

Official Minutes
CCSF Academic Senate Executive Council
Wednesday, October 24, 2012, 2:30–5:45 pm
Civic Center Campus, Room 103

Council Members Present: Jacques Arceneaux, Anna Asebedo, Thomas Blair, Monica Bosson, Venette Cook, Anthony Costa, Erin Cunningham, Beth Ericson, Vivian Ikeda, Pamela Kamatani, Lancelot Kao, Benedict Lim, Enrique Mireles, Kitty Moriwaki, Madeline Mueller, Francine Podenski, Suzanne Pugh, Carol Reitan, Lisa Romano, Karen Saginor, Louis Schubert, Diana Verdugo, Rosario Villasana, Ellen Wall, Kovak Williamson

Council Members Absent: Robert Clark, Stephan Johnson, Suzanne Lo, Gloria Weinstock

Other Senate Members Present: Veronica Feliu, Robin Pugh

Guests: Remmert Dekker, Noah Hirsch, Jonathan Lightman, Jeffrey Michels, Robert Shireman.

I. Call to Order

The Academic Senate Executive Council came to order at 2:34 p.m.

II. Adoption of Agenda

Council adopted the agenda.

III. Approval of Minutes: Meeting October 3, 2012

Council approved the October 3, 2012 minutes.

IV. Public Comment

- Council member Vivian Ikeda gave an introduction to the Civic Center Campus.
- Associated Student Council members from the Civic Center Campus welcomed the Executive Council and spoke about their experiences at Civic Center.
- Member of the public Robert Shireman talked about California Competes.
- Members of the Executive Council announced fine arts offerings at the College: Madeline Mueller's Bach and Brunch at Pierre Coste Room, Friday, October 26, 2012; the student-curated "Accreditate This" exhibit from the Art Department under Chair Anna Asabedo; and the November 8, 2012 Festival of the Moving Image at the Roxie Theatre showcasing student films, under the direction of Chair Francine Podenski.

V. Officers' Reports

President Saginor reported that:

- She had prepared a written report (Appendix A).

VI. Committee Appointments

Resolution 2012.10.24.01 Appointments to Committees

Resolved, that Academic Senate Executive Council approve the appointments to limited and unlimited committees, as recommended by the Committee on Committees.

Moved: Podenski; Seconded: Kao; MCU; Appendix B

VII. Old Business

A. Enrollments, Apportionment, Productivity, and Making it to Base: President Saginor referenced a list of concerns that she had sent to Interim Chancellor Fisher about making enrollment base for Spring, 2013. Saginor indicated that marketing had been discussed at the Chancellor's

Roundtable but that no concrete action seems to have been taken yet. She has not received information about any “Plan B” in the event CCSF does not make base. Council members expressed a need to tap potential students not already enrolled at CCSF, particularly as courses move to other centers/campuses or new locations such as Chinatown. They expressed a desire to create banners announcing enrollment periods, and to submit public service announcements to media outlets.

B. Board Policy 2.08:

Resolution 2012.10.24.02 On Board Policy 2.08: Collegial Governance – Academic Senate

Whereas, Title 5 Section 53200 directs district governing boards to “consult collegially” with their academic senate and defines “consult collegially as “district governing boards shall develop policies on academic and profession matters through either or both of the following methods, according to its own discretion:

- (1) relying primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate; or
- (2) agreeing that the district governing board, or such representatives as it may designate, and the representatives of the academic senate shall have the obligation to reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the governing board effectuating such recommendations.”

and

Whereas Interim Chancellor Fisher recommends that the Board of Trustees for City College of San Francisco reaffirm a policy to choose “rely primarily” for all of the ten defined academic and professional matters, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommend the text supplied to the Board of Trustees for adoption as Board Policy BP 2.08; and be it further

Resolved that if the Board of Trustees for City College of San Francisco prefers to establish a policy choosing “reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy,” for any or all of the ten defined academic and professional matters, then the Academic Senate recommends a change to the text supplied to show to which of the ten matters, mutual written agreement will apply, and a change in the Guidelines (B.1) to incorporate the relevant section of Title 5 Section 53203 (d) (2).

Moved: Schubert; Seconded: Blair; MCU

C. Structure of Committees of the Academic Senate:

Resolution 2012.10.24.03 Structure of Committees of the Academic Senate

Whereas Article X of the Constitution of the Academic Senate states that “Committees may be created at the discretion of the Council.”; and

Whereas effective, representative committees are essential for the Academic Senate to fully comply with its responsibilities under **Title 5 CCR § 53200** “to make recommendations to the administration of a college and to the governing board of a district with respect to academic and professional matters.” and with its responsibilities under Accreditation standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC) **Standard IV: Leadership and Governance**, including IV.A.1 “... When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are

used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.”, IV.A.2.a. “Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.”, and IV.A.2.b. “The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning program and services.”; and

Whereas in June, 2012 in its Evaluation Team findings, ACCJC stated that “To fully meet Standard IV Leadership and Governance, the team recommends that college leaders from all constituencies evaluate and improve the college’s governance structure and consequent processes used to inform decision making for the improvement of programs, practices and services and ensure that the process does not create undue barriers to the implementation of institutional decisions, plans and initiatives (IV.A.1, IV.A.3). (**Accreditation Recommendation 13**); and

Whereas, Michelle Pilati, President of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and Scott Lay, President and CEO of the Community College League of California provided information and training on August 23-24, 2012, and a subsequent written report on September 20, 2012 concerning the efficiency and effectiveness of our governance processes, including advice and recommendations to limit the number of committees, clarify their reporting and jurisdiction, provide training for participants, and regularly evaluate governance process; therefore be it

Resolved that the Academic Senate adopt the outcomes and plan for the reorganization of committees, schema for committee organization, description of committee types, and elements of committee description and purpose presented to the Executive Council on October 24th, 2012.

Moved: Schubert; Seconded: Kao; MCU

VIII. New Business:

A. Election Commissioners:

Resolution 2012.10.24.04 Appointment of Election Commissioners

Resolved, that the Academic Senate appoint Alan D’Souza, Lorraine Leber, and James Armstrong to serve as Election Commissioners for the Spring 2013 election of Academic Senate Executive Council members.

Moved: Blair; Seconded: Arceneaux; MCU

B. Proposed Reorganization of Academic Affairs: Council members discussed their concerns about the Administration’s plan to regroup departments and remove the majority of department chairs, replacing them with a small number of higher-level administrators. Members expressed skepticism that so few individuals could handle the work of the current number of chairs and match not only their content knowledge, but also their knowledge of course scheduling and institutional procedures. They expressed concerns about the legal implications of making such a move unilaterally without bargaining with the Department Chair Council (DCC), the possible negative impacts on productive scheduling of classes, and the day-to-day working conditions of faculty members. The Council had a consensus opinion that more transparency and communication on this

issue was in order to make it workable, and discussed possible responses to be taken for the Board of Trustees meeting October 25, 2012.

- IX. Special Order of Business: Presentation by the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC):** Jonathan Lightman, Executive Director of FACCC, discussed the history and current role of FACCC. He also discussed the genesis of, and issues relating to, the recent Student Success Task Force initiative. Lightman highlighted the current financial issues pressing on California Community Colleges, and their impact on revenues, the number of course sections, waitlists, enrollment figures, and access to higher education, particularly for first-generation college students.
- X. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Appendix A: Report from Academic Senate President Saginor

Board of Governors Special Session, October 4th, 2012

I drove up to Sacramento to sit in on this special session concerning City College of San Francisco. Joe Montero, member of the FTMAC team, made a presentation about their report – not quite as detailed as the presentation made to our Board of Trustees in September. I was interested to note that Montero made a point of saying that “Labor is not the villain in Community College of San Francisco . Those issues should not be laid at the feet of labor.” Dr. Fisher, Dr. Scott-Skillman, President Rizzo and Vice President Grier spoke and answered questions on behalf of City College. In explaining “how we got to where we are” Dr. Fisher’s assessment started with 1992 and the chancellor of that time [Dobelle] who “changed a lot of practices and put a lot of things in place,” which then a later chancellor [Day] funded, enabled by \$14 million a year from City of San Francisco sales tax. President Rizzo was questioned closely about the Board’s oversight of fiscal and accreditation issues. In answering these questions, President Rizzo encourage the Board of Governors to requires accreditation training for trustees and made the unfortunate remark that because of lack of training, “we were clueless” – a remark that was picked up by Nanette Asimov who was present for another unfortunate article in the Chronicle. Alisa Messer and I and I both spoke briefly for public comment. I assured that Board of Governors that the Academic Senate was working hard to satisfy accreditation requirements. A transcript of the entire meeting is available:

http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/BOG4Oct2012.pdf
OR <http://tinyurl.com/9zkugae>

Meeting with SFSU Academic Senate Executive Committee, October 9th

After some phone conversations, Larry Hanley, the Chair of the Academic Senate for San Francisco State University, I was invited to speak with their Executive Committee on October 9th. Their main concerns were how did we get into this mess, and could they help us? I countered some of the misinformation that has been reported in the news, and pointed out aspects concerning faculty roles and defunding of public education that they would wise to beware of in their own system. I followed up the visit by emailing Professor Hanley, but have not yet heard back from him.

DCC meeting re Program Review and Enrollment plans, October 10th

I finagled an invitation to attend a part of a Department Chairpersons’ Council meeting on October 10th at which Pam Mery, Tom Boegel, Fabio Saniee, and Joanne Low presented information about the program review process and fielded questions. A request was made for program review information to include departmental revenues as well as costs. Recurring problems with incomplete data for certain departments and types of data were discussed. Interim Dean Saniee agreed to keep a list of known issues—both those are can be fixed, and those that cannot be fixed at this point in time. I hope that both of these items receive good follow up. In limited discussion of enrollment plans for Spring, 2013 anxiety was expressed about whether individual departments and whether the College as a whole will make FTES goals.

Special Report October 15th

As instructed by you on October 3rd, I read the October 15th Special report to ACCJC, asked for a few last changes, (they were made) and supplied my signature. It was sent in On October 12th. I thought that almost all of the report was really quite excellent. My ongoing concerns with the Accreditation work are

- Will the March 15th report have full input from faculty, students, and classified staff?
- What will happen with the various “possible options” for cost savings?

10/24/2012

- Will it be acceptable to the commission that we are working at setting up and following data informed processes for next year's budget (2013-2014) budget, but had little process or constituent input into the budget for this year (2012-13).

Accreditation Steering Committee, October 16th.

The March 15th report will cover all the standards in addition to the issues of the 14 recommendations and the eligibility requirement questions. The work groups for the October 15th report were given assignments for the March 15th report. Other sections were assigned to Vice Chancellors to coordinate. The work groups are to meet and develop plans before November 9th. A first draft should be prepared before December 10th. A close-to-final draft should be ready in mid February for review by the Board of Trustees and approval at the regular February Board meeting.

There was a discussion of the Closing Report, which had been placed on the agenda at my request. In addition to specifying disposition of property (complicated by agreements with the City and County), preparation of this report will require identifying a community college partner in our area that is willing to take students who have already completed 75% of their requirements for degrees/certificates. This aspect will be difficult to arrange for some of our programs which are not offered at other colleges in the area. I have deep appreciation for the Academic Senate members who attended the Steering Committee meeting as guests.

Fall Bipartite, October 17th

As most of you know – because you were present – the administrator part of bipartite lacked quorum because of a conflict with leadership training facilitated by Dr. Barbara Beno. Nonetheless, we had productive discussions and developed plans for proceeding on the many threads of GEO assessment. The notes will be posted online soon.

Chancellor's Forum, October 18th

I attended the first part of the Chancellor's Forum (formerly known as College Council), attended by department chairs, administrators, and constituency leaders. I was encouraged that the administration is making adjustments to class scheduling and enrollment expectations for Spring, 2013 and is starting promotional efforts. I hope that this work is being done quickly enough to have the desired results for the Spring 2013 semester. I had to leave the meeting early to go get my braces removed – at last!

Area B Bipartite, October 19th

Thanks to Venette Cook, Madeline Mueller, Francine Podenski, and Ellen Wall for attending this meeting in the Library of the College of Alameda. In addition to the opportunity to preview some of the resolutions that will be brought to plenary, we were reminded of several important ongoing issues.

- The new Title 5 repeatability rules will be fully implemented by Fall, 2013. Adjustments must be made this year for affected courses.
- Implementation of enrollment priorities required by legislation recommend by the Student Success Task Force will be required by Fall on 2014.
- In regards to AA-T/AS-T degrees:
 - by Fall 2013, each college will be required to offer such degrees for 80% of the majors offered at the college for which AA-T/AS-T degrees have been developed;
 - by Fall 2014, each college will be required to offer such degrees for 100% of the majors offered at the college for which AA-T/AS-T degrees have been developed.
- Our faculty should be participating now in surveys available through iHelp concerning issues such as whether local AA and AS degrees should be eliminated if they correspond to AA-T and AS-T degrees.

Enrollment issues and survey

Following up on concerns about enrollment from individual faculty, individual department chairs, and individual administrators, I conducted a confidential survey of departments on October 17-18th. I wrote a memo compiling the results from the survey and added them to general observations about the challenges to meeting Enrollment goals for 2012-13. Copies of the memo are in the online document area for the Executive Council and are being supplied to you in paper as a basis for our discussion of these issues today.

A few more snippets

With the advice of members of the Committee on Committees, I sent faculty nominations to Clara Starr for the search teams for the new administrative positions in Research and Planning. There seem to have been some wrinkles in the process, for at least one of the committees, the interviews were scheduled before the committee was formed, resulting in that committee having only two faculty members instead of three, because two of the nominated members had scheduling conflicts, we were unable to replace both quickly enough. It also may be that the steps of specifying the criteria, writing the interview questions, conducting the paper screening, and conducting the interviews may not have taken place in the specified order. These appointments are not on the October 25th Board agenda, so I don't know what accounts for the haste in the process.

There may be people out there who actually read our minutes. I received an email yesterday seeking our October 3rd minutes from Remmert Dekker, Program Associate at California Competes: Higher Education for a Strong Economy.

You may recognize the name of the organization, their director is Robert Shireman, author of an opinion piece in the San Francisco Chronicle last month.

Board of Trustees meetings, October 25th

The Trustees will meet at 4:00 with the new Special Trustee, Dr. Bob Agrella, and again at 6:30 p.m. Both meetings will be in MUB 140 – seating is limited, I expect there will be an overflow room.

Appendix B: Committee Appointments

Name of Committee	C/N	Name	Department	Status
Career and Tech. ED.	C	Marie Conde	Health Care Technology	Reappointment
Career and Tech. ED.	C	Carin Zimmerman	Engineering and Technology	Reappointment
Career and Tech. ED.	N	Rodolfo Padilla	Business	Reappointment
Career and Tech. ED.	C	Pierre Thiry	Computer Science/Technology	Reappointment
Career and Tech. ED.	B	Terri Massin	ESL	Reappointment
Institutional Review Board	C	Megan Corry	Health Care Technology	New Appointment
K–12 Partnership	C	John Isles	English	New Appointment
Student Learning Outcomes	C	Katryn Wiese	Earth Sciences	New Appointment
Student Learning Outcomes	C	Karen Parks	Business	New Appointment
Sustainability	C	Dennis Hendrickson	English	Reappointment
Sustainability	C	Erika Delacorte	ESL	Reappointment
Sustainability	C	Chantilly Apollon	Biological Sciences	Reappointment
Sustainability	C	Alan D’Souza	Library Services	Reappointment
Teaching, Learning and Technology Roundtable	B	Christine Beard	Transitional Studies	Reappointment
Teaching, Learning and Technology Roundtable	C	Barbara Baraff	Library Services	Reappointment
Teaching, Learning and Technology Roundtable	C	Cynthia Dewer	Educational Technology	Reappointment