



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 Agenda FINAL MINUTES

Wednesday, November 1, 2017, 2:30-5:00p.m.

John Adams Center, Room 139

2017-18 Council Members Present: Monica Bosson, Neela Chatterjee, Verónica Feliu, Thomas Kennedy, Mandy Liang, Alexis Litzky, Danyelle Marshall, Antonio Martinez, Sheila McFarland, Madeline Mueller, Marie Osborne, Louis Schubert, Coni Staff, Fred Teti

2017-18 Council Members Absent: Jacques Arceneaux (on leave), Kimiyoshi Inomata, Carole Meagher, Joseph Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Mike Solow, Rosario Villasana

Other Senate Members Present: Kim Ginther-Webster, Jennifer Levinson

Guests:

I. Call to Order, 2:49

II. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda adopted.

III. Officers' Reports

President Liang briefly reported that:

- A memo was sent from the State Chancellor's office to terminate the CCCAsses assessment project. Because of this termination, the listening resolution we passed at the last ASEC is no longer applicable.
- There is a Pathways workshop on 11/2 in MUB 140.
- The Participatory Governance Council recommended the Budget committee description and the Chancellor is going to put it on the December 14th Board of Trustees agenda.
- The Integrated Plan and the Guided Pathways Self-Assessment will have a first read at PGC on 11/2, and at the Board of Trustees for a first read on 11/9. The task force was working on the updates based on the Executive Council's comments.
- The Faculty Position Allocation Committee met 10/30 to discuss how the process can be expedited to hire more faculty. There are 25 faculty positions in the budget, but nothing has gone through FPAC yet. The tentative plan now is that FPAC will meet again at the end of November or early December to look at the list. The Office of Research will pull all the requests from this Fall's annual plan. Tom Boegel will meet with the Deans and department chairs tomorrow to provide an update, but it has to be in this Fall annual plan to be considered. The deadline to submit the Annual plan is November 14th. The top 25 ranked choices will be submitted to the Chancellor and send it to the Board for the December 14th meeting. This is in addition to the previous 41 positions that were already approved, and all 66 can be hired to start in August 2018.

- There was a Requisite Enforcement meeting on 10/30. The pilot in the fall was successful overall, so we are going to continue the project in Spring 2018 but will need to have more discussion if we want to include other departments and sections. In the Spring only Foreign Languages, Art, and Economics will participate.

First Vice-President Teti provided a written report (Appendix A) and briefly highlighted:

- The Board of Trustees revealed at the last meeting that they would not approve faculty travel to the listed states in AB1887.
- A new development is that the Chancellor wants me to get a vice chancellor’s signature on all out-of-state travel requests. This is not compliant with the Faculty Travel Guidelines and so I have been resisting. This has resulted in a strange stalemate: the requests are still having to go a VC, just not through *me*.

Second Vice-President Staff reported that:

- No report.

Secretary Litzky reported that:

- No report.

IV. Public Comment

- Cheryl Allen from the Office of Instruction suddenly passed away yesterday. There is a card going around. There may be a service on November 10th.
- There was a call to be aware of the accelerated timelines that the State Chancellor’s office is using for the Pathways funding, which is problematic for getting information through our governance structure. The Chancellor’s office is supposed to put out the plan proposal, but it’s late.
- It was asserted that the Koch brothers and Lumina are playing a hand in Pathways, and some literature was distributed.
- We need to figure out why a student drops a course, which is a problematic gap in our data. There is a desire to work with the Research Office about how to get this kind of exit data.
- It’s great to hire all these new FT instructors, which will produce an inordinate amount of work for other FT instructors to sit on Tenure committees and be mentors.
- The CTE Steering Committee is having to produce work 4-6 weeks earlier, which will impact faculty directly.
- A council member conducted research about Open Educational Resources (OER) for a specific class, and found that most of it was produced by consultants. There is the feeling that for this particular class, it wouldn’t be an appropriate text.
- A concern was shared about statewide discussions about the use of restricted funds.

V. Consent Agenda

Resolution 2017.11.01.01A Approval of Minutes: October 18, 2017

Resolved, that the Executive Council adopt the minutes for **October 18, 2017.**

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2017.11.01.01B GE Area C and Math Graduation Requirement Assessment Report

Whereas, this GE Area C and Math Graduation Requirement Assessment Report is an effect of the general education learning outcomes assessment process, an accreditation requirement designed to promote analysis, discussion, reflection, and improvement; and

Whereas, serious time and analysis went into this report with the hope of improving student success; and

Whereas, learning outcomes assessment reports need to be used to think critically about and improve the College; be it therefore,

Resolved that the Academic Senate accept the GE Area C and Math Graduation Requirement Assessment Report, and

Further resolved, that the Academic Senate recommend this report be used, when relevant, during planning and improvement processes.

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2017.11.01.01C Clarifying Hours Categories on the Credit Course Outline of Record

Whereas, CCSF, in compliance with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO), s interpretation of Title 5 hours and units ratios, uses these categories for calculating hours and units:

| Instructional Category | In-Class Hours | Outside-of-Class Hours |
|--|----------------|------------------------|
| Lecture (Lecture, Discussion, Seminar and Related Work) | 1 | 2 |
| Activity (Activity, Lab w/ Homework, Studio, and Similar) | 2 | 1 |
| Laboratory (Traditional Lab, Natural Science Lab, Clinical, and Similar) | 3 | 0 |

Ref: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Division of Academic Affairs, Program and Course Approval Handbook, 6th ed, p.46.

Whereas, The Course Outline of Record format used at CCSF has a single place with the label “Lab” in which to designate Laboratory and Lab w/Homework hours, and

Whereas the current practice of one label and listing for two different categories of hours has caused confusion and misinterpretation of the hours and units calculation with CCCC reviewers, and

Whereas, new Title 5 regulations require additional specification of outside-of-class and total student learning hours on the Course Outline of Record, and

Whereas, specifying separate categories of hours will facilitate the automatic calculation of outside-of-class hours on the Course Outlines of Record,

Be it resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate recommend that credit Course Outlines of Record shall differentiate between lab and activity hours with appropriate labels "lab" and "activity."

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2017.11.01.01D Recording Hours on the Credit Course Outline of Record

Whereas, 5 CCR § 55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses has been amended in July 2017, thus:

55002. Standards and Criteria for Credit Courses

(a) Degree-Applicable Credit Course:

(2)(B) Units. The course grants units of credit in a manner consistent with the provisions of section 55002.5. The course outline of record shall record the total number of hours in each instructional category specified in governing board policy, the total number of expected outside-of-class hours, and the total student learning hours used to calculate the award of credit, and

(3) Course Outline of Record. The course is described in a course outline of record that shall be maintained in the official college files and made available to each instructor. The course outline of record shall specify the unit value, the expected number of contact hours, outside-of-class hours, and total student learning hours for the course as a whole..., and

(b) Nondegree-Applicable Credit Course

(2)(B) Units. The course grants units of credit in a manner consistent with the provisions of section 55002.5. The course outline of record shall record the total number of hours in each instructional category specified in governing board policy, the total number of expected outside-of-class hours, and the total student learning hours used to calculate the award of credit, and

(3) Course Outline of Record. The course is described in a course outline of record that shall be maintained in the official college files and made available to each instructor. The course outline of record shall specify the unit value, the expected number of contact hours, outside-of-class hours, and total student learning hours for the course as a whole..., and

Whereas, the credit course outlines at CCSF currently include only the total number of hours in each instructional category,

Be it resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate recommend that the credit course outline of record shall be modified to include the total expected outside-of-class hours and total student learning hours used to calculate the award of units of credit.

Adopted by consent

VI. Appointments

A. Committee, Task Force, Work Group Appointments

There were some questions and concerns from the Council:

- There was a concern about the list of faculty appointed to the OER Task Force because of their focus in STEM.
- There was a request to see if anyone from the Social Sciences applied (there was not).

Resolution 2017.11.01.02 Appointments to Committees and Task Forces

CTE Steering Committee

Nick Rothman, Automotive technology (new appointment)

Noncredit Issues

Ann MacAndrew, ESL (new appointment)

Ed Policies

Fred Teti, Math (reappointment)

Monica McCarthy, CSCD (reappointment)

S. Erin Denney, English (reappointment)

Student Equity Strategies

Carina Lin, NSCD (new appointment)

OER Task Force

Carol Reitan, Foreign Languages & Ed Tech (new appointment)

Elizabeth Stewart, LRN (new appointment)

D. Matthew Schweitzer, Biology (new appointment)

Monica McCarthy, CSCD (new appointment, alternate)

Kirstie Stramler, Earth Sciences (new appointment, alternate)

Jonathan Potter, Computer Science (new appointment, alternate)

College Professional Development

Christopher Howe, ESL (new appointment)

Michelle Simotas, English (new appointment, alternate)

Facilities RFP

Madeline Mueller, Music (new appointment)

Steven Brown, Environmental Horticulture & Floristry (new appointment)

Rosario Villasana, Child Development & Family Studies (new appointment, alternate)

Participatory Governance Council

Erika Gentry, Photography (new appointment, alternate)

MC, Abstentions: Fred Teti, Madeline Mueller

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Carole Meagher, Joseph Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Mike Solow, Rosario Villasana

B. Process for appointing faculty to the Guided Pathways Plan Taskforce

Vice President Teti set up anticipated the timeline for the Pathways Plan Proposal, and why we need to pass this now even though we have not sent the Self-Assessment tool through the PGC and the Board.

The Council shared some concerns:

- Since this is supposed to be a faculty issue, there is a concern that the administration will push something or some people through separately.
- It was clarified that this will have to come to the Senate before it goes through the rest of Participatory Governance.

Resolution 2017.11.01.03 Process for appointing faculty to the Guided Pathways Plan Taskforce

Whereas, the State Chancellor’s Office has established a submission deadline for the Guided Pathways Multi-Year Plan as March 30, 2018, and

Whereas, the State Chancellor’s Office is scheduled to publicize the Guided Pathways Multi-Year Plan framework criteria at the end of October, 2017, and

Whereas, a Guided Pathways Plan Taskforce is being formed and the taskforce needs to begin consideration of the State Chancellor’s framework to be able to follow our CCSF governance process and timeline, and

Whereas, it is prudent that this taskforce starts meeting before our next Executive Council meeting on November 15, 2017 when faculty appointments would normally be made, be it therefore,

Resolved, the Academic Senate authorize President Liang to appoint faculty to the Guided Pathways Plan Taskforce after consultation with the Committee on Committees.

Moved: Thomas Kennedy. Seconded: Marie Osborne

MC, Abstentions: Monica Bosson, Danyelle Marshall, Louis Schubert

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Carole Meagher, Joseph Reyes,

Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Mike Solow, Rosario Villasana

VII. Reports

A. Incorporating Additional Instructional Methodology Detail into the Course Outline of Record

Curriculum Committee Chair Kim Ginther-Webster oriented the Council to the Curriculum Committee’s resolutions and some of the history behind Course Outlines and the Instructional Methodologies section. Rather than creating a new section that would repeat information, the committee recommends we change the label of “In-class Assignments” to “In-class Activities.”

The Council had a few questions:

- There was a question about whether this stipulates specific activities. It was clarified that the state provides “such as” options for their requests, but it’s mostly in the ASCCC course outline of record document. The examples are things like lecture, guided discussions, presentations.
- There was a request for a living document that includes these changes, and it’s hard to know exactly what changes have been made. The TRACE checklist is supposed to serve this purpose, and provide brief examples. The chair will revisit the checklist.
- There was gratitude that the Curriculum Committee is being proactive thinking about this kind of labor on behalf of the faculty.
- It would be helpful to have the exact language that will get these outlines through, especially for less obvious courses such as Non-Credit.

VIII. Unfinished Business

A. Reconsideration of the MOU between Academic Senate and Administration*

President Liang oriented the Council to the document, with additional input from Council members Danyelle Marshall and Veronica Feliu. On October 4th at the Academic Senate meeting, the resolution to recommend the MOU between the Academic Senate and Administration to ensure regular and ongoing collegial consultation per BP/AP 2.08, transparency in governance, and participatory decision-making, did not pass. Members expressed their opposition to accept an MOU without the item contemplating the administrative evaluations. After the meeting there were inquiries about options for the evaluations of administration and not eliminate the MOU. Clarity and the crucial importance of having a document that ensures regular and ongoing collegial consultation and transparency in governance is imperative, thus, be voted on again. We can continue to pursue the administrator evaluation as one of the Plus 1 items. If we reach mutual agreement with the governing board, the item about administrator evaluation can eventually be added in writing in the BP/AP 2.08.

President Liang explained the Chancellor’s position. He will not sign this MOU with the administrator’s evaluation included, so the Council has 2 options. Either we sign the MOU without this item, or we will not have this MOU with the Chancellor at all.

There was a friendly amendment to change some Whereas language, seconded by Veronica. There was a short discussion about the change:

- A council member spoke against the proposed amendment because we want the Chancellor to sign the original agreed upon MOU.
- A council member spoke against the friendly amendment because we want to be able to develop a relationship with the Chancellor, and if this is the language that was agreed to we should honor it.

The amendment was withdrawn.

A second amendment was proposed by Madeline Mueller to change the last whereas (*the Academic Senate contends as to the Academic Senate contends is*). The amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.

A third amendment was proposed by Coni Staff to amend the resolution to include a contingency to account for any changes the Chancellor may want to make. The amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate conditionally approve the MOU dependent on the Chancellor's acceptance of the 11/1/17 wording of the MOU.

Be it further resolved should the Chancellor desire any additional edits from the 11/1/17 MOU wording through Collegial Consultation, a new version of the MOU will be considered by the Academic Senate Executive Council.

Resolution 2017.11.01.04 Motion to Reconsider the MOU between Academic Senate and Administration

Whereas, the resolution to recommend the MOU between the Academic Senate and Administration to ensure regular and ongoing collegial consultation per BP/AP 2.08, transparency in governance, and participatory decision-making, did not pass on October 4, and Whereas, it is important to maintain and ensure regular and ongoing collegial consultation, transparency in governance, and participatory decision-making and

Whereas, the issue of faculty participation in administrator evaluation is a "Plus 1" academic and professional matter, will be a collegial consultation item, and

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate enter into mutual agreement with the Administration as described in the MOU presented on November 1, 2017.

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate conditionally approve the MOU dependent on the Chancellor's acceptance of the 11/1/17 wording of the MOU.

Be it further resolved should the Chancellor desire any additional edits from the 11/1/17 MOU wording through Collegial Consultation, a new version of the MOU will be considered by the Academic Senate Executive Council.

Moved: Thomas Kennedy. Seconded: Louis Schubert

Motion carries unanimously.

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Carole Meagher, Joseph Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Mike Solow, Rosario Villasana

B. ASCCC Fall 2017 Plenary Resolutions

President Liang asked the Council for feedback on the State resolutions presented. There were a number of concerns from the Council:

- There was a desire for more nimbleness in delegate decision-making, based on what the resolutions and arguments are that are provided.
- There was a concern about the way the State Academic Senate is handling this information, so we need to make local determinations rather than be influenced by any particular person or group.

- The comment was made that the state level Executive Council members were also for removing repeatability, and this shows that they are not friendly to our local concerns.
- Specific resolutions were spoken against:
 - 13.01 F17 Recognition of Course Sections with Low Cost Course Material Options (2)
 - An argument was made about how this violates Academic Freedom.
 - 15.01 F17 Aligning Transfer Pathways for the CSU and UC Systems
 - There was a concern from a counselor about how we are already doing this, and some questions about the purpose and value.
 - 17.02 F17 Local Academic Senate Role in Developing and Implementing Guided Pathways Frameworks (2)
 - Is there a discussion happening about the forced narrowing of the Mission statement at the State level?
 - There was a request to have President Liang debate against this motion.

Resolution 2017.11.01.05 ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions

Whereas, City College of San Francisco values the opportunities to participate in statewide discussions of academic and professional matters; and,

Whereas, the proposed ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions were provided to all faculty members to review and provide feedback on;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate direct its Fall 2017 Plenary delegate to vote in favor of ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions except 13.01, 15.01, 17.02, unless further provided information persuades the delegate otherwise.

Moved: Louis Schubert. Seconded: Monica Bosson.

MC. Abstentions: Alexis Litzky, Madeline Mueller, Fred Teti.

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Carole Meagher, Joseph Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Mike Solow, Rosario Villasana

C. Senate Goal - “Plus 1”

This item was moved to the next Academic Senate Executive Council Agenda.

IX. New Business

A. Food Pantry

Jennifer Levinson, English, is a member of the CCSF Food Pantry workgroup. Jennifer described an experience with a student about their lack of food, and how revealing this experience was about food insecurity on our campus. Colleges and universities across the country have confirmed this is true in many places, and have instituted food programs (including food pantries) to help address this issue. The workgroup is running a pilot

program based on a similar program at San Jose State University. The resolution will support this work and recommend that the Administration support this program.

Concerns from the Council:

- Is this a 10+1 issue? Yes, it is. Food is critical for student success. Eith our recommendation this resolution comes with a stronger voice.
- There was a concern there is no administrative support in the form of a specific leader to help ushering this project forward. It was clarified that we have already received funds for this, but no one has been appointed.
- There was a concern that we need an MOU from the Chancellor, and it was clarified that first the resolution needs to work through the internal governance process before entertaining an MOU or even taking action with the food bank.

Resolution 2017.11.01.06 Resolution for a Hunger-Free CCSF

Whereas, food insecurity is defined as the “limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable foods in a socially acceptable manner” (Life Sciences Research Office, 1990);

Whereas, recent research indicates that between 20% and 50% of community college students face food insecurity (*Hungry and Homeless in College: Results from a National Study of Basic Needs Insecurity in Higher Education*, March 2017 and *Hunger On Campus: The Challenge of Food Insecurity for College Students*, Oct. 2016, respectively), which has sparked the Hunger-Free Campus movement (AB 453);

Whereas, more than 400 colleges nation-wide have recognized the need by creating food pantries for their students, including local institutions such as College of Marin, Skyline College, College of San Mateo, Cañada College, and San Francisco State University; therefore be it

Resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate join the CCSF Associated Students in support of the Hunger-Free Campus movement at CCSF through an On-Demand Food Shelves program and a Food Pantry at the Ocean Avenue Campus; and be it further

Resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate recommend that the administration work with appropriate local agencies (e.g., the SF-Marin Food Bank) and seek funding sources to implement and operate the On-Demand Food Shelves program and the Food Pantry.

Moved: Monica Bosson. Seconded: Alexis Litzky.

Motion carries unanimously.

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Carole Meagher, Joseph Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Mike Solow, Rosario Villasana

B. AB 19 and AB 705 Discussion

President Liang highlighted the goals, purpose, and requirements of AB19 and AB705. The State Chancellor’s office will provide more context and materials about how to approach and implement these programs.

The Curriculum Committee chair called a meeting with Math, English, ESL, and Matriculation to hear what their responses are to these bills. They indicated that there would be some phased in guidance about how to implement these programs, and until then there is nothing we can really do. We will still need certain courses at the remedial level for CTE and other degree programs.

The Academic Senate engaged in a robust discussion about a variety of concerns:

- This appears to be a disaster for marginalized and underrepresented minorities. Multiple measures are helpful, but should not be the only metric used. For example, a D is a passing level grade in High School.
- A council member provided an anecdote about an adult student that attended a university in Montana. At that time there were no requirements or requisites for entering classes, and while he succeeded in the program he received a lot of support from counselors and tutors, in addition to being an adult student. It is questionable whether or not this will work the same way for high school students.
- An equity consideration was shared about biases in teacher and instructor assessment, and how these bills don't take into account existing flaws in using grades as a primary tool in placement.
- There is still no definition of "highly unlikely," which makes this very ambiguous.
- This appears to be a part of streamlining students into the CSU and UC system, rather than actually taking into account the purpose of a Community College.
- AB19 is allegedly linked to Lumina and an attempt to take-over the education system.
- This was made for homogenized, white, male, middle class students. This is not reflective of our student populations.
- There was a statement made in support of waiting to make too many decisions about moving forward.
- This appears to be a bill not made by educators, or by people who have talked with educators. This feels like an attempt to remake the purpose and landscape of community colleges.
- In Equity funding it started with a focus on new, incoming students rather than on existing students, and this feels very similar.
- An argument was made that this will actually increase the amount of money coming to the College by offering more tuition waivers.
- There is a concern that when we take away services from students in urban areas we are essentially saying that they shouldn't think, that they can't have control over their lives, and then they become more controllable.
- There was a concern that if we wait for the Chancellor's office to clarify things we might be waiting too long. Perhaps we need to get ahead of this, as it seems to be part of a larger project to remake the Community College.
- Is it possible that an ESL student would receive 3 years of funding instead of just 1?

X. Adjournment, 4:58pm

Appendix A
First Vice President's Report

2017.11.01

Inemuri

Past Meetings/Events include

- 2017.10.19: Officers meeting
- 2017.10.23: Officers meeting with Board President Thea Selby
- 2017.10.23: "Pathways" meeting with officers and Michelle Simotas
- 2017.10.24: Scholarship Summit
- 2017.10.25: Collegial Consultation with the Chancellor
- 2017.10.26: Officers meeting
- 2017.10.27: College Professional Development Committee
- 2017.11.01: Mo Equity Mo Money

Upcoming Meetings/Events include

- 2017.11.02: Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee
- 2017.11.06: Agenda Review
- 2017.11.08: Collegial Consultation with the Chancellor
- 2017.11.09: Officers meeting
- 2017.11.09: Officers meeting with Board President Thea Selby
- 2017.11.13: Education Policies Committee

Faculty Travel Update

- Last Thursday the Board showed that it will, indeed, not be approving out-of-state travel to the AB1887 states. Even so, when I receive requests for travel to such states, I will continue forwarding them to Gough Street for inclusion on the Board agendas, thus giving the attention-hungry trustees their opportunity to grandstand.
- A new development is that the Chancellor wants me to get a vice chancellor's signature on all out-of-state travel requests. This is not compliant with the Faculty Travel Guidelines and so I have been resisting. This has resulted in a strange stalemate: the requests are still having to go a VC, just not through *me*.

Education Policies News

- On Monday, November 13, Ed Policies will vote on whether to propose the following new policy for conferring honors on graduates: Students who have earned a grade point average between 3.30 and 3.49, inclusive, by the end of their last semester, will be graduated with honors. Those who have earned a grade point average between 3.50 and 3.74, inclusive, by the end of their last semester, will be graduated with high honors. Those who have earned a grade point average between 3.75 or higher, inclusive, by the end of their last semester, will be graduated with highest honors. The Honors GPA calculation will include grades from all degree applicable coursework including coursework from outside institutions. If a student graduates with Honors, a notation will be placed on the student's unofficial/official transcript.

Committee Update

- The Senate Office staff and I have started writing to the ~60 faculty with committee terms expiring in December, asking them if they wish to be reappointed. We ask them to respond by December 1st so that the Senate may make reappointments at our December 6th meeting, the last one of this semester.

Fred Teti, 1st Vice President