



# The Academic Senate

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

50 Phelan Avenue, Box E-202, San Francisco, CA 94112 • (415) 239-3611

[www.ccsf.edu/academic-senate](http://www.ccsf.edu/academic-senate) • email: [asenate@ccsf.edu](mailto:asenate@ccsf.edu)

Curriculum • Degree Requirements • Grading Policies • Program Development • Student Prep & Success • Governance  
Accreditation • Professional Development • Program Review • Planning & Budgeting Processes • Others as agreed

## CCSF Academic Senate Executive Council FINAL NOTES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015, 2:30 - 5:00 p.m.

Ocean Campus, Room 140

**2015–2016 Council Members Present:** Lenny Carlson, Neela Chatterjee, Ms. Bob Davis, Matthew Duckworth, Veronica Feliu, Maria Heredia, Mandy Liang, Lillian Marrujo-Duck, Sheila McFarland, Madeline Mueller.

**2015–2016 Council Members Absent:** Susan Berston, Steven Brown, Korey Brunetti, Cynthia Dewar, Dayo Diggs, Lawrence Edwardson, Donna Hayes, Dana Jae Labrecque, Jim Long, Ghislaine Maz'e, Amy McLanahan, Wendy Miller, Carol Reitan, Todd Rigg Carriero, Pablo Rodriguez, Lisa Romano, Denise Selleck, Coni Staff.

**Other Senate Members Present:** Tracy Burt, Wendy Kaufmyn, Chantel Naas, Francine Podenski.

**Guests:** Steve Bruckman, Susan Lamb.

**I. No quorum, discussion only.**

**II. Public Comment.**

- Faculty publicly acknowledged the Academic Senate President Lillian Marrujo-Duck and all faculty for their hard work and dedication.
- The Lavender Graduation was a huge success. The Academic Senate President spoke at the graduation ceremony. A thank you card was presented to the Academic Senate President
- A community member shared a perspective on Judge Karnow's decision.

**IV. Officers' Reports. -- Unofficial**

- President Marrujo-Duck: All faculty are asked to submit evidence to support the injunction documents. It's important to use evidence to support our argument and our work. This is an opportunity for faculty to submit all relevant evidence.
- Secretary: None

## V. New Business

### B. Reconsideration/Injunction Update

- Feedback for the email sent by Academic Senate regarding injunction documents:
  - Make the email brief and direct to the point.
- Injunction Updates from Steve Bruckman
  - Report due on June 26, 2015
  - When Judge Karnow speaks about holistic, he was talking about the context when the ACCJC took actions in 2013. He means don't just focus on the 10 deficiencies, also look at the other 30.
  - The court rules on a whole lot of issues. The court rejected many arguments presented by the City Attorney. He was not ruling over the right or wrong decision that the commission made. He was talking about the due process that CCSF was not informed about the 10 additional deficiencies throughout the process. When the commission made a decision, CCSF was caught in surprise about the 10 deficiencies. Therefore, CCSF was not given sufficient time to address the 10 deficiencies and to provide evidence to address the 10 deficiencies.
  - This is an opportunity for CCSF to provide evidence in addressing those 10 additional deficiencies.
  - What's going to happen? CCSF is submitting the evidence to address the 10 deficiencies. Then ACCJC will provide a written response. According to Judge Karnow, the case is over. Bruckman believes that the chance of changing the Commission's decision by submitting the evidence is very slim
  - On July 8, 2015, CCSF will be able to present the College's Injunction Response to ACCJC
  - A question was posed about the meaning of "holistic:" CCSF shouldn't be closed based on ACCJC's finding on false decision. Do a comparison between CCSF and other colleges, for the exactly same deficiency. If CCSF is placed on termination while other colleges are fine, that will be valid evidence to show that ACCJC did not treat CCSF fairly.
  - A point was made that comparisons are hard to make because it's not cut and dry. There are a lot of nuances unless we can make a very clear comparison. It's better to focus on error than bias when presenting arguments and evidence. The 100% compliance is not on any board policy, but there is a policy on "full compliance."
  - The Commission's policy on reaffirmation; on the show cause setting, a substantially compliance does not work. There is a need to be fully compliant. Full compliance standard applies for new accreditation, show cause, and restoration.
  - What can we do now? CCSF has a process to review and update the Mission statement. But this process was not recognized by the Commission; as a result, this was identified as a deficiency because they believe the process was not continuous. Faculty have information about the process the College has. If the evidence shows that the College has established a

process to update the Mission Statement and documents are kept by Department Chairs, is this new evidence to support CCSF? If the visiting team didn't look and they only look at the few departments that put the information online, it is now important to present the evidence to show that reviewing and updating the mission statement process has been continuous since 2012, then this can be used as evidence.

- In 1998, evidence showed that student learning outcomes were included in the College dialogue. But the standard focuses on result and concrete plan for improvement and tie to budget. Simply having a dialogue was not enough to meet the standard. The focus is on closing the loop.
- The point is that, in 2012, those 10 deficiencies were a surprise to CCSF. If CCSF had known about these deficiencies, the College could have provided evidence to address the deficiencies.
- Apparently the Commission doesn't agree with the Judge. But CCSF can only do what the College does the best and stays hopeful. CCSF must do whatever we can to show evidence to show that CCSF is working its best if the case has to go to the federal court.
  
- A follow up email from the Academic Senate President will be sent to all faculty to provide instructions on how to holistically address the following ten deficiencies. The ideas for how to respond to each deficiency were discussed with the Executive Council and the CCSF Counsel:

## **10 Deficiencies**

### **Number One**

***I.A.3. Using the institution's governance and decision making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.***

There seems to be some agreement that the current response to Number I.A.3 is strong. There is also some talk that when Susan Lopez was in charge of planning, there was a decision made to review the Mission Statement the year prior to the review of the Strategic Plan. This could demonstrate very thoughtful planning. If you have planning minutes, etc. that addresses this, consider taking this one on. Remember to consider that we are better off when we can "close the loop" on the process.

### **Number Two**

***I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.***

Ideas for I.B.1: Many department chairs have binders of SLO data that demonstrate broader department wide and institution wide dialogue of SLO, and using SLOs to plan improvements. Find evidence of SLO activity prior to the Show Cause decision in 2012. We have heard that Chairs have binders and boxes

of evidence in their office that were never seen by the visiting team in March 2012. Please, Chairs, tape up the boxes and label them very clearly: SLOs data from \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_ year. This evidence includes anything done in each department that is using SLOs to improve student learning. Send/take these boxes to the Academic Senate office in E202A. Boxes of evidence will be returned to appropriate faculty and/or departments.

Evidence of college wide dialogue about SLOs PRIOR to the team visit in March 2012: minutes from SLO meetings, minutes from planning meetings, minutes and agendas from Academic Senate meetings that list SLOs as an item of discussion. Remember to consider that it is better off when CCSF can “close the loop” on the process.

### **Number Three**

***I.B.2 The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.***

Ideas for I.B.2: Find Program Review Annual Unit Reports from 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012. Find the language in the document that shows where program goals were directly linked to larger college plans of any sort, including links to Board priorities. Find the School Reports written by Deans that summarized the accomplishments of the units for that year. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can “close the loop” on the process.

### **Number Four**

***I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.***

Ideas for I.B.3: describe the previous Shared Governance process and demonstrate that it was effective. Show how decisions made their way up through the decision making process. Most people were operating within the Shared Governance system. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can “close the loop” on the process.

### **Number Five**

***II.A.6 The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes.***

***In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.***

Idea for II.A.6: there is some agreement that the College's response to this deficiency is pretty strong. Still, additional evidence can always be added. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can "close the loop" on the process.

### **Number Six**

***II.B.4 The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.***

Idea for II.B.4: We heard that at one point CCSF was ahead of the curve in its evaluation of student services. Can we relook at that? What were we doing well? What happened? Is there a context to place this narrative in? Also, there is increased statewide attention to student services with an aim to improve student services. There is more money - but with strings attached (SSSP, Student Equity). Other colleges' student support services are being critiqued as well. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can "close the loop" on the process.

### **Number Seven**

***III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.***

Idea for III.B.1: CCSF Counsel is going to look at the 2014 Self Evaluation. How can we go from not meeting a planning and facilities standard to meeting it in 9 months? Look at the reports describing our physical resources and planning to see if you can articulate a position that we should not have been found deficient. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can "close the loop" on the process.

### **Number Eight**

***III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.***

Ideas for III.C.1: Please brainstorm ideas on how to address this deficiency. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can "close the loop" on the process.

### **Number Nine**

**III.C.2. *Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.***

Ideas for III.C.2: Please brainstorm ideas on how to address this deficiency. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can “close the loop” on the process.

## **Number Ten**

### **Standard IV. Leadership and Governance**

**IV.A.1. *Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in 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 discussion, planning, and implementation.***

Ideas for IV.A.1: Describe the previous Shared Governance process and demonstrate that it was effective. Show how decisions made their way up through the decision making process. Focus on constituent participation. Find proof that decisions were made. Submit evidence that the system worked. Most people were operating within the Shared Governance system. Remember to consider that CCSF is better off when the College can “close the loop” on the process.

#### **A. Introduce Susan Lamb as new Interim Chancellor**

Highlights from Interim Chancellor Lamb’s speech:

- CCSF has the top programs and services and high level of excellence in the nation.
- CCSF must improve the communication and processes: need to develop systematic and collaborative processes at the College.
- The planning and communication need to be more proactive: for example, Academic Senate should not need to fight for processes, but the processes must be more transparent and collaborative. For all 10+1 academic and professional matters, the issues should go to Academic Senate and then Academic Senate can seek additional feedback if appropriate.
- Interim Chancellor Lamb will start a publication (Monday Mailbag) on a weekly basis to keep the College informed.
- By Spring 2016, the accreditation self-study needs to be done
- Need to clarify roles and responsibilities
- Processes need to be consistent, collaborative, and transparent.
- Budget: CCSF will compensate department chairs and faculty leaders who work in Summer 2015 and start the planning. Need to be more clear on the budget planning not only for this year but the following year.

- Student Equity and Student Success: need to look at the data and identify opportunities of improvement.

### **C. Equity Update and Recommendations**

Please refer to the Equity Update and Recommendations document enclosed in the meeting packet

Discussions:

- The Metro counselor and the Metro Coordinator positions are two separate positions with reassigned time, requested from Metro Program.
- The process must be clear and defined how the counselor position is assigned.
- The process can be referenced to the CTE Perkins grant process and the PUENTE model (e.g., appropriate department chair signatures need to be included on the proposal to ensure all parties are involved and informed).
- A systematic and an open process need to be placed on how the process should be and who needs to be involved.
- Under the May 19<sup>th</sup> Resolution (Executive Council meeting packet p.50), it is important to clarify the following: 1.d. what does it mean by “significantly expanding the number of students...” 1.b. “seeking external funding” –need to have discussion about how to institutionalize programs that are effective.
- The process need to include the Academic Senate, Administration, and the appropriate departments.

### **E.) IEPI Feedback Consideration:**

PRT stands for Partnership Resource Team.

Goal: the PRT provides feedback on how to integrate the different plans

- There was a concern about getting PRT feedback in writing. The fear is that ACCJC may use the document as documentation of deficiencies against CCSF.
- The positive side is to use the document as a reference and make improvements. This can be used as evidence for continuous improvement.
- At the Academic Senate and PRT meeting, the current participatory governance structure was also discussed.
- There was a general consensus (but not official vote) that CCSF will accept the PRT feedback in writing.

**Next Academic Senate Meeting  
Wednesday, June 24, 2015, Ocean Campus,  
Executive Council 2:30 to 5:00 p.m.**