



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, December 6, 2017, 2:30-5:00p.m.

Ocean Campus, MUB 140

2017-18 Council Members Present: Loren Bell, Monica Bosson, Neela Chatterjee, Verónica Feliu, Thomas Kennedy, Mandy Liang, Alexis Litzky, Danyelle Marshall, Antonio Martinez, Carole Meagher, Madeline Mueller, Marie Osborne, Joseph Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Louis Schubert, Mike Solow, Coni Staff, Fred Teti, Rosario Villasana

2017-18 Council Members Absent: Jacques Arceneaux (on leave), Kimiyoshi Inomata, Shiela McFarland, Marc Santamaria

Other Senate Members Present: Melissa McPeters, Carol Reitan, Kim Ginther-Webster, Sheri Miraglia, Deanna Abma

Guests:

I. Call to Order, 2:30p.m.

II. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda adopted, with some resolution title updates in the Consent Agenda.

III. Officers' Reports

President Liang briefly reported that:

- There are many updates in her most recent email update to faculty.
- President Liang thanked the Executive Council for their work on the Council, and wished everyone a Happy Holidays.
- The Chancellor plans to move the commencement to Thursday, May 24, 2018, at the Masonic Center. President Liang shared the Commencement Committee concerns with the Chancellor, and the Chancellor said he will take those concerns into consideration. There is a set of minutes available with your packets to see those concerns.

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

- The Professional Development Committee is deliberating about whether or not CCSF should participate in a one-book program as a college. We may choose a book focused on higher education.

Second Vice-President Staff reported that:

- The PGC meeting tomorrow will have several items that the Council may want to speak to or be present for at the resolution. One of them is the resolution on Frida Kahlo Way, and another resolution that will be discussed later in this Senate meeting.

Secretary Litzky reported that:

- The public listens to our minutes, and that we should try to minimize cross-talk to aid in the quality of the sound recording.

IV. Public Comment

- There is a request from faculty to do something about food on the north side of campus.
- A student asked about electric charging stations for electric vehicles on campus.
- A request was made for more information about what the objections are to the name change for Frida Kahlo Way.
- An article was distributed about the Lumina Foundation.
- The Choral concert will happen Thursday evening in the Library on the 2nd floor.
- Tuesday is the annual Jazz Band recital, with a spectacular jazz pianist to play with our band. This will be in the Diego Rivera Theatre.
- A Council member asked for any information available on re-organizations in the college. There are concerns with the number of administrators that are leaving, the combining of positions, and the effect this will have on the overall organization of the College.

V. Consent Agenda

Resolution 2017.12.06.01A Approval of Minutes: November 15, 2017

Resolved, that the Executive Council approved the minutes for November 15, 2017.

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2017.12.06.01B Approval of Fall 2017 Academic Senate Annual Plan

Whereas, the integrated resource prioritization for 2018-19 will be based on the annual plans, and

Whereas, the Academic Senate require adequate funding and resources to support the important faculty work with respect to the academic and professional matters,

Resolved, that the Academic Senate approve the Fall 2017 Academic Senate Annual Plan, as presented on December 6, 2017.

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2017.12.06.01C Use Cumulative GPA (based on all degree applicable coursework) to Determine Graduation with Honors

Whereas, the current CCSF policy for awarding honors at graduation excludes grades in Physical Education classes and transferred-in grades that would elevate a student's grade point average; and

Whereas, the Education Policies Committee was unable to discover any reasonable justification for these practices; and

Whereas, the Education Policies Committee has voted to propose that the College use students' cumulative grade point averages to determine honors at graduation; therefore be it

Resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate recommend that the College adopt the following new policy, to replace the current on on p. 470 of the 2017-18 Catalog:

Students who have earned by the end of their last semester a grade point average between 3.30 and 3.49, inclusive, will be graduated with honors. Those who have earned by the end of their last semester a grade point average between 3.50 and 3.74, inclusive, will be graduated with high honors. Those who have earned by the end of their last semester a grade point average between 3.75 or higher, inclusive, will be graduated with highest honors.

The Honors grade point average 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 official and unofficial transcripts.

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2017.12.06.01D CCSF Application for Membership in the Online Education Initiative Course Exchange

Whereas the State Chancellor's Office sponsors the Online Education Initiative (OEI); and

Whereas the OEI Course Exchange allows us to increase our reach to gain additional students; and

Whereas the OEI Course Exchange is soliciting colleges for a second cohort of colleges to join the OEI Course Exchange; and

Whereas CCSF has a variety of courses not available at many other California Community Colleges; therefore be it

Resolved, that the Academic Senate authorize President Liang to sign the letter of interest to get information about how to apply for the Online Education Initiative Course Exchange.

Adopted by consent

VI. Appointments

Resolution 2017.12.06.02 Appointments to Committees and Task Forces

Scholarship committee

Lori Cabansag, ESL (reappointment)
Timothy Harrington, Visual Media Design (reappointment)
Carole Toebe, Biology (reappointment)
Bruce Leung, Business (reappointment)

Sustainability committee

Hitesh Soneji, Engineering & Technology (reappointment)

Career and Transfer Pathways

Carina Lin, New Student Counseling (new appointment)

Concert and Lecture committee

Benedict Lim, Music (reappointment)

Curriculum committee

Mary Juno, Administration of Justice & Fire Science (upgrade)

Honors issues

Jack Sugawara, Continuing Student Counseling Department (reappointment)

Career Clusters Workgroup

Carina Lin, New Student Counseling (new appointment)

Institutional Review Board

Rebecca Ancheta, Behavioral Sciences (reappointment)

Participatory Governance Council

Lisa Romano, New Student Counseling Department (new appointment for faculty-at-large)

Guided Pathways Task Force

Mia Rusali, Business (new appointment)
Jim Wong, New Student Counseling Department (new appointment)
Larry Damato, Continuing Student Counseling Department (new appointment, alternate)
Danyelle Marshall, Continuing Student Counseling Department (new appointment, resource)

Moved: Marie Osborne; Seconded: Rosario Villasana

MCU, Abstentions: None.

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Shiela McFarland, Marc Santamaria

VII. Reports

A. Updates from the Fall 2017 Curriculum Regional Meeting

Kim Ginther-Webster, Chair of the Curriculum Committee provided a report from the regional meeting. See APPENDIX B for additional notes and supplemental materials. Ginther-Webster briefly highlighted a few items:

- They reviewed local approval of curriculum, the next step will be cooperative work courses and non-substantial changes to noncredit courses and programs.
- There have been many problems with the new state software. There are some bugs being worked out on the back-end.
- Cooperative work experience units have existed only as whole units based on Title 5, but this will be changed to include incremental units. This will go to the Board of Governors in January.
- There may be a decrease in the minimum number of units required for a certificate from 16 units to 8 units. There is no timeline yet, but they are hoping to develop a process soon.
- We are up to date with our hour changes.
- There has been a request for a legal opinion to clarify the implications of having credit and noncredit students in the same course.
- The committee received some clarification on the 2 types of certificates. We have been using a generic noncredit certificate, but the state inventory requires us to align our certificates with the state definitions.
- On AB 705, they said several times that Community Colleges should wait to make sweeping changes. There is concern this shifts control to the state, because if they choose very specific assessment measures we will only be able to use those assessment measures.
- There is a data-sharing agreement being worked out to be able to look at High School transcripts.

There were a few comments from the council:

- This appears to be an attempt to control the certificate process at the state level.
- The state certificate would prevent us from having a local certificate in the same area (i.e. Creative Writing).
- There was a question about the role of confidentiality in High School transcripts, but Kim did not hear any discussion about this other than what was already presented.

B. Updates from Student Health Services

See APPENDIX C for an update from Student Health Services.

C. ACUE Online Course in Effective Teaching Practices

Tracy Burt and Danyelle Marshall updated the Council about the ACUE Online Course in Effective Teaching Practices, and the cohort of 39 CCSF faculty currently completing the course.

There were a few questions from the Council:

- One Council member wanted to know if faculty were being paid or if there was a way to use this for FLEX hours. Faculty are not being paid, but could likely submit this for independent FLEX hours.
- One Council member inquired about the cost. The cost is \$1250 per person that participates.

D. Enrollment Management and Growth Plan Update

Carole Meagher, co-chair of the Enrollment Management Committee (EMC), provided a brief overview and update of the EMC documents. Carole is currently collecting information from faculty about what specific tasks and actions faculty have taken to increase enrollment. A question was asked about the Free City program, and some of the mixed messages that have been disseminated from the CCSF financial aid office. Carole clarified that there have been additional internal processes added and clarified.

VIII. Unfinished Business

A. Administrator Evaluations

President Liang oriented the Council to a proposed draft of AP 3.04 that was reviewed by the Senate in Spring 2016, and the Academic Senate resolution passed in response to the proposed revisions. The final passage of this procedure was never completed at the PGC and is coming back to the PGC this Thursday for a first read. A proposed draft of AP 3.04 will be presented with the removal of the hiring minimum qualification of 3 years of faculty experience for educational administrators, which the Senate resolution explicitly does not endorse. The officers attempted to describe some of the complexity of this issue. The officers highlighted the absence of any MOU or other documentation that proves administrator hiring is a 10+1 issue.

The council had a number of comments:

- The Hiring, Evaluation, and Retention Agreement (HER) was between the Senate and the Board, and this is a clear 10+1 area. The PGC does not have authority over this issue.
- There was a question about why they would want to take it out - it appears to be an increase in corporate management practices.
- We should provide the documentation to back up the history of this issue, and make a statement from the Senate that prohibits this from being up in the PGC.
- A question was raised: If this was already approved, why does it need to be approved again?
- There was a question about the timeline - President Liang explained that these strikeout changes were provided in November 2015, and brought to PGC in Spring 2016.

- There was a suggestion about having administrators teach a class on a regular basis, which would require they have some faculty experience, and provide another reason to keep this in the hiring process.
- There was a comment about the effect this would have on educational administrators that want retreat rights, and leaves the administrators in a limbo.
- There was a concern about another part of 3.04 that changes the way interview questions are asked in the final interview.

President Liang informed the Council about the Pilot Administrative Procedure 3.18 the Chancellor has proposed for administrator evaluations. President Liang asked for specific information about how the Council would like the Officers to respond in the next Collegial Consultation. The pilot is to evaluate all administrators on campus in Spring 2018. The Chancellor plans to submit this Pilot AP to the Board in December, 2017.

There were a number of comments from the Council about the content:

- There will be problems if people have to include their names, and there is a fear of retaliation.
- There was a suggestion that point 4 under procedures should be changed from “solicit input” to “complete evaluation” or something similar.
- A council member expressed their appreciation for the addition of 4a and 4b.
- There are many concerns about the blunt use of retaliation from administrators.
- This should be an evaluation, not a supervisor’s review.
- There was a question about what will happen with the “reports from constituent groups,” and if it will really have an effect on the procedure.
- There was a comment that the Chancellor doesn’t understand the culture of CCSF, and that we have a responsibility to educate the Chancellor about this history.
- There was a concern that there are too many administrators to actually complete this pilot by the spring, and that there won’t be a substantial amount of faculty participation.
- There was a question about when BP 3.18 was approved, and if Agrella was here when that happened. Perhaps the Board would be surprised to know that this policy is in effect.
- There should be a modified process, based on the length of time since the last evaluation.
- The dates should be eliminated, or at least adjusted. If we use the March deadline it feels more judgmental than developmental.
- This seems unfair to evaluate administrators who have taken on additional duties beyond their original position.
- There was a suggestion to strike procedure 5 and the need for attribution from a contributor. The history of retaliation at CCSF is just too thick to be ignored.

There were a number of concerns about the process:

- There was a concern the appropriate constituencies were not being consulted. There should be input from DCC on this. In the past, the Classified staff opposed this kind of process.
- This was brought up in our MOU, and it was not considered an emergency then. Why is it being considered an emergency now?

- The language the Chancellor is using in the RRP sets a bad precedent. There should be a clear bright line about what constitutes an emergency.
- There was a suggestion to push forward with the RRP handbook argument, and the value of maintaining the integrity of that process.
- There was a fear that this will be used as a precedent for future procedures and policies.
- We should return this to the Chancellor with edits based on this discussion.
- Instead of focusing on the value of the RRP as a process, we should focus on removing the line about emergencies from the handbook. We need dialogue rather than emergency driven policies and procedures.
- This process will not produce legitimate evaluations, and feels more like a sham.
- There was a comment that we would rather wait for a legitimate process than have all administrators evaluated this year.

IX. New Business

A. April 20th, 2017 SLO Flex Day Analysis Report

SLO Coordinator Sheri Miraglia oriented the Council to the final SLO Flex day report. This day was used to help train employees about aggregate assessments. This report includes survey data about people’s experiences, and has great information about what we do on campus.

B. Revised Institutional Assessment Plan

SLO Coordinator Sheri Miraglia oriented the Council to the changes made to the Institutional Assessment Plan. Most of the changes are small process changes, or language changes. For example, rather than a “program,” the language was changed across the document to “degrees and certificates.” There are new sections that outline the connections between aggregate assessment and curriculum processes already recommended by the Academic Senate. The Planning Committee has already recommended these changes. Miraglia provided a resolution to approve this report.

There was a concern about the use of the word “plan” - Miraglia agreed to bring this back to the SLO committee to determine if it would be appropriate to change the language. There are accreditation concerns, as well as what other colleges call this document.

<p>Resolution 2017.12.06.03 Revised Institutional Assessment Plan - 2017</p> <p>Whereas, the Fall 2017 Annual Institutional Assessment Plan, as edited, accurately describes our current processes for institutional assessment; be it therefore,</p> <p>Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommend the Fall 2017 Annual Institutional Assessment plan, as presented on December 6, 2017.</p> <p>Resolved, that the Academic Senate authorize its SLO committee to change the document’s title appropriately.</p>
--

Moved: Carole Meagher; Seconded: Thomas Kennedy

MCU, Abstentions: None.

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Monica Bosson, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Danyelle Marshall, Shiela McFarland, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria

C. Proposal to revise Aggregate Assessment (Course and Program) Prompts

SLO Coordinator Sheri Miraglia asked for feedback about the proposals. A council member asked a question about whether or not any guidance has been provided to clarify what constitutes “significant” numbers of students for analysis. Sheri emphasized the need for input as soon as possible in order to facilitate the process. President Liang encouraged the Council to offer some feedback to the SLO committee by next week.

D. Resolution on Balboa Reservoir

Coni Staff oriented the Council to the resolution. There is still a hope that there will be full representation for the best future for CCSF, with a possible reconsideration of the housing project in the Balboa Reservoir.

Resolution 2017.12.06.04 Public Land Must Stay in Public Hands

Whereas, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC), the San Francisco Planning Department, and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development plan to build a private housing development on public land (the Balboa Reservoir) currently owned by the PUC with which City College of San Francisco (CCSF) has used, improved, and leased for decades; and

Whereas, this development’s planning process has involved pressure exerted on CCSF administration and has routinely ignored input from tens of thousands of San Franciscans who use the Reservoir in order to take CCSF classes and improve their lives thereby; and

Whereas, this development’s planning process began when all of CCSF’s resources were directed at the accreditation crisis, a crisis that is now essentially over; and

Whereas, San Francisco public agencies must abide by both the spirit and the letter of State Surplus Land Statute 54222, which requires that any local agency disposing of surplus land shall send, prior to disposing of that property, a written offer to sell or lease the property...to any school district in whose jurisdiction the land is located; therefore be it

Resolved, the CCSF Academic Senate ask the SF PUC to offer in writing to sell or lease this public property to the City College of San Francisco, as it has considered doing in the past; and be it further

Resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate ask the Board of Trustees and administration to advocate vigorously for this written offer, as is best for the College’s future, for the tens of thousands of future CCSF students, and for the principle of public land for the public good.

Moved: Thomas Kennedy; Seconded: Verónica Feliu

MCU, Abstentions: None.

Not present: Jacques Arceneaux, Monica Bosson, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Danyelle Marshall, Shiela McFarland, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria

X. Adjournment, in memory of John Balano.

APPENDIX A

First Vice President's Report

2017.12.06

Last Year, Last Week, Last Night...But not Last Day

Past Meetings/Events include

- 2017.11.16: Officers meeting
- 2017.11.17: College Professional Development Committee
- 2017.11.17: "One Book" meeting at the SF Public Library
- 2017.11.27: Guided Pathways Task Force (~half the mtg)
- 2017.11.28: VCSD forums
- 2017.11.29: Collegial Consultation in the alternate universe
- 2017.11.30: Officers meeting
- 2017.12.01: Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee
- 2017.12.04: Guided Pathways Task Force (~half the mtg)
- 2017.12.05: Guided Pathways webinar
- 2017.12.05: Officers meeting

Upcoming Meetings/Events include

- 2017.12.08–09: CMC3
- 2017.12.11: Guided Pathways Task Force
- 2017.12.11: Education Policies Committee
- 2017.12.12: (tentative) College Professional Development Committee
- 2017.12.13: Collegial Consultation (universe unknown as yet)
- 2017.12.14: Officers meeting (possibly with Trustees)
- 2017.12.18: Officers meeting with Trustee Selby
- 2017.12.18: Math Department AB705 meeting

Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee

- FPDAC has not yet decided whether to participate actively in SFPL's One City, One Book project. We might pick our own book, one geared toward higher education or pedagogy. In any case, the CCSF Library will participate in One City, One Book.
- PD Coordinator Chris Howe continues to visit constituent groups to build support for a faculty recognition program.
- On Flex Day, Chris and Nathan Steele will present "Unbury Me! How to Use Google Docs to reduce Email Overflow".
- I reported on the current semi-stalemate occurring over approvals for out-of-state travel. Cynthia Dewar keeps *saying* she wants to meet with me but...

Status of the Plus-1 Project

- Much to the officers' chagrin, the Chancellor was not at all receptive to our requests for "Plus-1" matters, not even to the ones to which he seemed amenable in the past. Indeed, he seemed to act as if he was seeing our requests for the first time even though we had kept him informed about them for at least two prior meetings.
- For example, he said explicitly that he doesn't want to bind future administrations with his decisions...which, well, is *exactly* what *we* want! We *don't* want to have to appeal over and over again for, say, parking permits for retired faculty.
- We must now decide whether to continue working with the Chancellor in the hopes of changing his mind or to approach the Trustees directly.

College Professional Development Committee The statuses (stati?) of all Flex proposals are viewable at [this Google doc](#).

APPENDIX B

ASCCC Curriculum Fall Regional Meeting (Northern) Highlights for the Academic Senate Executive Council

(by Kim Ginther-Webster, Curriculum Committee Chair)

Presentation slides are here: <https://www.asccc.org/events/2017-11-17-170000-2017-11-17-233000/fall-curriculum-regional-north>

Opening session

- ! Review of local approval
 - The next additions that colleges can expect are:
 - Automated approval of cooperative work experience courses
 - Automated approval of nonsubstantial changes to existing credit (non-ADT) programs
 - Automated approval of noncredit courses
 - Since the new inventory was deployed in July of 2017, there have been many challenges for submission and approval of courses and programs.
- ! Cooperative work experience units cannot be done in increments currently (not .5 units) but changes to Title 5 to allow this are expected to go to the Board of Governors in January.
- ! Credit Certificates (goes to BOG in January for first reading)
 - 5C has approved changes to Title 5 §55070 that were reviewed at Consultation Council on 11/16
 - Changes are:
 - Decrease the minimum possible units for a Certificate of Achievement from 12 to 8
 - Decrease the unit threshold when colleges must submit a certificate for approval from 18 to 16
 - Not yet determined when colleges will be required to have submitted their certificates that are 16 – 17.5 units or whether there will be a special approval process for those programs.
- ! Review of hours/units changes – we are up to date with these.
- ! Community Service offerings – 5C requesting a legal opinion about allowing community service students to be in the same classes with credit students. There has been uncertainty about this.

Noncredit session

- 5C has formed a workgroup to develop guidance for the following
 - Offering credit and noncredit courses together
 - Using noncredit courses as prerequisites for credit courses
 - Noncredit courses as corequisites to credit courses (related to AB 705)
- Noncredit Certificates – language for both is similar. COCI now requires we identify which certificates are which.
 - Certificate of Completion – focused on progress in a career path, so would be vocational certificates
 - Certificate of Competency - demonstrated achievement of a set of competencies - ESL or basic skills certificates

AB705

- ! Colleges are encouraged to wait before making sweeping changes
- ! Shifts control
 - If the Board of Governors creates a list of approved assessment measures, colleges will only be able to use those tools
- ! Getting HS data into our systems - The Chancellor's Office is working with CDE to establish a data sharing agreement between the two systems