

Official Minutes  
CCSF Academic Senate Executive Council  
Wednesday, December 12, 2012, 2:30–5:00 pm  
Ocean Campus, ART 218

**Council Members Present:** Jacques Arceneaux, Anna Asebedo, Thomas Blair, Monica Bosson, Venette Cook, Anthony Costa, Vivian Ikeda, Stephan Johnson, Benedict Lim, Suzanne Lo, Enrique Mireles, Kitty Moriwaki, Madeline Mueller, Francine Podenski, Suzanne Pugh, Carol Reitan, Lisa Romano, Karen Saginor, Louis Schubert, Rosario Villasana, Ellen Wall

**Council Members Absent:** Robert Clark, Erin Cunningham, Beth Ericson, Pamela Kamatani, Lancelot Kao, Diana Verdugo, Gloria Weinstock, Kovak Williamson

**Other Senate Members Present:** Verónica Feliu, Ray Gamba, Susan Lopez, Craig Persiko, Lisa Romano, Fred Teti, Katryn Wiese

**I. Call to Order**

The Academic Senate Executive Council came to order at 2:35 p.m.

**II. Adoption of Agenda**

Council adopted the agenda.

**III. Approval of Minutes: November 7, 2012; November 28, 2012**

Council approved the minutes for November 7, 2012 and for November 28, 2012, as amended.

**IV. Public Comment**

- Council Member Podenski solicited volunteers to assist her in completing the templates for Accreditation Standard 3, on faculty and staff diversity.
- Council Member Blair solicited volunteers for the student recruitment he is organizing January 9 and 10, 2013 in BART stations.
- Senate Member Susan Lopez announced the upcoming Board of Governors meeting, January 7, 2013, and the January 17, 2013 meeting of the Consultation Council.

**V. Officers' Reports**

President Saginor reported that:

- She and CCSF Accreditation Liaison Officer Gohar Momjian had attended a meeting in Fresno for accreditation liaison officers sponsored by ACCJC.
- She had been communicating with Michelle Pilati about events at CCSF and would be in further conversation with both Pilati and FACCC President Jonathan Lightman.
- Faculty members should return to the text of the actual ACCJC report and the actual Standards in preparing and revising the March 15, 2013 Show Cause Report.

Second Vice President Moriwaki reported that:

- Recommendation S8 on the Board of Trustees' December agenda detailed revisions to 19 articles of the SEIU contract, and that as many as 50 layoffs were planned for the College's classified staff, some of whom would have rights to bump less senior civil service employees employed by the City and County of San Francisco.

**VI. Committee Appointments**

<b>Resolution 2012.12.12.01 Appointments to Committees</b>
--

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

Moved: Lo; Seconded: Asebedo; MCU; Appendix A

## VII. Old Business

**A. Learning Outcomes:** Faculty member Katryn Wiese affirmed the contents of the draft Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), asking for feedback from the Executive Council during January, before the February Board of Trustees retreat. Council members expressed appreciation to both Wiese and President Saginor for their efforts. They discussed creating a committee for reporting progress on learning outcomes; Wiese suggested conducting ILO assessments in fall, and General Education Outcomes assessment in spring.

### **B. Program Discontinuance Policy:**

#### **Resolution 2012.12.12.02 Program Discontinuance Policy and Procedure**

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Executive Council approve the draft Program Discontinuance Policy and Procedure, as edited.

Moved: Blair; Seconded: Schubert; MCU; Appendix B

### **C. Academic Senate Committees:**

#### **Resolution 2012.12.12.03 Quick-Start Guide for Academic Senate Committees**

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Executive Council approve the Quick-Start Guide for Academic Senate Committees at City College of San Francisco, with the provision that President Saginor may make minor edits to it at her discretion.

Moved: Bosson; Seconded: Johnson; MCU; Appendix C

#### **Resolution 2012.12.12.04 Revising Submitted Descriptions for Academic Senate Committees**

Moved, that the workgroup meeting December 19, 2012 refine the draft Academic Senate Committee descriptions so far received, that these refined descriptions subsequently be uploaded to the Academic Senate Web site in draft form for feedback and further correction, that the revised descriptions be brought back to the Executive Council in the Spring semester; and that, in the interim, the Academic Senate continue to appoint members to those committees for which it has so far received draft descriptions.

Moved: Wall; Seconded: Asabedo; MCU

**D. Accreditation Self-Evaluation:** President Saginor reported that accreditation work-groups are sending templates (over 100 of them) to Gohar Momjian and Kristen Charles. She indicated that these templates would be merged into a single document by early- to mid-January, and that faculty would need to read this document for accuracy and forthrightness.

### **E. Technology Plan and Computer Use Policy:**

#### **Resolution 2012.12.12.05 Technology Plan**

Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommend Draft 11 (October, 2012) of the *Technology Plan*

2013–2015.

Moved: Reitan; Second: Ikeda; MC

- F. Enrollment Issues:** Council members discussed ideas to improve spring enrollments previously discussed at the special meeting of the Executive Council on November 21, 2012, and Council Member Blair’s efforts to recruit students in BART stations in January, 2013. President Saginor offered recruitment posters to Council members.
- G. EFF – Electronic Faculty Forum:** Council members expressed consensus agreement at President Saginor’s ideas for a survey soliciting information about participation in, nonparticipation in, and opinions about EFF.
- H. Departmental Reorganizations:** Council members expressed concerns about having insufficient information from the administration about who exactly would do the various sorts of work currently done by CCSF department chairs. They expressed particular concerns for who would do scheduling, and for a need for additional support staff in the proposed reorganization.

### VIII. New Business:

#### A. Curriculum Committee Actions:

**Resolution 2012.12.12.06 Curriculum Committee Recommendations**

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Executive Council recommend Board Resolution 121213-S1.

Moved: Mueller; Seconded: Pugh; MCU

- B. Participatory Governance Council and Committees:** President Saginor gave an overview of drafts of the Participatory Governance Council and its committees and Council members offered ideas.
- C. Draft Board Policy 8.01 Budget Preparation and Fiscal Accountability:** Council members discussed draft changes to BP 8.01 on the Board of Trustees agenda for December 13th. Council members directed President Saginor to speak at the Board of Trustees meeting to suggest that the Board consider revising the language of their draft policy to clarify that “assumptions” refer to cost and revenue assumptions. Council also indicated that the Board, if keeping BP 7001 (from April 26, 2012), should consider including the requirements from BP 7001 in BP 8.01, so that the Chancellor is directed to prepare information which BP 7001 requires for approval of the budget. The Council further directed Saginor to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the criteria of Draft BP 8.01 be revised to directly address accreditation standards for budget preparation and the recommendations from ACCJC. Appendices D& E.
- D. Reassigned Time:** Concerns were expressed about a more comprehensive overview of faculty non-instructional time. This item will be continued at the next meeting.
- E. Flex Record Keeping:** President Saginor reported that no progress appears to have been made in the development of efficient on-line record keeping for faculty Flex obligations. The Academic Senate officers would be meeting with the Chancellor soon and would point out the need to address this important record-keeping matter.

**F. Administrative Hiring and Evaluation:** Council members discussed the distribution of minimum and desirable qualifications in the draft job descriptions for Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor of Student Development in the context of whether Human Resources or the search committee is best equipped to evaluate them. They suggested streamlining the minimum qualifications to allow the hiring committees to consider a larger pool of applications, and also increasing the amount of responsible administrative experience sought.

**X. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

### Appendix A: Committee Appointments

Name of Committee	C/N	Name	Department	Status
Equal Employment Opportunity	C	Erlinda Legaspi	English	New Appointment
Equal Employment Opportunity	C	Muriel Parenteau	Disabled Students Programs/Services	New Appointment
Equal Employment Opportunity	C	Steven Brown	Environmental Horticulture/Floristry	New Appointment
Equal Employment Opportunity	C	Jessica Williams	Social Sciences	New Appointment
Transfer Issues Advisory	C	Beth Freedman	Health Sciences	New Appointment

### Appendix B: Program Discontinuance Policy and Procedure

## DRAFT City College of San Francisco Academic Senate recommendation for Policy for Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance (PRSD)

Reference: Education Code 78016; Title 5, 51022, 55130

### Background

In accordance with Title 5, CCR Section 51022, “college districts are required by regulation and statute to develop a process for program discontinuance and minimum criteria for the discontinuance of occupational programs.”

Accreditation Standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/Western Association for Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC) calls for systematic review of programs and requires that “When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.”

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) in *Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective Revisited* (November, 2012) recommends that local academic senates, district and college administrators, and governing boards work collegially to develop and implement a program discontinuance policy.

### Definitions

12/12/2012

An **instructional program** is defined as an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education."

A **student support services program** starts with outreach that promotes the community college pathway as a viable option. It is defined as a wide variety of services whose purpose is to promote student development and civic engagement, ensure successful completion of the matriculation process, assist in the choice and attainment of an educational goal, and enhance student learning through ongoing support in areas such as counseling, tutoring, financial aid services, and career and job development.

A **Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Committee (PRSD Committee)** is a group appointed to evaluate a particular program under the Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Procedure (PRSD Procedure).

A **program revitalization plan** articulates specific interventions designed to improve the viability and responsiveness of the program. The plan shall include expected outcomes and a timeline during which the interventions will occur.

A **program continuance recommendation** recommends that a program continue without any specific requirements for changes to the program. No timeline is needed.

A **program discontinuance plan** recommends that the college cease to offer a program. Program discontinuance can be recommended only at the conclusion of the established collaborative process that analyzes appropriate data and applies established criteria. The plan must include provisions for students already enrolled to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

A **program suspension plan** recommends that the college suspend a program for one semester to three years. Program suspension can be recommended only at the conclusion of an established collaborative process that analyzes appropriate data and applies established criteria. The plan must include provisions for students already enrolled to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

## **Policy**

City College of San Francisco is committed to providing excellent educational programs that prepare students to meet the challenges in their chosen field. The College shall develop and implement a Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance Procedure (PRSD Procedure) to assure that the College's resources are used in support of programs that are appropriate to the mission, serve a need, meet curriculum standards, are maintained at a sufficient level of quality, and comply with state or federal law, licensing laws for particular occupations and accreditation standards.

If there is some formal evidence that a program may no longer be viable, the PRSD Procedure will be utilized to analyze appropriate data, apply established criteria, assess impact on student learning, and provide a recommendation to the governing board as to whether the program should be continued, discontinued, revitalized, or suspended. A recommendation to suspend, revitalize or discontinue a program shall include an assessment of impacts on students, on employees, and on other programs. A recommendation to discontinue or suspend a program must include recommended provisions for enrolled students to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. The contractual rights of employees affected by the revitalization, suspension or discontinuation of a program shall be respected.

Programs shall not be discontinued or suspended without following the PRSD Procedure.

The PRSD Procedure shall include provisions for an expedited process to be used if a program is under immediate threat because of damage or loss of suitable facilities, loss of and inability to replace sufficiently qualified employees to maintain the program, or dire financial emergency.

## **Appropriate Evidence, Criteria and Personnel for the Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Procedure**

Both quantitative and qualitative data shall be used as a basis for making informed recommendations. Evidence for the PRSD Procedure shall incorporate the following as appropriate:

- Recent Program Review reports
- Evidence of student learning, including program SLO assessment work and attainments by current and former students in the program
- Student achievement data, such as completion, persistence, retention, and success
- Productivity data, such as FTES per FTEF
- Participation of underserved students in the program.
- Evidence of workforce demand and/or advisory committee recommendations
- Evidence of impact on other programs
- Evidence of student satisfaction
- Other types of information recommended by the Academic Senate or by the Governance Council

The following criteria to be used for assessing programs for revitalization, suspension, discontinuance are based on the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH), published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office:

- Is the program appropriate to the mission of the college?
- Does the program serve a need?
- Do the components of the program meet curriculum standards and/or accreditation standards?
- Does the college have adequate resources to support the program at a sufficient level of quality?
- Is the program in compliance with federal and state laws and regulations and/or with licensing laws for an occupation, if relevant.

Additional criteria to be considered may include:

- How will institutional student learning outcomes be affected by the continuation or discontinuation of the program?
- What impact will the continuation or discontinuation of the program have on diversity at City College?
- What effect do changes in technology have on the efficacy of the program?
- What impact do long term trends in the demographics, economy, and labor markets of San Francisco and the Bay area have on the need for the program?
- Other criteria recommended by the Academic Senate related to curriculum, educational program development, or student preparation and success.
- Other criteria determined by the Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Committee (PRSD Committee) to be relevant for assessing the viability of a particular program.

In accordance with CCSF Board Policies 2.07 and 2.08 and with ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Standards, the PRSD Procedure shall specify appropriate roles for students and staff to provide input into institutional decisions that will affect them. The procedure shall specify appropriate roles to enable the College to rely on faculty and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

### **Authority and Responsibility**

The Chancellor is authorized to establish the Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Procedure (PRSD Procedure) in collegial consultation with the Academic Senate and other constituent groups.

The PRSD Procedure shall be used to make recommendations concerning particular programs to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees shall review recommendations, plans, and accompanying materials before making a determination to revitalize, suspend or discontinue a program. When the

board makes the final decision to suspend or discontinue a program, the board members are responsible for responding to concerns from the community and upholding the collegial processes used to come to that conclusion.

**Relevant Sections of ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Standards (Adopted June 2002; Revised June 2012)**

II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

II.A.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

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

IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

IV.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

**Relevant Sections of Education Code and Title 5**

**Education Code §78016**

- (a) Every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board of the district to ensure that each program, as demonstrated by the California Occupational Information System, including the State-Local Cooperative Labor Market Information Program established in Section 10533 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, or if this program is not available in the labor market area, other available sources of labor market information, does all of the following:
  - (1) Meets a documented labor market demand.
  - (2) Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the area.
  - (3) Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.
- (b) Any program that does not meet the requirements of subdivision (a) and the standards promulgated by the governing board shall be terminated within one year.
- (c) The review process required by this section shall include the review and comments by the local Private Industry Council established pursuant to Division 8 (commencing with Section 15000) of the Unemployment Insurance Code, which review and comments shall occur prior to any decision by the appropriate governing body.
- (d) This section shall apply to each program commenced subsequent to July 28, 1983.
- (e) A written summary of the findings of each review shall be made available to the public.

**Title 5 §51022. Instructional Programs.**

(a) Within six months of the formation of a community college district, the governing board shall adopt and carry out its policies for the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of courses or programs. Such policies shall incorporate statutory responsibilities regarding vocational or occupational training program review as specified in section 78016 of the Education Code.

**Title 5 §5130. Approval of Credit Programs.**

(d) An approval is effective until the program or implementation of the program is discontinued or modified in any substantial way. The [State] Chancellor may evaluate an educational program, after its approval, on the basis of factors listed in this section. If on the basis of such an evaluation the Chancellor determines that an educational program should no longer be offered, the Chancellor may terminate the approval and determine the effective date of termination.

**DRAFT City College of San Francisco Academic Senate recommendation for:  
Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Procedure  
(PRSD Procedure)**

**Background and Purpose**

The Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Procedure (PRSD Procedure) for City College of San Francisco is established as authorized by Board of Trustees Policy BP xxxx, approved on \_\_\_\_\_. Policy BP xxxxx defines terms, stipulates appropriate evidence, and sets other parameters used in this Procedure.

Program suspension or discontinuance should occur only after serious deliberation. A program should be discontinued only after all recommended intervention strategies have been implemented but still result in a program that remains outside the college's mission and master plan, and the department's goals and objectives. The purpose of the PRSD Procedure is to have an established process in place to guide a discussion should it be needed. The establishment of a procedure should not be construed as an inducement to look for programs to discontinue, nor as reason to avoid honest participation in an academic process such as program review.

**Stages of the Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Procedure (PRSD Procedure)**

The PRSD Procedure is initiated if there is some formal evidence that a program may no longer be viable.

The stages of the PRSD Procedure are:

1. Initiation of the Procedure
2. Appointment of a Program Revitalization, Suspension, Discontinuance Committee (PRSD Committee)
3. Determination of criteria and collection of evidence to be used
4. Evaluation of evidence in accordance with criteria
5. Development of Review Report, Recommendation, Plan, and Timeline by the PRSD Committee
6. Decisions and Actions

**Expedited Process for Emergency Situation.**

Each of these stages includes provisions for an expedited process to be used if a program is under immediate threat because of damage or loss of suitable facilities, loss of and inability to replace sufficiently qualified employees to maintain the program, actual loss of accreditation, or dire financial emergency. The expedited alternatives are to be used only in emergency situations, not chosen for convenience.



### **Conditions under which the PRSD Procedure is not needed**

Departments may revitalize, suspend, or discontinue a program without the PRSD Procedure if ALL of following conditions are met:

- No department will cease to exist as a result of the suspension or discontinuance.
- The appropriate dean(s), the appropriate department chair(s), and a majority of the faculty in the department support the suspension or discontinuance of the program.

### **Stage 1. Initiation of the PRSD Procedure**

Formal evidence indicating the need for a PRSD Procedure may arise in the course of a program review process, or it may come from the appropriate vice chancellor, dean, department chair, or a majority of the faculty in the program. Request for initiating the PRSD should be directed to both the Chancellor (or designee) and the President of the Academic Senate. The Chancellor and the Academic Senate President may jointly deny a request to initiate a PRSD procedure.

**This stage may be expedited** by either the Chancellor (or designee) informing the President of the Academic Senate, or the President informing the Chancellor of the need to initiate the PRSD Procedure, based on formal evidence.

### **Stage 2. Appointment of a PRSD Committee**

The PRSD Committee will be composed of:

- The Vice Chancellor over the program under review or designee (Co-chair of Committee)
- The Academic Senate President or designee (Co-chair of Committee)
- The Dean over the program under review
- An additional administrator not from the program under review
- The department chair over the program under review
- An additional faculty member from the program under review
- An additional faculty member not connected with the program under review
- If a substantial number of classified staff serve the program under review, a classified staff member will be appointed to the committee
- Two students connected to the program will be appointed to the committee, if possible.

A researcher should serve as a resource (non-voting) member.

Committee members will be appointed by their constituency leadership as appropriate.

The Co-chairs of the committee will provide all members with copies of the PRSD policy, the PRSD procedure, applicable legal, licensing, and accreditation requirements and other relevant documents, such as the *Program and Course Approval Handbook* and *Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective Revisited*. It is the responsibility of every member of the committee to familiarize themselves with the documents provided to them.

The PRSD Committee will draw up an outline of the work they need to accomplish with dates for the completion of all stages of the PRSD Procedure.

**This stage may be expedited** by the appointment of a smaller Committee, consisting of

- The Vice Chancellor over the program under review or designee (Co-chair of Committee).
- The Academic Senate President or designee (Co-chair of Committee).
- The Dean over the program under review.
- The department chair over the program under review.
- An additional faculty member not from the program under review.
- A student connected to the program, if possible.

For the expedited process, the Co-chairs of the committee will provide all members with copies of the PRSD policy, the PRSD procedure, applicable legal, licensing, and accreditation requirements and other useful documents, such as the *Program and Course Approval Handbook* and *Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective Revisited*. It will be the responsibility of the four committee members to familiarize themselves with the appropriate documents.

The smaller, expedited PRSD Committee will draw up an outline of the work they need to accomplish with dates for the completion of all stages of the PRSD Procedure.

### **Stage 3. Determination of criteria and collection of evidence to be used**

The PRSD Committee will determine the specific criteria for the evaluation of the program under review, using the general criteria established by the PRSD Policy (BP xxxxxx ) and additional criteria appropriate for the program. The PRSD committee will collect ample qualitative and quantitative evidence and data best suited for addressing the specific criteria. In addition to documentary evidence, PRSD Committee will include input from all parties potentially affected by the decision. These include faculty, staff, administrators, students, the employing business and industry, and the community. Extraordinary efforts must be employed, if necessary, to ensure that student and community voices are heard.

**For an expedited process**, the smaller PRSD Committee must still determine specific criteria to be used to adequately evaluate the program under review. The committee may collect a more basic set of evidence necessary to address the criteria. There must be at least one well publicized open meeting for the PRSD committee to hear from students, the community, and college employees,

THIS STAGE SHOULD BE REVISITED AND GUIDELINES EXPANDED AFTER THE ADOPTION OF THE BOARD POLICY

### **Stage 4. Evaluation of evidence in accordance with criteria**

After an initial examination of the criteria and evidence, the PRSD Committee will choose its method for making its determination. The committee may choose to draw up a rubric with points assigned for how well the program meets various criteria. The committee may choose to conduct unweighted qualitative assessments of the evidence in accordance with the criteria. The committee will document its chosen method making its determination before it begins deliberations.

**For an expedited process**, the smaller PRSD Committee will discuss the evidence that the program does or does not meet the criteria and vote for an appropriate provisional recommendation.

THIS STAGE SHOULD BE REVISITED AND GUIDELINES EXPANDED AFTER THE ADOPTION OF THE BOARD POLICY

### **Stage 5. Development of Recommendation, Reports and Plans by the PRSD Committee**

The PRSD Committee will conclude its process by drafting a provisional recommendation and preparing written findings with plans and timelines, if appropriate. In every case, the PRSD Committees findings will identify the major factors that led the committee to its provisional recommendation. The findings will document the opportunities provided for input from all parties potentially affected by the decision, and summarize the input received. The determination process (including the rubric if one was used) and the evidence examined will be attached as appendices.

For a provisional recommendation of **revitalization**, the findings of the PRSD Committee will include a written plan articulating intervention strategies designed to improve the viability and responsiveness of the program. Such strategies may include specific outreach projects to recruit new students, the development of articulation agreements, modification of scheduling, curriculum development, faculty retraining, investment in updated equipment, the introduction of a certificate to signify completion and/or the recommendation of modifications to the curriculum or other substantial changes to the program. Any substantial program change must be approved through regular channels as applicable, e.g. modifications to curriculum must gain approval through the curriculum process. The plan shall include expected outcomes and an implementation timeline.

For a provisional recommendation of **suspension**, the PRSD committee will specify a time period for the suspension of one semester to three years. Reasons for recommending suspension may include damage to or loss of suitable facilities, inability to provide qualified faculty, or dire financial emergency. The written plan will specify actions to be taken during the period of suspension. The plan must include provisions for students already enrolled

to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. A program may not be suspended indefinitely, but must be revived at the end of the specified time period.

For a provisional recommendation of **discontinuance**, the PRSD committee will prepare a plan to address the needs of affected students, faculty, staff and operations will need to be designed and a timeline for the elimination process developed. Students already enrolled in the program must be given time to complete the program or assistance in transferring to a college which offers a similar program. Students should also be encouraged to utilize career and/or academic counseling. It is the responsibility of the college to protect the investment students have already made in their education. A process to facilitate the reassignment or retraining of faculty which includes timelines and college support must be developed in conjunction with the local bargaining unit. Staff must be given assistance to transfer to another area of the college. A plan must be developed to inactivate courses, address other operational issues.

For a provisional recommendation of **continuance**, no specific plan is required.

The PRSD Committee will conclude its process by drafting a provisional recommendation and preparing written findings with plans with timelines, if appropriate. In every case, the PRSD Committees findings will identify the major factors that led the committee to its provisional recommendation. The findings will document the opportunities provided for input from all parties potentially affected by the decision, and summarize the input received. The determination process (including the rubric if one was used) and the evidence examined will be attached as appendices.

The findings of the PRSD committee, with written report and plan will be presented to the Academic Senate for review. The Academic Senate will make a recommendation based on the findings of the PRSD Committee. If the recommendation of the Academic Senate does not confirm the provisional recommendation of the PRSD Committee, the Academic Senate will provide written justification.

**This stage may be expedited** by the drafting of a provisional recommendation accompanied by a brief written summary of the findings by the members of the PRSD Committee. The provisional recommendation may be forwarded to the President of the Academic Senate instead of its Executive Council. For revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance, written plans with timelines must be developed, but they may be completed after the provisional recommendation has been forwarded.

### **Stage 6. Decisions and Actions**

The recommendation of the Academic Senate with findings and plans will be forwarded to the Chancellor. If the Chancellor does not concur with the recommendation of the Academic Senate, he/she will provide reasons in writing to the Academic Senate. If the Chancellor's decision is to **continue** a program, no further action is needed. If the Chancellor's decision is to **revitalize** a program, the administration will take actions to support the revitalization plan. In the case of program **suspension** or program **discontinuance**, the Chancellor shall make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees which shall make a final decision. The administration will be responsible for implementing the plans to mitigate impacts on students and employees.

**For an expedited process**, the recommendation may come to the Chancellor from the President of the Academic Senate instead of the Executive Council.

## **Appendix C: Quick-Start Guide for Academic Senate Committees**

### **Quick-Start Guide for Academic Senate Committees at City College of San Francisco**

1. Academic Senate committees exist to provide effective mechanisms for faculty, students, administrators and classified staff to work together to improve student learning. [See Standard IV.A.1.-3.]

2. Discussion at meetings should foster mutual understanding and respect, an opportunity for all points of view to be expressed, and a process towards decision making based on evaluated information.
3. The facilitator of discussion (usually the chair of the committee) has two major responsibilities.
  - 1) fostering a welcoming environment of mutual respect and
  - 2) managing the time of the group and the flow of the meeting
4. The chair and the committee as a whole should work together to make information about the committee readily available, through posted agendas, posted minutes or notes, etc.
5. The time/day of committee meetings shall be regular and stable so as to minimize time conflicts for all participants.
6. Committees may not **direct the administration or other college bodies to take particular actions**. Committees make decisions for the actions of the committee itself, or the actions of its member in regards to the purpose and goals of the committee. Committees **propose** or **recommend** actions to other components of the college through appropriate channels.
7. Proposals that will improve learning opportunities for students college-wide, committees should be forwarded to the Academic Senate Executive Council with sufficient information to support deliberation. The Educational Policy Committee and officers of the Academic Senate are available to help committee chairs develop proposals.

For more information on the operations and requirements, see Guidelines for Academic Senate Committees. [http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic\\_Senate/AcadSenCommGuidelines.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/Organizations/Academic_Senate/AcadSenCommGuidelines.pdf)

**Appendix D:** Statement delivered orally and in writing to the Board of Trustees on December 13, 2012 in response to direction from the Executive Council.

**Concerning Draft BP8.01. Budget Preparation and Fiscal Accountability.**

In the spirit of College Policy BP 2.08, adopted last month, and in accordance with its provisions, the Academic Senate Executive Council has directed me to speak to BP8.01 concerning “processes for institutional planning and budget development.”

To explicitly align college policies with accreditation standards and ACCJC recommendations, the Academic Senate recommends adding:

**The development of the annual budget and the comprehensive planning process shall be directly linked.**

To clarify the first criteria, the Academic Senate suggests correcting “District’s strategic plans” to “District Strategic Plan.

To clarify what is meant in two criteria by **assumptions**, the Academic Senate suggests “revenue and expenditure **assumptions**” or other clarifying language be used.

To create clear direction for budget preparation, the Academic Senate suggests that the Board review BP7001: Adoption of Annual Budget – Requirements. 4/26/12, which specified types of information required before the Board approves the annual budget