: [Decision Making Flowchart](#))

<sup>43</sup> [Chart R1](#) (Source: [Decision Making Flowchart](#))

<sup>44</sup> [Chart R2](#) (Source: [Decision Making Flowchart](#))

<sup>45</sup> [Chart R3](#) (Source: [Decision Making Flowchart](#))

<sup>46</sup> [PGC Meeting on September 17, 2015: 2015-16 Adopted Budget Presentation; Recording of Meeting](#))

### **IV.A.3. Analysis and Evaluation**

The policies and procedures at CCSF establish the roles of the constituent group members. The policies and procedures are memorialized in the Roles, Responsibilities, and Responsibilities Handbook. The RRP Handbook defines the roles of constituents and in particular, administrators and faculty, to participate in shaping the content of draft policies and procedures, planning and budget/funding. In Spring 2015, the Academic Senate worked in collaboration with the Planning Committee (of the PGC) to improve Program Review, which informs the process for development of the Annual Budget, beginning with the development of the 2016-17 Budget.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.3.

**IV.A.4.** *Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.*

### **IV.A.4. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The development of course and program curriculum is at the heart of student learning at the College. The roles of faculty in the development, creation and implementation of new and emerging content is well recognized and guarded by their faculty in their leadership in academic and professional matters. The role of the administration to support faculty in this endeavor and foster implementation and evaluation is likewise clear.

**Policy Defines the Role of Faculty and Academic Administrators.** Board Policy 2.08 and Administrative Procedure 2.08 (Collegial Governance) describes the Board of Trustees' decision to rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all academic and professional areas defined by Title 5, section 53200,<sup>47</sup> including:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for Program Review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon

---

<sup>47</sup> [Title 5, CCR § 53200](#)

**A Well-Defined Academic Senate Structure Makes all Collegial Recommendations.** The Academic Senate has the benefit of many years of strong leadership and well-defined structures. The Academic Senate has three governing documents: the Constitution, Bylaws, and Operational Guidelines.<sup>48 49 50</sup> These governing documents describe an Academic Senate made up of a 29-member at-large Executive Council that oversees approximately 20 committees. The Executive Council is led by four officers elected annually. The membership of the Academic Senate committees (usually all constituent groups are encouraged to participate), the role of the Academic Senate committees in creating proposals for review and recommendation by the Executive Council, and the roles and responsibilities of the Officers are clearly spelled out. Each committee has a description, membership list, activities list, and purpose statement, all of which are posted online.<sup>51</sup>

In addition, the Academic Senate continues to work with the Associated Students Executive Council regarding those “10+1” items that overlap with student interests as memorialized in the Student “9+1” of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, section 51023.7.<sup>52</sup> Students have seats on all appropriate Academic Senate committees. Faculty submitting items for consideration by the Academic Senate fill out a submission form and describe the effective participation that was engaged in for each item. This includes an identification of the interests of students in the item and the clarification of the opportunities that students were offered to participate.

**Faculty and Academic Administrators Make Recommendations about Curriculum and Learning Programs.** Curriculum and educational program development begin with the faculty expertise in each of the College’s departments. Faculty, with the support of their department chair, use the Curriculum Committee Handbook to ensure that proposed curriculum meets all state defined parameters. Per Board Policy 6.03 (Curriculum and Program Development), the College’s Curriculum Committee, a committee of the Academic Senate, works collaboratively with the Office of Instruction to review and recommend curriculum and programs.<sup>53</sup> The Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction serves on the committee as well as a number of additional ex officio positions, such as the SLO Lead, the CurricUNET administrator, the Matriculation Coordinator, the Articulation Coordinator, and the Distance Education Coordinator, whose expertise is deemed essential.

Committee structures and participation in Collegial Governance procedures provide academic administrators and faculty the responsibility to make recommendations on student learning program and services. The Academic Senate has committees that focus on various aspects of

---

<sup>48</sup> [Academic Senate Constitution](#)

<sup>49</sup> [Academic Senate Bylaws](#)

<sup>50</sup> [Academic Senate Guidelines for Committees](#)

<sup>51</sup> [Academic Senate web page re Committees](#)

<sup>52</sup> [Academic Senate Committee Page with Instructions for Students on How to Join Committees.](#) see also, [Title 5, California Code of Regulations, section 51023.7](#)

<sup>53</sup> [AP 6.03](#) (recommended by Academic Senate in May 2016 along with revised BP 6.03; moving through formal adoption process)

the Academic and Professional matters that are in the Senate’s charge, as well as a number of subcommittees and other advisory committees that are in alignment with institutional priorities as set by the Board of Trustees, as well as both the Mission and Vision Statements.<sup>54</sup> For example, the Matriculation committee reviews and makes proposals on College-wide prerequisite policies.

**Faculty and Academic Administrators Make Recommendations about Student Support Services.** Using Participatory Governance processes, the Chancellor established the Equal Access to Success Emergency (EASE) Task Force in Fall 2015.<sup>55</sup> The EASE Task Force included members from the Student Development Division, School and Center deans, department chairs, faculty, classified staff, and students, to provide equitable student support services, and library and learning support services at all Centers in order to appropriately serve the students in programs located at the Centers.<sup>56 57</sup> The EASE Task Force met regularly on a strict timeline to ensure that a plan for the provision of services was ready by November 1, 2015, for implementation in the Spring 2016 semester.<sup>58</sup>

#### **IV.A.4. Analysis and Evaluation**

The College has clearly defined policies and practices that follow Title 5 and the Education Code, and the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in all 10+1 Title 5 Academic and Professional matters, and relies upon the Academic Senate to work with students on “10+1” matters that overlap with student interests. It also looks to the various committees and subcommittees of the Academic Senate for proposals concerning student learning programs and services. In addition, the Chancellor created the EASE Task Force which included faculty, department chairs, and academic deans to implement a plan for the provision of essential student services at the Centers. Implementation began in early Spring 2016.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.4.

**IV.A.5.** *Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.*

---

<sup>54</sup> [Academic Senate webpage re Committees](#)

<sup>55</sup> [EASE Taskforce Webpage](#)

<sup>56</sup> [EASE Taskforce Membership List](#)

<sup>57</sup> [EASE Taskforce Purpose PowerPoint](#)

<sup>58</sup> [EASE Taskforce Purpose PowerPoint](#)

#### IV.A.5. Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Governance Structures Effectuate the Inclusion of Relevant Perspectives.** Through the use of principles outlined in Board Policies 1.10 (Public Participation at Board meetings), 1.11 (Speakers at Board Meetings), and 1.12 (Decorum), the Board of Trustees ensures the participation of all College constituents in the discussion of items brought before them for final adoption.<sup>59 60 61</sup> In addition, both Participatory (Board Policy 2.07) and Collegial (Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2.08) Governance structures include and encourage participation by all constituent groups. The RRP Handbook more clearly defines the processes used by these structures.

**The PGC.** For example, the Participatory Governance Council, with its standing committees and its collaboration with the Academic Senate Collegial Governance system, ensures the provision of input from constituents and engagement in robust discussion on a variety of topics of Collegewide significance such as: accreditation, enrollment management, student trustee elections, student worker wages, faculty and classified staffing, and major plans such as the Education Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Technology Plan, the Mission and Vision Statements, Program Review and development of the Annual Budget, changes in administrative structures, as well as the roles and responsibilities of all constituents to engage in decision-making processes, as codified in the RRP Handbook.<sup>62</sup>

The PGC will have six standing committees, with members from all four constituent groups. All of the standing committees meet regularly to provide a forum for discussion of issues of College-wide significance. The PGC relies on the standing committees and their members for their work and expertise on topics of College-wide concern. They maintain a calendar, meeting agendas, and notes for all meetings and provide regular reports to the PGC. Information regarding each committee appears on separate web pages of the College's website.<sup>63</sup> In addition to the PGC, all of these committees provide an additional opportunity for members of the College community to engage on specific topics of Collegewide significance.

**The Academic Senate.** The Academic Senate Executive Council provides a forum for discussion on SLO assessment requirements, Program Review process improvements, the SSSP Plan, the Student Equity Plan, Annual Institutional Assessments, the RRP Handbook, the Enrollment Management Plan, the Institutional Self Evaluation, and more.

Many of these discussions take place within Academic Senate committees. The Academic Senate has approximately 20 committees that serve as expert resources for learning community and pathway development, student equity and basic skills strategies, Program

---

<sup>59</sup> [Board Policy 1.10](#) - Public Participation at Board Meetings

<sup>60</sup> [Board Policy 1.11](#) - Speakers at Board Meetings

<sup>61</sup> [Board Policy 1.12](#) - Decorum

<sup>62</sup> [Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes Handbook](#)

<sup>63</sup> Subcommittees of PGC: [Accreditation Committee](#), [Diversity Committee](#), [Enrollment Management Committee](#), [Planning Committee](#)

Review processes, scholarships, and more.<sup>64</sup> Most of these committees have seats for both classified staff and Associated Students representatives.

In addition, the Academic Senate Executive Council Agenda Items Submissions form specifically identifies the Student 9+1 and asks submitters to describe how “effective participation” was achieved.<sup>65</sup> This information is shared with all faculty prior to the Council meeting and included when Academic Senate items are forwarded to the PGC.

**The Associated Students.** The Associated Students Executive Council recently drafted edits to ratify the existing Constitution that more accurately outline student representation across the District. The Associated Students provides an avenue for student involvement and engagement with student issues and concerns through their processes. Each Campus/Center has the ability to elect or appoint students to serve as representatives of students within the Associated Students. In total, the following Campus/Centers have active Associated Student Councils: Civic Center, Chinatown/North Beach, Downtown, Evans, John Adams, Mission, Ocean, and Southeast. The Associated Students Councils at these sites serve to represent the student voice at their respective Campus/Center. The Associated Students Executive Council is made up of two representatives appointed by each of the active Associated Students Councils and the Student Trustee. The Associated Students Executive Council is the governing body that appoints students to serve on the Participatory Governance Council and its standing committees, the appropriate Academic Senate committees, and facilitates participation.

**The Classified Senate.** The Classified Senate provides a forum for discussion on the Institutional Self Evaluation, EASE Task Force, Information Technology, the Student Equity Plan, Enrollment Management, and more at the monthly Senate meetings.<sup>66 67 68 69 70 71</sup>

**Decision-making is Aligned with Expertise and Responsibility.** Both the PGC and the Academic Senate provide opportunities for all constituent groups to participate on committees. However, decision making is intentionally aligned with expertise in several ways:

- Each constituent group has the opportunity to appoint individuals whom they feel have the appropriate expertise to best represent them.
- Committees are led by individuals with expertise and responsibility in that committee’s area of purview. For example, the administrative leadership of the Capital Projects and Plans Committee is the Vice Chancellor of Finance. The administrative leader of the

---

<sup>64</sup> [Committees page of Academic Senate website](#)

<sup>65</sup> [Academic Senate Executive Council Agenda Item Submission Form](#)

<sup>66</sup> [Classified Senate Agenda August 26, 2015](#)

<sup>67</sup> [Classified Senate Agenda September 16, 2015](#)

<sup>68</sup> [Classified Senate Agenda October 21, 2015](#)

<sup>69</sup> [Classified Senate Agenda December 16, 2015](#)

<sup>70</sup> [Classified Senate Agenda October 21, 2015](#)

<sup>71</sup> [Classified Senate Website](#)

Enrollment Management Committee is the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The faculty Basic Skills Coordinator leads the Basic Skills Committee.

- Many Collegial Governance committees have a membership structure that draws from specific areas of expertise. For example, the Basic Skills, Student Equity Strategies, and Curriculum Committees all define their membership to include specific areas of expertise. All three of these committees have seats specifically for representatives from Math, English, Career Technical Education, English as a Second Language, and more.
- Standing committee chairs or classified representatives on standing committees present College-wide plans to the Classified Senate during its regular meetings; members of the Classified Senate discuss these plans and make suggestions for improvement.<sup>72</sup>
- The Associated Student Councils discuss relevant College-wide plans and initiatives during the meetings of the Executive Council and similarly with the individual AS Councils across the District. The AS Executive Council provides written and verbal feedback that is shared at the PGC meetings.<sup>73</sup>

By designing committees intentionally and allowing constituent groups to appoint their preferred representatives, the College ensures that decision making is aligned with expertise.

**Timely Action is Taken on Institutional Plans.** The processes described above have resulted in timely action on institutional plans, policies and curricular and programmatic changes as part of the College's overall commitment to continuous quality improvement. For example:

- Academic Senate discussions and the decision to assess SLOs in each course section led to the revision of the Annual Assessment Plan and the timely implementation of program-level changes in assessment. The College now has over 95 percent reporting, by individual student, across all course sections, and is now a leader across the state in the assessment of student learning outcomes.
- The collaborative decision between the Academic Senate and the administration to create dedicated faculty coordinator positions in key areas attached to categorically funded state plans led to the creation of the Fantastic Five ("Fan5"). The Fan5 committees have enabled better coordinated and more timely disbursement of categorical funds which will result in improved and equitable curriculum and services for students.<sup>74</sup> The recent addition of the Classified Senate President or their designee exemplifies an improvement aimed at further ensuring the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives.

---

<sup>72</sup> [Classified Senate Agenda October 21, 2015](#) (see agenda items related to IT Plan and Enrollment Management Plan), [Classified Senate Agenda December 16, 2015](#) (see agenda item related to the Student Equity Plan)

<sup>73</sup> Examples: [Screenshot of 6/17/16 Associated Students Meeting Agenda - Item 9c](#) (Source: [6/17/16 Associated Students Executive Council Meeting Agenda](#)), [2/18/16 PGC minutes, p.5](#); [3/3/16 PGC minutes, item #6, p.3](#) reflect Associated Students recommendation; [3/3/16 handout from PGC student member](#) (Source: [PGC website](#)).

<sup>74</sup> [Basic Skills Funding Recommendations for 2015-16](#); [Student Equity Funding Recommendations for 2015-16](#)

- A clear result of timely action on institutional plans is the accomplishment of discrete plan activities from across the institution's plans. The Office of Research and Planning oversees the Educational Master Plan Implementation Matrix that tracks progress on all activities linked to institutional plans. The update on implementation provided to the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and the PGC in May 2016 revealed a substantial completion rate for all plans.<sup>75</sup>

#### **IV.A.5. Analysis and Evaluation**

Both the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems provide for the inclusion of all constituent groups and relevant perspectives. The leadership, structure, and make up of the committees align decision-making with expertise and responsibility. By connecting decision-making with responsible parties, timely action is taken on plans and changes at all levels of the institution. In addition, the Associated Students governance structure encourages the participation of students from all Centers and centralizes these perspectives on the Associated Students Executive Council. The Classified Senate holds regular meetings to discuss and collect feedback on all College-wide plans and shares that feedback at PGC.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.5.

**IV.A.6.** *The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.*

#### **IV.A.6. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**Decision-making Processes Are Documented.** The PGC and the Collegial Governance systems both have documented processes for decision-making.

**The PGC.** Board Policy 2.07 (Participatory Governance) and the PGC Operational Guidelines outline the principles, goals, and processes for participation on PGC committees and describe the management of each committee. In addition, each PGC committee has an official webpage with its published committee description, meeting times, agendas, minutes, and supporting materials.

**Collegial Governance.** The Academic Senate ensures that all Collegial Governance system (Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2.08) structures and activities are also published online. The Academic Senate's governance documents (Constitution, Bylaws, and Operational Guidelines) are on the Academic Senate homepage.<sup>76 77 78 79</sup> These governing documents describe the roles, responsibilities, and processes of the internal workings of the

---

<sup>75</sup> [Education Master Plan Implementation Matrix 2016](#)

<sup>76</sup> [Academic Senate Constitution](#)

<sup>77</sup> [Academic Senate Bylaws](#)

<sup>78</sup> [Guidelines for Academic Senate Committees](#)

<sup>79</sup> [Academic Senate Homepage](#)

Academic Senate. Committees each have a separate web page with published committee descriptions, membership lists, meeting times, agendas, minutes or notes, and supporting materials.

**The RRP Handbook - working collaboratively.** While the PGC and the Academic Senate each have their own documentation of internal decision-making processes, the RRP Handbook describes the processes by which these two systems work together in collaboration with all constituent groups. This handbook has been shared with all constituent groups and is published on the Academic Senate and Participatory Governance websites.<sup>80</sup>

**Resulting Decisions Are Documented and Widely Communicated.** The College widely documents and communicates decisions.

There are several locations where the College documents decisions:

- Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are available from the Board of Trustees webpage.
- Board of Trustees meeting minutes are available from the Board of Trustees webpage.
- Institutional Plans are published under “College Plans” on the College Planning Committee webpage.
- Program Review prioritizations are posted on the Program Review website.
- Constituent Group and Division Reports (Academic Affairs, Student Services, Institutional Development) are published with the Board Agenda.
- PGC and Committee minutes are published on the Council webpage and appropriate individual PGC web pages.
- Academic Senate Executive Council minutes are published on the Academic Senate Minutes web page. Committees each have individual web pages where minutes and decisions are published. In addition, all resolutions passed by the Executive Council are published on the Resolutions page of the Academic Senate.

College constituents are also kept informed of issues through email (Chancellor’s Mailbag, accreditation updates, Academic Senate News, Associated Students Newsletter) and College-wide meetings (Chancellor’s Flex Day address, the Chancellor/Vice Chancellor “Town Hall” meetings, College-wide Colloquies on Budget and Enrollment).<sup>81 82 83 84 85</sup> In addition, administrators regularly give updates to the Associated Students Executive Council at their bi-

---

<sup>80</sup> [RRP Handbook](#)

<sup>81</sup> [Chancellor's 8/14/15 Flex Day Address](#)

<sup>82</sup> [Accreditation emails](#)

<sup>83</sup> [President's Reports](#)

<sup>84</sup> [AS Newsletter](#)

<sup>85</sup> [CCSF Town Hall Schedule 2015-2016](#), Classified Flex Day (9/25/15) Chancellor's Q&A Town Hall, see [September 25, 2015 Classified Flex Day Handbook](#), (pg. 3.)

monthly meetings on key topics as accreditation, enrollment, the Annual Budget, and the issues of College-wide significance that are discussed at the PGC.<sup>86</sup>

#### **IV.A.6. Analysis and Evaluation**

The College documents its decision-making processes for both Participatory and Collegial Governance and makes the RRP Handbook widely available for all constituent groups. The College has multiple means of regular communication about decisions that are made. Timely feedback is provided in the making of decisions and the providing of feedback on evaluation of steps taken. Systems in place safeguard the respected role that College groups play in the process.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.6.

***IV.A.7.** Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, 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.*

#### **IV.A.7. Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

##### **Leadership Roles, Governance, and Decision-making Processes Are Regularly Evaluated.**

The College regularly evaluates the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems.

**The PGC.** Since the College's last comprehensive Self Evaluation, the Participatory Governance system has been evaluated three times. The College has conducted an internal (by PGC and standing committee membership) and external (College community) evaluation each year.<sup>87</sup> The internal evaluation revealed that members of PGC were aware of the Operational Guidelines. However, results were mixed as to effectiveness of the PGC's governance and the PGC members' conveyance of information to their constituents and solicitation of input, and whether the standing committees provided sufficient information regarding the matters that they address.

**The Collegial Governance system.** The Academic Senate also regularly reviews the effectiveness of the Collegial Governance system.

Each year committee members report back on committee effectiveness; alignment of committee activities with Accreditation Standards, academic and professional matters, and student needs; effectiveness of communication; and ideas for improvement. In 2015, the Academic Senate

---

<sup>86</sup> Accreditation presentations at Associated Students Executive Council Meeting: [8/12/15, item 8c, last page](#), [10/30/15, item 8a, last page](#) - [Kristin and Lani's Accreditation presentation](#) (Source: [Accreditation Conversation Archives](#), see 10/30/15), [11/4/15, item 9a, p.3](#); Trustee Randolph presented to students at Associated Students Executive Council: [2/5/16, Item 9k, last page](#), and [3/11/16, Item 7i, last page](#); Discussion of Equity Plan: [4/25/16 Associated Student Council/Inter-Club Council Agenda, Item 8a, p.3](#)

<sup>87</sup> See, [PGC Internal Evaluation, Spring 2014](#) - (Comments to Questions 3 & 4), and [PGC External College-Wide Evaluation \(Quantitative\), Spring 2014](#); [PGC External College-Wide Evaluation \(Comments\), Spring 2014](#) - (Comments to Questions 4, 6 & 7)

added an internal and external evaluation of the Executive Council and committees based on the Participatory Governance system's internal and external evaluation model. The evaluation revealed that faculty were informed about the activities of the Executive Council and satisfied with its performance. However, the relationship of the Academic Senate committees to the Executive Council and the communication of their activities needed improvement.

For the last two years the Academic Senate has also participated in Program Review. This provided the opportunity for the Academic Senate to more intentionally evaluate the effectiveness of its activities through a quantitative analysis of the alignment of Executive Council resolutions with academic and professional responsibilities. The combination of this analysis with the external and internal evaluation results revealed that the Academic Senate was primarily focused on accreditation issues, faculty roles in governance, and overall student success. These identified focus areas were in alignment with the overall concerns of the College during the same time period.

**The Associated Students.** The Associated Students participates in the evaluation of the Participatory Governance system. To date, the Associated Students is in the process of internally evaluating its processes and will begin designing a formal evaluation of its internal processes that mirrors the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems. For the past couple years, the Associated Students Executive Council has participated in the Program Review process and Student Learning Outcomes processes through the Student Activities Office. Based on analysis of these processes, the Associated Students continues to make improvements through increased training and modifications to existing processes.

**The Classified Senate.** The Classified Senate participates in the evaluation of the Participatory Governance system. To date, the Classified Senate has evaluated its own processes informally (see results below) and has begun designing a formal evaluation of its internal processes that draws on the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems internal and external evaluation models with the support of the Office of Research and Planning. It will administer this evaluation in Fall 2016. In addition, the Classified Senate will begin participating as a unit in Program Review in Fall 2016.<sup>88</sup>

**Results of Evaluations are Communicated and Utilized as the Basis for Improvement.** Both the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems communicate their evaluation results and use them to make improvements.

**The PGC.** In Spring 2015 and going into Summer 2015, both the PGC and its (then) four standing committees initiated an online evaluation, for both members and College constituents to provide feedback as to the efficacy of the PGC and the standing committees. The standing committees were included in the Spring/Summer 2015 internal and external evaluations, as a result of the PGC External Evaluation in Spring 2014.

---

<sup>88</sup> [Classified Senate minutes for June 15, 2016](#)

Discussion of the latest results of both internal and external evaluations took place at the November 5, 2015, PGC meeting, and a number of concerns were raised that are under consideration by the PGC.<sup>89</sup> The internal evaluation indicated: (1) the PGC should convene a workgroup to review the Operational Guidelines, (2) encourage the Chancellor to attend PGC meetings, (3) conduct meetings more efficiently, (4) increase efforts to seek constituent input, (5) continue to conduct annual surveys of the PGC, (6) develop and clarify decision-making processes, (7) receive monthly reports from standing committees, and (8) continue to review draft Board policies and administrative procedures to provide more clarity to constituents.<sup>90</sup> The results of the external evaluation (College community) indicated (1) the PGC should clarify its purpose and communicate this College wide, (2) engage PGC members in discussions, and (3) provide for more public input at PGC meetings.<sup>91</sup>

As a result, the PGC implemented a number of improvements, including: (1) clearer procedures on how to place items on the PGC agenda; (2) creation of a list of items recommended to the Chancellor and/or Board of Trustees, tracking those that have been implemented, and (3) better agenda planning to allow constituents longer lead times for review of agenda items (e.g., the Annual Budget), prior to discussion by the PGC.

In addition, in September 2014, the PGC introduced an online form that constituent groups can submit in order to propose new agenda items.<sup>92</sup> The PGC now also has an online spreadsheet that tracks the progress of items reviewed by the PGC.<sup>93</sup> Also, beginning in Fall 2015, the PGC formed an Agenda Review Committee made up of the Chair of the PGC, members from all constituent groups, and the General Counsel to review proposed agenda items and plan future agendas for PGC meetings. The Agenda Review Committee also looks at the timing of items to be brought at future meetings, in order to ensure that all College constituents have sufficient time to review information regarding items before they are discussed at the PGC.

While the Information Technologies Advisory Committee and the Capital Projects and Planning Committee (Facilities) have been bringing discussion items to PGC on a regular basis, in order to formally include these key areas of concern to the college within the systematized decision-making process, the Chancellor added these committees as standing committees of the PGC. A third new standing committee, Budget, is currently under consideration.

The standing committees were instructed to review their individual results and report back to the PGC on improvements made as a result.<sup>94</sup> All standing committees reported back that they were making improvements to communication (posting of agendas and minutes); increasing efficiency (managing the meetings more intentionally); taking clearer actions by voting on action items and

---

<sup>89</sup> [PGC Agenda - November 5, 2015](#)

<sup>90</sup> [PGC - 2015 Evaluation Results](#)

<sup>91</sup> [PGC - 2015 Evaluation Results](#)

<sup>92</sup> [PGC Agenda Proposal form](#)

<sup>93</sup> [Online spreadsheet to track progress of items reviewed by the PGC](#)

<sup>94</sup> [PGC Agenda - November 5, 2015](#)

reporting back on results; encouraging broader participation (reach out to appointing bodies especially for classified staff and student representatives); and connecting more intentionally to the PGC (providing regular written and oral updates).

The Facilities and IT Committees underwent internal and external evaluations at the same time as the PGC and four then-existing standing committees in Spring 2016, the results of which will be available in Fall 2016.

**The Collegial Governance system.** The Academic Senate regularly evaluates its governance structure, communicates the results widely, and uses the results as a basis for improvement.<sup>95</sup>

Regular annual committee evaluations have been discussed at Executive Council meetings and communicated to all faculty on an annual basis via email for several years. In addition, the results are posted on the Academic Senate website. In 2014, the Academic Senate began participating in the Program Review process. The results of evaluations are included in the Academic Senate Program Reviews for both 2014 and 2015.<sup>96</sup>

As a result of the committee evaluations, the Academic Senate changed the reporting structure for committee agendas, minutes, and reading materials; created an online tracking sheet of committee postings, created an online Executive Council Agenda Submission Form that specifically identifies the link between the work of the committee and both the academic and professional and student areas of interest; and created an online tracking sheet of Executive Council actions taken and where the item was forwarded to for taking action.<sup>97 98 99 100</sup>

The combined survey results of the internal and external evaluation of the Academic Senate Executive Council and the quantitative evaluation of the actions taken by the Academic Senate led to the setting of annual improvement goals by the Academic Senate. Five key goals were identified in Program Review in Fall 2014 and as of Spring 2016 are completed:

1. A review of the alignment of Academic Senate committees with the needs of the Senate: This review was conducted over the course of the 2015-16 academic year with adjustments made to the makeup of several committees.
2. Work with Administration to create a map/diagram process of how Collegial Governance and Participatory Governance work alongside each other in a manner that best protects a reliance on faculty for all academic and professional matters: The resulting RRP Handbook was completed in May 2016.

---

<sup>95</sup> [Academic Senate 2014-2015 Program Review Internal and External Evaluation Results under "Data Trends"](#)

<sup>96</sup> Academic Senate Program Review: [2014](#), [2015](#)

<sup>97</sup> [Academic Senate Committee Agenda, Minutes, Materials Upload Instructions](#)

<sup>98</sup> [Academic Senate Committee Postings](#)

<sup>99</sup> [Academic Senate Executive Council Agenda Item Submission Form](#)

<sup>100</sup> [Academic Senate Executive Council Actions Taken](#)

3. Professionalization of institutional work done by faculty coordinators: The codification of the role of the Fan5 workgroup was included in the RRP Handbook.
4. Continued professional development of leadership: The Leading From the Middle program took place over the 2015-2016 academic year. LFM teams made presentations on their experiences to the administrative team in May 2016.
5. A redesign of the Senate offices to accommodate committee and Officer meetings and to ensure ADA compliance: This project was completed in Summer 2015.

The Academic Senate Program Review for 2015 included the following goals:

1. Bring additional on-site ongoing professional development programs to CCSF. This proposal has already been recommended by the Executive Council. And is included in the Student Equity Plan.
2. Establish a “President-elect” position for the Academic Senate with additional reassigned time. A request for resources has been made, however, this will require a change to the Academic Senate Constitution.
3. Consider reformatting Executive Council representation to be based on area, departments, or schools. This would require a change to the Academic Senate Constitution.
4. Improve report back function of Academic Senate committees, and faculty representatives from the PGC standing committees.

The improvement goals for the Academic Senate included in the 2015 Program Review require substantial time to accomplish. For example, changing the basis of representation on the Executive Council requires a change to the Academic Senate Constitution. This is an endeavor that exceeds the current resources of the Academic Senate due to the primary focus of meeting the 2014 Accreditation Standards.

**The Associated Students.** In Fall 2015, the Associated Students Executive Council undertook a long-overdue update of its Constitution, Bylaws, and Campus/Center Council Bylaws.<sup>101</sup> The Associated Students Executive Council began the process to make edits to ratify the Constitution and create standard Bylaws for all Campus/Center councils. In addition, the Council is continuing in their process to review and make edits to the Associated Students Financial Guidelines and create operating guidelines consistent with Board Policies/Administrative Procedures, District Guidelines, and the Education Code.

**The Classified Senate.** Although the Classified Senate has not formally evaluated its processes, it took action in Fall 2015 to better publicize and post agendas and minutes from its meetings, after receiving feedback that there was a lack of online information regarding the

---

<sup>101</sup> [Associated Students' Campus and Center By-Laws](#)

Classified Senate meetings and resolutions.<sup>102</sup> Beginning June 2016, the Classified Senate Executive Council increased its meeting frequency to weekly to conduct regular business and update the website.<sup>103</sup>

#### **IV.A.7. Analysis and Evaluation**

Both the Participatory and Collegial Governance systems conduct regular evaluations, communicate the results widely, and use the results as a basis for improvement to College decision-making processes.

The results of the internal PGC membership and external College-wide surveys indicate that, while many in the College understand the roles of the PGC, in 2015 many still questioned its efficacy. As a result, several improvements were made at both the committee and Council level. The results of these changes will be evaluated in Fall 2016 based on feedback from the May 2016 annual external and internal survey of PGC.

#### **Response to findings from the Restoration Evaluation Team/January 2015 Action Letter.**

The Restoration Evaluation Report included the following comments related to this Standard:

*Evaluate all components of the governance structure and processes and widely communicate the results of the evaluation. (2012 Standard IV.A.5)*

As noted above, the PGC has engaged in internal and external evaluations in both Spring 2014 and Spring 2015, both of which were publicized at PGC meetings. As a result, the PGC has made a number of improvements to improve the efficacy of the operation of the PGC. In addition, as a follow up to the Spring 2014 internal and external evaluations, in Spring 2015, the (then) four standing committees of the PGC engaged in internal and external evaluations of each Committee. The results were reported to the PGC in Fall 2015, and a number of improvements were made in order that each Committee may continue to be effective in its work and recommendations to the PGC. The results of the Spring 2016 internal and external evaluations of the PGC and the now six standing committees will be available later in Fall 2016.

The Academic Senate has conducted ongoing evaluations of its committee structure and effectiveness. In addition, an annual internal and external evaluation of the Academic Senate has been added. The results of all evaluations are discussed at the Executive Council, shared with all faculty, posted on the Academic Senate website, and used as a basis for improvements.

The Associated Students Executive Council has been reviewing its effectiveness and making changes to its Constitution, Bylaws, and Campus/Center Council Bylaws. In addition, the Council is reviewing and updating its Associated Students Financial Guidelines and creating operating guidelines consistent with Board Policies/Administrative Procedures, District Guidelines, and the Education Code.

---

<sup>102</sup> [Classified Senate website](#)

<sup>103</sup> [Classified Senate Executive Council meeting notes](#)

Classified Senate informally evaluates its processes on a regular basis and makes improvements as a result such as ensuring that the website provides sufficient, up-to-date information about its activities and increasing the frequency of Executive Council meetings. It has begun designing a formal evaluation that it will administer in Fall 2016 at which time it will also begin completing Program Review as a unit.

**Conclusion.** The College meets Standard IV.A.7.

**Standard IV.A. Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process**

Standard IV.A. Changes Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process				
Goal	Associated Action(s)	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date	Outcome
Codify the College's decision-making processes and the relationship between the Participatory Governance system and Collegial Governance system  (Standard IV.A.2.; Standard I.B.7.)	Develop RRP Handbook that simultaneously codifies and evaluates the roles, responsibilities, and processes related to decision making	Chancellor Academic Senate President Classified Senate President AVC Institutional Development	April 2016	All constituencies will have clarity regarding their roles and responsibilities and the processes related to decision making at the College
Ensure evaluation of all governance structures  (Standard IV.A.2. and IV.A.7.)	Conduct PGC evaluation Conduct Academic Senate evaluation Conduct Associated Students evaluation Conduct Classified Senate evaluation	PGC Chair Academic Senate President Associate Dean of Student Affairs and Associated Students Classified Senate President	PGC evaluation completed in Spring 2014 and Spring 2015 and continuing annually  Academic Senate conducts ongoing evaluation  Associated Students conducts ongoing evaluation  Classified Senate will conduct formal internal and external evaluation in Fall 2016  Classified Senate will begin conducting Program Review as a unit in Fall 2016	Ongoing improvement of governance structures based on evaluation findings

<b>Standard IV.A. Plans Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process</b>				
<b>Goal</b>	<b>Associated Action(s)</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	<b>Expected Outcome</b>
Evaluate the RRP Handbook both as a tool and the processes themselves (Standard IV.A.1.)	<p>Conduct trainings on RRP and continue to adapt RRP as needed to ensure clarity and usability.</p> <p>Conduct formal evaluation through survey and discussion in PGC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and other forums as appropriate.</p>	<p>Chancellor Academic Senate President Classified Senate President Associate Vice Chancellor of Institutional Development/ALO</p>	Ongoing informally; formally during Spring 2018	RRP Handbook will continually improve and adapt as needed to ensure currency and utility