Minutes
CCSF ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
Wednesday, November 11, 2009
John Adams Campus, Room 104

Council Members Present:
Bob Davis, Christine Francisco, Matthew Holsten, Hal Huntsman, Carmen Lamha, Tore Eldor Langmo, Renato Larin, Susan Lopez, Enrique Mireles, Elliott Osborne, Francine Podenski, Fred Teti, Edgar Torres, Ellen Wall, Carlos Webster, David Yee

Absent:
Mary Bravewoman, Steven Brown, Beth Cataldo, Beth Freedman, Nora Goodfriend-Koven, Lynda Hirose, Glenn Nance, Indiana Quadra, Maria Rosales-Uribe, Bill Shields, Jane Sneed, Ardel Thomas, Trinh Tran

Other Senate Members Present: Todd Rigg Carriero, Carmen R. Roman-Murray, Karen Saginor

Guests: John Adan, Alan Chen, Tom Boegel, Katie Gelardi, Alice Murillo

Before a quorum was reached, council members informally discussed informational items on the Agenda.

I. **Call to Order**
The Academic Senate Executive Council came to order at 2:51 pm.
II. **Adoption of Agenda**
Council adopted the agenda with several changes:
Committee Appointments were moved to after Committee Reports.
Council prioritized Unfinished Business and New Business items.
III. **Approval of Minutes: October 21, 2009**
Council approved the minutes with corrections.
IV. **Officers' Reports**
A. President Huntsman:
- Distributed his report in writing (Appendix A) and called attention to Item 8: Chief Technology Officer and Item 9: Program Review Workgroup.

B. 1st Vice President Edgar Torres:
- Distributed his report in writing (Appendix B) and summarized efforts to recruit faculty for committee appointments.

V. **Unfinished Business**
A. **Fourth Reading: Proposed Changes to District Vision and Mission**
Two versions of the District Vision and Mission Statements were distributed in writing.

Resolution 2009.11.11.01 District Vision and Mission Statements

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Executive Council endorse the Vision and Mission Statements as amended.

Moved: Francisco; seconded: Torres; motion carried. See Appendix C.

~~A.~~**B.**   **Update: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Student Success, and Accreditation.**
Davis and Boegel provided an update about the SLO retreat that they recently attended. They discussed the role of SLOs at City College and our ongoing work that will help document them as a part of a reflective educational process.

C. **Second Reading: Proposed Associate Dean of Student Life and Student Learning**
Teti distributed a written report of concerns from the work group about this job announcement.

Executive Council members expressed additional concerns and referred this matter back to the work group.

VI. Committee Reports
A. Curriculum – Proposed Policies and Procedures Regarding Content Overlap – Todd Rigg Carriero

Discussion highlighted the role of mediation meetings to resolve differences between departments about content overlap.

Resolution 2009.11.11.02 Proposed Principles and Mechanics Regarding Content Overlap Review

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Executive Council approve the documents "Principles of Content Overlap Review" and "Mechanics of Content Overlap Review."

Moved: Lopez; seconded: Teti; motion carried. See Appendix D.

VII. New Business
A. Discussion: Proposed Administrative Reorganization and Chief Technology Officer

---

Resolution 2009.11.11.03 Proposed Administrative Reorganization and Chief Technology Officer

Resolved, that an Academic Senate Executive Council work group examine the Proposed Administrative Reorganization and Chief Technology Officer position and report back to the Executive Council at the December 2 meeting.

Moved: Podenski; seconded: Lopez; motion carried.

Note: Due to lack of time, committee appointments were not made.

VIII. Adjournment
Council adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Saginor, Senate Member
and
Beth Cataldo, Academic Senate Secretary

Appendix A: Academic Senate President's Report

1. Bipartite Follow-up 1: Two items from the Bipartite agenda will be carried onto the next agenda: proposed new language for catalog rights; a proposed liberal arts & science degree expansion (some explanation for both is attached). Please familiarize yourself with these issues so that we can decide at the next Bipartite (February 17). Let me know if you have questions.

2. Bipartite Follow-up 2: CINE 23B was not approved for Area E. I have already passed on some feedback to the department chair so that the proposal can be stronger next time, but any further feedback would be helpful. Please send it to me so I can pass it on to the chair.

3. Bipartite Training Workshop: After our last Bipartite, I was approached by a few faculty asking for further training on the General Education requirements and other issues related to Bipartite. I am currently working with Deanna Abma and others to hold such a workshop. If you are interested in this workshop, please hold February 3, 2010, at 3:30 pm open. Note that February 3 is not a Council day and is two weeks prior to our next Bipartite meeting.

4. Budget Update: The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) approved 5 of 16 requested full-time faculty positions for Fall 2010. Beyond that, PBC is already beginning to focus on and make plans for the anticipated $14 million shortfall in 2010-2011. The Chancellor is watching enrollment levels very carefully; he said at PBC that the college's FTES numbers may come close to our base funding level during 2009-2010. If they come "close enough," he suggested that we could use 2010-2011 as our "hold harmless" year with the state—that means that classes postponed this academic year would probably not come back during 2010-2011.

5. Reassign Time: The Reassign Time committee has begun asking department chairs to look at the reassign time in their departments and identify what might be temporarily given up considering our fiscal crisis. The Academic Senate currently has 1.9 FTE of reassign time for its officers each semester. Taking the lead in serving our students during the financial crisis, I believe the Academic Senate should consider temporarily, for 2010-2011, reducing the amount of reassign time we use.

	Current FTE Reassigned	Proposed FTE Reassigned (for 2010-2011 only)
President	0.8	0.5 – 0.8
1st VP	0.3	0.2
2nd VP	0.3	0.2
Secretary	0.3	0.2
Archivist	0.2	0
Total	1.9	1.1 – 1.4

I am extremely sensitive to not unintentionally creating layoffs of part-time faculty by bringing full-timers on partial release back to the classroom. If the college reduces the amount of reassign time used by full-time faculty, I am advocating that we increase the number of class sections, counseling and library hours proportionately, thereby serving more students at no new cost to the college.

6. Resolution on Admissions to the Nursing Programs: Trustee Jackson is sponsoring another nursing-related resolution, which attempts to be a compromise (see attached). The nursing chairs (Annie Chien and Chita Torres) and their dean (Linda Squires-Grohe) have approved the content of the new resolution.

7. Chancellor's Evaluation: Trustee Grier has asked for feedback regarding the evaluation instrument faculty will use for the Chancellor and the timetable for his evaluation. I have not yet received the draft evaluation, but will be forwarding it on to you as soon as I get it.

8. Chief Technology Officer: As part of the administrative reorganization, the Chancellor is proposing a Chief Technology Officer, which he believes will head a newly consolidated and more efficient ITS department,

thereby saving money. He was not able to provide the job description in time for this agenda, but it is attached to this report. The Chancellor expressed quite a bit of urgency around the position and asked to address concerning it at our December 2 meeting. He hopes we will approve the position at that meeting. Job announcement is attached.

9. <u>Program Review Workgroups:</u> As part of our new and improved program review process, we are currently recruiting 14 faculty to serve on work groups for the program review process. Faculty on these work groups would join members of the other constituencies to read and comment on program review documents from a subset of the entire college. Each work group will present recommendations to the CCSF Program Review Committee.
Most of the work would be in the spring, after the program reviews are completed by each department and program. There will be seven work groups: two for schools in Academic Affairs; one for non-Ocean campuses; one for student support and retention; one for Student Development; one for Finance and Administration; and one for the Chancellor's reporting line. Please pass the word on to potential volunteers and let the Academic Senate office know as soon as possible about any interest in these work groups.

10. <u>State Academic Senate Fall Plenary (Ontario, California):</u> The plenary meets November 12-14. One issue on the agenda is creating flexibility in the 50% law (ask me later if you want more information) during this economic environment.
The other major issue on the agenda (by my reading) pertains to a state-wide "Early Assessment Program" (EAP). The idea is to create a state-wide assessment tool that would allow students applying to California community colleges to take one test placing them as "college-ready" or not; however, the current EAP has limitations and problems; as I understand them, the gist of the resolutions at the plenary is to improve the EAP and to make sure it is not used improperly.
You can see every resolution in all their detail at: http://asccc.org/Events/sessions/fall2009/materials.html

11. <u>Agenda Items:</u> A reminder that the Academic Senate agenda is yours. I encourage you to bring issues that you think the Executive Council should be addressing. Part of my job is to help you do that as best we can, whether through drafting resolutions, referring you to other resources, or anything else I can do.

Appendix B: 1st Vice President's Report on Committee on Committees

<u>Summary of recent outreach efforts</u>
● Huntsman's two messages sent out to the faculty list serv.
11/6: Request for faculty participation on the Scholarship committee
11/8: Request for faculty participation in Shared Governance

● Torres' meeting with various departments
10/30 meeting with Associate Dean Roland Montemayor
10/23, 10/30, 11/6 meetings with editor of City Currents

● A document containing the SG openings was distributed to the faculty mailboxes at the following campuses: Mission, Chinatown, Downtown and Castro/Valencia

● Published committee vacancies in the following issues of City Currents: October 26th page 3, November 2nd page 2, November 9th page 2

● Shared Governance information is now on the Academic Senate website

<u>Results</u>
Seven (7) new faculty applications have been turned in – 0 from non-credit faculty

<u>Brief conclusions</u>
● Continue outreach to departments during Flex Day

<u>Non-credit issue notes</u>

● The Master list now includes a notation for non-credit faculty

Dates when SG openings were listed in past issues of City Currents:
Fall '09: October 26th, pg 3, November 2nd, pg 2, November 9th, pg 2

Spring '09: January 12th, pg 8, January 19th pg 2, February 16th pg 6, March 9th pg 3

Fall '08: August 18th pg 2, August 25th pg 7, October 20th pg 4, October 27th pg 5, November 10th pg 6, November 17th pg 4

Spring '08: March 3rd pg 5

Fall '07: None

Spring '07: None

Spring '06: January 30th pg 5

Fall '06: September 18th pg 3

Fall '05: None

Appendix C: Vision and Mission Statements

<div align="center">

Our Vision

</div>

City College of San Francisco values and fosters superior levels of educational participation and academic success among all students. Reaching out to and including all populations, we strive to provide an affordable and unparalleled learning experience in a supportive and caring environment that leads students to successfully complete their goals.

We will be a teaching and learning community whose principal distinction is the high quality of instruction. The educational experience will feature successful learning in areas as varied as basic skills, academic courses, advanced honors, career and technical courses, retooling of job skills, and preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions. Learning opportunities will extend to a broad array of courses and programs to offer any student a pathway to educational and career success.

As a community of service, we will continue to reach out to all people, especially to those communities that encounter barriers to higher education; develop sustainable campuses and sites to better serve students and neighborhoods; diversify and improve programs and services for the benefit of the community; build partnerships with public, private, and community-based agencies to better respond to educational, economic, environmental, and societal needs; foster the participation of our students and employees in community life; and welcome students from around the world. Committed to lifelong educational opportunities for all, we will exchange expertise and innovation with colleagues in the state, the nation and the world.

We will build an inclusive and diverse community, where respect and trust are common virtues, and where all people are enriched by diversity and multicultural understanding. We will maintain a supportive, positive, and productive working environment for our diverse faculty and staff, as well as a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, timely, and caring manner.

Mission Statement

CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the following needs of our diverse community:

- Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions

- Achievement of Associate Degrees of Arts and Science

- Acquisition of certificates and career skills needed for success in the workplace

- Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language

- Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED

- Promotion of economic development and job growth

- Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment

To enhance student success, the college provides an array of academic and student development services that support students' intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to provide an accessible and affordable education as a part of its commitment to serve as a sustainable community resource.

Appendix D: Proposed Principles and Mechanics Regarding Content Overlap Review

Principles of Content Overlap Review

The following principles are guidelines for the review of content overlap. These principles establish the basis for the consideration of overlap by departments involved in the review process and, if necessary, the Curriculum Committee; however, it is <u>not</u> assumed that a course would have to meet <u>all</u> of the criteria to be approved. Reviewers should use the text of proposed and existing course outlines of record during their review.

1. The primary goal in the review of content overlap is to ensure that students are well served by the content of a course and, when significant content overlap is necessary, there are discipline-specific rationales for the overlap that the proposing department can clearly articulate.

2. Content overlap will be justified by establishing that the overlap is part of the core instructional mission of the department. Departments will avoid unnecessary duplication of coursework available through other departments' established, regularly offered courses.

3. Content overlap will be limited to specific skills and knowledge needed for student success in the overlapping course. Significant overlap will be permitted when such overlap provides the student with specific skills and knowledge within the accepted scope of the academic discipline of the proposing department. The proposing department is responsible for determining the skills and knowledge necessary for student success within the proposed course.

4. The instruction provided in the overlapping content will be sufficient to meet the student learning outcomes for the proposed course.

5. If the course title or catalog description contains reference to overlapping content, the course title or catalog description should provide students with clear and logical information regarding overlapping content to ensure that students understand the relationship of a course's content to the student's educational goals.

6. When courses are revised, the review of content overlap should address the extent to which the revisions maintain the original scope and framework of the course.

All courses must be in a discipline. Some courses may be placed in more than one discipline, indicating that a faculty member from either discipline would be qualified to teach the course. Other courses may not clearly fall within a discipline, in that they might combine two or more disciplines to such a degree that they need to be taught by someone with some preparation in each of the constituent disciplines. These courses are designated as interdisciplinary.

For credit courses, the discipline lists are taken from the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges", which contains two lists: "Disciplines Requiring a Master's Degree", and "Disciplines in which a Master's Degree is not Generally Expected or Available." For noncredit courses, Title 5 Section 53412 establishes qualifications for instructors of noncredit courses.

Emerging fields often do not fall cleanly within existing disciplines; technological developments change the nature of work within disciplines; developments in pedagogical practices often point towards interdisciplinary approaches. Since the initial publication of discipline lists by the State Academic Senate, there have been revisions every three years. A discussion of content overlap can be seen as something to be avoided, and that discipline areas are territories to be defended. Rather, content overlap is, in some instances, inevitable and desirable. Departments are encouraged to innovate, and work collaboratively where such collaboration is seen as mutually beneficial for students and pedagogically sound.

Mechanics of Content Overlap Review

1. Course outline developers are encouraged to consider whether their proposed content overlaps with content taught in one or more other departments. If overlap is possible, developers should ask their department chairperson to discuss the proposed course with the department chairperson(s) of the potentially overlapped department(s).

2. Course outlines are normally submitted to the Curriculum Committee chair for technical review. While not a required element of technical review, the Curriculum Committee chair may consider whether proposed content overlaps with content taught in one or more other departments. If possible content overlap is found, the Curriculum Committee chair will advise the proposing department to consult with the potentially overlapped departments.

3. Department chairpersons sign proposed course outlines before they are submitted to the Curriculum Office. During their review, department chairpersons are required to similarly consider whether proposed content overlaps with content taught in one or more other departments, and consult with the potentially overlapped departments, using the Principles of Content Overlap Review to justify the overlap.

4. School deans sign proposed course outlines before they are submitted to the Curriculum Office. During their review, school deans should similarly consider whether proposed content overlaps with content taught in one or more other departments, and encourage their department chairperson to consult with the potentially overlapped departments.

5. The preparation for a Curriculum Committee meeting includes a pre-agenda review meeting. This meeting is normally led by the Curriculum Committee chair and includes the Dean of Instruction, the Articulation Officer, and the Assessment and Prerequisite Coordinator. If possible content overlap is seen during this review, and no sign-off has been obtained, the Curriculum Committee chair will strongly encourage the proposing department chair to seek sign-off. The Curriculum Committee chair will also alert the chairs of the potentially overlapped departments and will provide them with a copy of the proposed course outline.

6. The Curriculum Committee agenda is posted online one week prior to the meeting. Department chairpersons should review the proposed agenda for proposals that may overlap their discipline(s). Department chairpersons may contact the chair of the proposing department, the Curriculum Committee chair, or the Dean of Instruction for a copy of the proposed course outline, and are encouraged to discuss any concerns they have with the chair of the proposing department, the Curriculum Committee chair, or the Dean of Instruction prior to the meeting.

7. Curriculum Committee members get proposed course outlines one week prior to the meeting. As part of their review, members should review course proposals for possible content overlap. If possible content

overlap is seen during this review, a Curriculum Committee member may bring this to the attention of the Curriculum Committee chair prior to the meeting and/or raise a question during the Curriculum Committee meeting.

8. Curriculum Committee meetings are open to all members of the City College community. If a department chair feels that a proposed course outline overlaps their department, the department chair or designee may attend the meeting and raise this question.

9. If a question of content overlap is first raised during a Curriculum Committee meeting and there has not been any mediation meeting, the committee may vote to table the proposal pending further review.

When reviewing a proposed course outline for overlap, a reviewing department may determine that (1) no content overlap exists, (2) the content overlap is acceptable, or (3) the content overlap is inconsistent with the Principles of Content Overlap Review.

- If no content overlap exists, department chairs shall indicate on the course outline cover sheet. Indicating that no overlap exists helps inform Curriculum Committee members who might otherwise have content overlap questions.

- If there is content overlap but the overlap is acceptable, department chairs shall indicate on the course outline cover sheet. Indicating that an acceptable overlap exists helps inform Curriculum Committee members who might otherwise have content overlap questions.

- If a department feels that the content overlap is inconsistent with the Principles of Content Overlap Review then they shall articulate their concerns to the proposing department, using the principles as the basis of their review. Any negotiation on content overlap between departments will be conducted using the process outlined below.

Reviews for content overlap should be handled at the lowest level possible:

1. Ideally, the discussions of content overlap should involve the chairs of the relevant departments. Where appropriate, chairs are encouraged to rely on the subject matter expertise of the members of their departments.

2. If departments are unable to reach consensus then a mediation meeting will be called. Either department chairperson may ask for the mediation meeting. The meeting will be attended by the chairs of the two departments, one faculty member from each department, and three Curriculum Committee members: the Curriculum Committee chair, the Dean of Instruction, and a faculty Curriculum Committee member selected by the Curriculum Committee chair. This faculty member should not be a member of either of the departments involved in the disagreement, and shall be from a relevant discipline area as defined by the Faculty Representation Groups of Table 29, Chapter 8 of the Curriculum Committee Handbook. The two departments will present their opinions of the course in question, using the Principles of Content Overlap Review as the basis of their discussion. Ideally this meeting will result in a mutually agreeable solution. If no mutually agreeable solution is found, then the three Curriculum Committee members will confer and inform the two departments of their assessment.

3. Regardless of the outcome of the mediation meeting, the proposing department may submit their course outline to the Curriculum Committee for review. If the mediation meeting did not result in a mutually agreeable solution, then the following process will be used when discussing the proposed course at the next Curriculum Committee meeting:

    a. Three supporting presenters of the proposal and three opposing presenters to the proposal may appear to speak to the issue, using the Principles of Content Overlap Review as the basis of their presentation. Presentations are limited to no more than three minutes per presenter.

    b. The three Curriculum Committee members who were present at the mediation meeting will inform the Curriculum Committee of their assessment of content overlap.

    c. The Curriculum Committee will then vote to either approve the proposed course or remove the course from consideration. Courses removed from consideration may not be brought back to the

Curriculum Committee for two years.