



The Academic Senate

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

50 Phelan Avenue, Box E-202, San Francisco, CA 94112 • (415) 239-3611 • Fax (415) 452-5115

www.ccsf.edu/academic-senate • email: 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 Official Minutes

Wednesday, March 2, 2016, 2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Mission Campus 109

2015–2016 Council Members Present: Susan Berston, Steven Brown, Neela Chatterjee, Verónica Feliu, Donna Hayes, Maria Heredia, Dana Jae Labrecque, Mandy Liang, Lillian Marrujo-Duck, Ghislaine Mazé, Sheila McFarland, Amy McLanahan, Madeline Mueller, Carol Reitan, Lisa Romano, Denise Selleck, Coni Staff

2015–2016 Council Members Absent: Lenny Carlson, Ms. Bob Davis (on leave), Dayo Diggs, Matthew Duckworth, Lawrence Edwardson, Todd Rigg Carriero (on leave)

Other Senate Members Present: Jacques Arceneaux, Tom Menendez

Guests: None

I. Call to Order. 2:07 p.m.

II. Adoption of Agenda.

Agenda adopted.

III. Review of Self-Evaluation Standards

- Executive Council members read and discussed the self-evaluation draft for Standard IIA and provided feedback to the Academic Senate President.

IV. Public Comment

- Discussion is underway in the Ocean Campus neighborhood about time limits on parking. Faculty also expressed concerns about future construction's impact on access to CCSF.
- The issue of non-compliance for open labs was discussed, in the context of several departments.

V. Officers' Reports

President Marrujo-Duck Reported:

- President Marrujo-Duck provided a written report (Appendix A).

First Vice-President Labrecque Reported:

- None at this time.

Second Vice-President Romano Reported:

- That she attended the FACCC Advocacy and Policy Conference February 28–29.
- That she brought back petitions for the extension of Prop 30 funds for people to collect signatures for the ballot.
- That she was asked to present FACCC's Legislator of the Year award to Assembly member David Chiu for his work on AB 404. She was glad to see FACCC recognition of 3 public servants who also happen to be Chinese Americans.

Secretary Liang Reported:

- None at this time.

VI. Appointments to Committees

Resolution 2016.03.02.01 Appointments to Committees

Nominations to Committees with Limited membership

* Basic Skills Committee

Julita McNichol — Transitional Studies

VII. New Business

A. BP 2.07 Participatory Governance

Resolution 2016.03.02.02 BP 2.07 Participatory Governance

Resolved, that the Academic Senate does not recommend the revisions to BP 2.07.

Moved: Steven Brown; Seconded: Lisa Romano; MCU

Feedback:

- The principles section should restate values as aspirational instead of fact and should reference the collegial system as well.
- Clarification is needed on section C “Membership”
- At most colleges there is a preponderance of faculty. More faculty representation is needed, including important constituencies such as noncredit, CTE, and others. Department chairs are also not included at present.
- There are potential legal problems with the policy under Ed Code and state regulations that need to be examined and addressed.

B. AP 3.04 Employment of Academic Administrators

Feedback:

- Tabled until future meeting.

C. Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Planning and Construction

Feedback:

- There is a lack of clarity about how this is “classified.”
- An organizational chart is needed to clarify whether this position has civil service and bumping rights.
- There is some redundancy in minimum qualifications and desirable qualifications.
- How does the salary compare to the last person holding the position?
- “Registered California Architect or Engineer” should be a minimum qualification.
- There is a lack of clarity about positions under this administrator and the long-term plan.

D. Associate Dean, Academic Affairs — Perkins, CTEA, and Workforce Experience

Feedback:

- Concerns were expressed about the overall number and structure of the administration. A comprehensive overview would be valuable.
- It is unclear to CTE chairs and faculty to whom exactly they will answer and what the relationship will be. Having two administrators over CTE leads to confusion.
- Although the hiring of grant-funded administrators may be appropriate to oversee large budgets and other items out of general faculty expertise, the issue of funding ancillary support staff for these new administrators is of importance to the college and needs clarification.

E. Bookstore Letter

Feedback:

- Executive Council members considered the President’s drafted bookstore letter (Appendix B).
- The advantages and disadvantages of the bookstore and alternative routes for textbook and reader delivery were debated.
- Concerns were raised about compassionately addressing the financial needs of students, especially in non-credit programs.
- There may be conflicting compliances when various grants mandate against requiring a purchase of textbooks.
- The point was raised that Follett will lower the price of readers to match publicized prices.
- Department chairs have been overlooked in the book ordering process, and students should be involved in the conversation.

F. Resolution on Hiring Consultants to Reorganize the Self-Evaluation

Resolution 2016.03.02.03 Hiring Consultants to Reorganize the Self-Evaluation

Whereas, the Accreditation Standards have substantially changed; and

Whereas, CCSF needs to “fully meet” the 2014 ACCJC standards in order to reaffirm our accreditation; and

Whereas, this Self-Evaluation is important in presenting the state of the college for several years; be it therefore,

Resolved, that the Academic Senate support the administration's efforts to hire a consultant to assist in completing the organization and design of the 2016 Self-Evaluation.

Moved: Sheila McFarland; Seconded: Steven Brown; MCU

G. Resolution to add May 18th and May 25th as Executive Council Meetings

Resolution 2016.03.02.04 Adding May 18th and May 25th Meetings

Whereas, the workload of the Academic Senate increased 36% from the 2013-2014 to 2014-2015; and

Whereas, the workload is expected to continue increasing through the completion of the 2016 Institutional Self Evaluation; and

Whereas, the Academic Senate is desirous of providing meaningful attention to and feedback on all items considered by the Academic Senate; be it therefore

Resolved, that the Academic Senate add two Executive Council meeting to the 2015-2016 Academic Senate calendar, May 18th, 2016 and May 25th, 2016; and

Resolved, that these two meetings are exclusively reserved for consideration of the Self Evaluation; and

Resolved, that the Administration find some funds for food and drink.

Moved: Steven Brown; Seconded: Dana Jae Labrecque; MCU

H. Resolution to change the seating of the New Council and election of Officers to May 25th

Resolution 2016.03.02.05 Seating of New Council/Election of Officers May 25th

Whereas, the Executive Council of the Academic Senate is expected to continue its review of the 2016 Institutional Self Evaluation until at least May 25th; and

Whereas, the Academic Senate recognizes the importance of the continuity of the review by the individuals who have been engaged in the review over the past year; be it therefore,

Resolved, that the seating of the 2016-2017 Executive Council members be rescheduled for May 25th, 2016; and be it further,

Resolved, that the election of Executive Council Officers be rescheduled until the new Council is seating on May 25th, 2016.

Moved: Dana Jae Labrecque; Seconded: Mandy Liang; MCU

VIII. Reports

A. Student Services Outcomes and PRT Update — Mandy Liang

Secretary Mandy Liang presented the substantive progress made in addressing the 10 deficiencies in student services outcomes, announcing that all have now been successfully addressed. She thanked the student development division for their hard work. She reported that there is still work to be done on disaggregated data.

XI. Public Forum

- When we were found out-of-compliance about the labs, we were out-of-compliance. Faculty do support students in lab.
- Bookstore: The costs are a little bit different at different places.
- A concern was expressed about the College paying for a consultant to Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Development.
- Decision-making chart and process: The role of Academic Senate was not clearly articulated in these charts, and a language about the role of Academic Senate has been added to each of these charts, which are under development now. The language addresses the interface of collaboration with participatory governance. The process of developing and finalizing these decision-making charts is taking too long (since July, 2015) and they are still not yet finalized. Clarifying how decisions are made at the College is very important to include in the 2016 self-evaluation.
- In 2012 when CCSF was placed on Show Cause, the site visiting team report noted a deficiency in shared governance. Now, after we restructure our participatory governance, there is resistance to include Academic Senate in participatory governance.
- The Academic Senate agendas and minutes for the last two years demonstrate how the Senate has efficiently dealt with all of the issues and resolutions that came to the Academic Senate Executive Council in a timely fashion.
- A lot of other California Community Colleges use CCSF as an example regarding 10+1 academic and professional matters.

XII. Adjournment: 5:34 p.m.

Appendix A President's Report for March 2, 2016

Update on Program Review Q2 and Q4 update – using Dean's score to create a test of improvement

Pam Mery and I met to talk about program review. For the past year I have been wanting to verify that we would be meeting the 2014 standards for program review and addressing my interpretation of the standards and the commentary from ACCJC that we improve our program reviews. We reviewed the program review conversation document started in March 2015 and maintained by the Academic Senate. We found that many of the suggestions for improving our program review process reflected in those conversations had in fact been implemented. And, we did find a means of assessing improvements to our program reviews themselves. We can compare the scores that Deans give to funding requests from last year, prior to the program review process improvements, to this year following the program review process improvements. If we do this, I will personally be satisfied that we have addressed all of the necessary aspects of program review for our accreditation purposes. However, we may want to consider conversations going forward about how the college wants to evaluate program review, instead of using a measure that exists, is usable, but has not been decided upon through meaningful dialogue by constituent groups. I also emailed the chairs of our Program Review committee to inquire about how this step impacts their own proposal for improvements to program review.

BPs and APs that need to undergo review – are completely scrambled.

Feb 10th meeting: I did a complete review of the latest batch of Chapter 6 (academic and professional matters) that the District's counsel sent to see if we could schedule them for presentation as informational items at PGC. What I found:

1. The versions forwarded do not include the feedback from our Ed Policies Committee
2. The versions are inaccurate – with many general information errors
3. The process agreed upon for decision making and dialogue is being ignored
4. The email sent out to students presented an impossible timeline for Academic Senate review, even after multiple conversations with Counsel about the process.

This is an important accreditation issue: we need to have ongoing and regular review of our Board Policies and Administrative Procedures and this is essentially the second year in a row that admin has not been able to follow a process.

Follow-Up: a meeting was held with Anna Davies, Steve Bruckman, Fred Teti, Deanna Abma, and Lillian Marrujo-Duck. The APs and BPs are being untangled. Currently there are three batches of Instructional BPs and APs: 1) those processed and reviewed by the Executive Council in 2014-2015 and 2) those reviewed in Fall 2015 by the Ed Policies Committee but not by the Executive Council 3) those new BPs and APs sent out by Steve Bruckman for review.

The first batch will have identified all those versions that were already reviewed by the Ed Policies committee and checked by Anna Davies for Title 5 compliance. If there are no changes they will go to Academic Senate for a check of whether or not they already received Executive Council review. If not they will be reviewed and recommended by the Executive Council. After, they will be reviewed with Chancellor before being presented to PGC as informational items.

The Second batch will be checked to see if the latest version shared by Steve Bruckman is the version proposed by the Ed Policies committee. Those Ed Policies proposed versions will be rechecked by Anna Davies for compliance with Title 5. They will come before the Executive Council for review and recommendation; shared with the Chancellor; then presented at PGC as information items.

The Third Batch will begin the process of review through the Ed Policies Committee and follow the established order of review and recommendation.

The entire Chapter 6 Instructional BP and AP process was reviewed by all involved parties and will be followed for all upcoming Instructional BPs and APs.

Review of Coordinator Effectiveness, Job Descriptions, and Reassigned Time

When we recommended the Equity Coordinator positions in Spring 2015 we requested a review of the reassigned time and the Coordinator job description in the Spring of 2016. We effectively did an implied review of the reassigned time when we recommended an Equity Plan that reduced the Equity Coordinator time from a 1.6 combined reassigned time to a 0.40 reassigned time and created two new coordinator positions in Transfer and Degree and Certificate completion. The coordinators that are applying for these positions are expected to review the Equity Plan and, in consultation with the VCSD, to create job descriptions that will be reviewed and recommended by the Executive Council.

We also had listed on our “Upcoming Agenda Items” a review of the Office of Equity and Excellence. I believe that reviewed was implied when we substantially changed the structure and resources of that office with the recommendation of the Equity Plan in December 2015.

Please use the formal processes of the Executive Council if you wish further action to be taken on those two reviews.

We are expecting to see SLO Coordinator job descriptions and appointments for the next year shortly. The Dean of Institutional Development is working with the current SLO Coordinator Team to facilitate that process.

Discussion on Revision of the Constitution

Our Academic Senate Program Review improvement plans include a consideration of changing the Academic Senate Constitution to elect representation by area. We would like to recommend that this discussion be put into the hands of the next Council, if they wish, for Academic Year 2016-2017.

Honorary Degrees

The Officers decided that we did not have the bandwidth currently to take on leading an effort to select nominees for the award of an Honorary degrees this year. If there is a small group of Council members who would like to take this on, we invite you to create a workgroup.

Collegial Consultation

One pressing issue: the number of items unresolved with the Chancellor on our collegial consultation chart continues to grow.

Accreditation Update

Follow up on the hiring of a consultant to help with the Self Evaluation. The Board asked questions about accreditation at the last Board meeting that were follow ups to the Academic Senate Board Report for February 2016. And there was follow up at the Accreditation Steering Committee meeting. Admin is talking to a couple of consultants and may be bringing on more than one. However, we are not sure that the steps outlined in the last update will be adhered to. One thing that is important about those steps is that it allows for identification of any gaps. This identification is especially important if our time to fully read and review the document is limited.

Standard IC was partially reviewed at the Accreditation Steering Committee meeting yesterday. It is currently being completely revised.

Appendix B Bookstore Letter

Bookstore Letter

Academic Senate Executive Council Meeting March 2, 2016

Submitters: Lillian Marrujo-Duck

Presenters:

Committee:

Timeline:

Faculty Academic and Professional Matter (10+1):

5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success

Student Matter (10):

7. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success

Student Participation:

None so far

Description of Effective Participation:

The VCAA drafted this letter. The President of the Academic Senate offered suggested changes shown in track changes.

Needed From Academic Senate Executive Council:

A resolution.

Background Information:

The VCAA approached the Academic Senate President with the suggestion to write a joint letter covering bookstore policies. However, there are several issues to address. First, we do, for accreditation purposes (the part where we abide by all federal regulations), need to inform students of the cost of the class at the time of registration. The cost includes all materials needed for the course, including course packs, readers, etc. Because students can link to Follett's Bookstore information for each course, this is a potential place to put any language on cost, provided that the entire cost is accurately represented. For example, if I had a coursebook for students, not sold through Follett's, I could inform Follett's to list a particular estimated cost of the Coursebook.

However, Follett's Bookstore has a contract with CCSF that lists it as the sole provider of course materials. This is not an accreditation issue, but essentially, by providing students other means, such as Copy Edge, to acquire course materials, we are in violation of that contract.

In addition, a representative of Follett's has looked into this issue and found that some instructors, in using Copy Edge services, are creating a circumstance where the step of accurately checking on copyright of materials might not be fully completed.

Follett's does claim to provide coursebook and class materials services.

These issues, and a draft of this letter, will also be discussed at an upcoming Deans and Chairs meeting. However, the Executive Council is viewing it now because it is time to order books for Summer and Fall and any faculty needing to make changes need to know sooner rather than later.

Note: I have not actually read the contract with Follett Bookstore, we can ask about that if we need confirmation.

Reference Material:

Item:

Dedicated and Thoughtful Faculty,

We would like to share some specific information about our college's obligation to publish the total cost of educational programs as well as the nature of our relationship with Follett, who manages our bookstore operations under an "exclusive right" vendor agreement. If you do not order all of your course materials, text, coursepacks, and any and all items that students need to complete your course through Follett Bookstore, this information will require you to take some extra steps this semester, including placing an order for all course materials through Follett instead of using any outside vendors.

In xxxx the federal government passed regulations requiring educational institutions to make public the total cost of their educational programs. Although this was primarily to force proprietary schools toward transparency, public agencies are held to the same standard. Therefore, CCSF is required to make public all associated costs of educational programs, including textbooks, supplies, and ancillary materials (uniforms, tools, etc.) at the time of registration. In addition, publishing the total cost of educational programs helps students by allowing all costs to be calculated with student financial aid applications. Without those costs being formally recognized, students lose precious financial aid dollars.

Textbooks and supplies/material costs are captured through our bookstore. As many of you know, in xxxx CCSF entered into an exclusive relationship with Follett Corporation to provide the following services for a period of x years:

- Textbook Procurement

- Miscellaneous Supplies

- Educational Program Materials (uniforms, tools, etc)

- Copyright verification for all course packs and other printed materials

In order to align with the federal regulations regarding total cost of educational programs, as well as honoring our contractual obligation to Follett, we would like to ask for your help. Please make sure to complete textbook requisitions in a timely manner and avoid utilizing outside vendors for course textbooks, supplies, and materials.

Thank you

Anna Davies and Lillian Marrujo-Duck