



# 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](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 Agenda FINAL MINUTES

Wednesday, February 28, 2018, 2:30-5:00p.m.

Ocean Campus, MUB 140

**2017-18 Council Members Present:** Jacques Arceneaux, Loren Bell, Monica Bosson, Neela Chatterjee, Thomas Kennedy, Mandy Liang, Alexis Litzky, Danyelle Marshall, Antonio Martinez, Shiela McFarland, Carole Meagher, Marie Osborne, Joseph Reyes, Marc Santamaria, Louis Schubert, Mike Solow, Coni Staff, Fred Teti, Rosario Villasana

**2017-18 Council Members Absent:** Verónica Feliu, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Madeline Mueller, Pablo Rodriguez

**Other Senate Members Present:** Simon Hanson

**Guests:** Rafael Mandelman, Mark Rocha

### I. Call to Order, 2:30

### II. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda adopted.

### III. Officers' Reports

#### **President Liang briefly reported that:**

- President Liang reminded council members who are eligible to run for their second term to consider running for the Executive Council again, and to turn in their nomination form by March 9. Liang encouraged the Council to reach out to others and encourage them to run, particularly Librarians.
- There are two new Administrative Dean positions being posted. One is the Dean of Chinatown/North Beach and Civic Centers. The other is the Dean of John Adams and Allied Health and Nursing.
- The budget committee met yesterday for the first time. They need 3 faculty alternates. They meet every Tuesday afternoon, and will submit a tentative budget to the Chancellor in May, and to the Board of Trustees in June.

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

- There is another development on travel - when you fill in the location of your event you must also include the State and/or Country.

#### **Second Vice-President Staff reported that:**

- None at this time.

#### **Secretary Litzky reported that:**

- None at this time.

**IV. Public Comment**

- A Council member attended the ITAC meeting on Tuesday. There is an exciting development that we will be updating to Banner 9. This is a good thing because the Banner we have now is almost impossible to maintain. The goal is to have it up and running in the Fall.
- There was an announcement about a number of things that happened at the last Enrollment Management Meeting, and the minutes are up from the February 27th meeting which are worth reading.
- A Council member announced that the Counseling department just hired 3 new counselors and they will be assigned to the Ocean campus.
- A comment was made that there will be a critical situation in hiring before May. It appears to be virtually impossible to hire all of the faculty FPAC approved at the current speed of HR processing.
- A comment was made about the ongoing problems with facilities, particularly with the MUB and classes being canceled without anyone knowing about the cancellations and closures.

**V. Consent Agenda**

**Resolution 2018.02.28.01A Approval of Minutes: February 14, 2018**

Resolved, that the Executive Council approve the minutes for February 14, 2018.

**Adopted by consent**

**Resolution 2018.02.28.01B Academic Senate Committees Evaluation Survey**

Resolved, that the Academic Senate Committees Evaluation Survey as an assessment tool for the Academic Senate Program Review be adopted.

**Adopted by consent**

**VI. Appointments**

**Resolution 2018.02.28.02 Appointments to Committees and Task Forces**

**Scholarship committee**

- Emily Chu, Chemistry (new appointment)
- Carina Lin, NSCD (new appointment)
- Patricia Castillo, NSCD (new appointment)
- Jesse Kolber, IDST (new appointment)
- Adriana Garcia, NSCD (new appointment)

**Works of Art**

- Katrina Rahn, Library & Learning Resources (new appointment)

**Student Grade & File Review**

Joe Reyes, Biology (new appointment)

**Moved: Mike Solow; Seconded: Marie Osborne**

**MC, Abstentions: Joe Reyes**

**Not present: Loren Bell, Verónica Feliu, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Madeline Mueller, Pablo Rodriguez, Louis Schubert**

**VII. Reports****A. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Accreditation Institute Update to the 2014 Accreditation Standards**

President Liang provided an update from the Institute. In particular, the tone has changed with the new President and leadership. Liang showed the Council how to find the materials from the Institute ([www.asccc.org](http://www.asccc.org)). There is a lot of information about the presentations and trainings for peer-reviewed site visits. Steve Reynolds, Vice President of ACCJC, is our new liaison to ACCJC.

Liang provided some specific detail about some of the Standards that have changed. The original standard for SLO collection included the assessment in an evaluation of faculty. But effective January 2018 this standard is no longer applicable. Liang told the Council we will still be required to assess learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, it just won't be included in the individual faculty evaluation process. The focus is instead on the collective effort of the institution to collect and assess outcome data.

Questions from the Council:

- Is the notion of changing to a different accreditation commission moot now that it appears things are getting better? President Liang said she did not know, but that she did not sense there is a strong motivation to change away from the ACCJC.
- Did anyone talk about CCSF about our experience? President Liang said not as much as before but people still appreciate what we have done in leading the change in accreditation.

**B. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Student Success Advisory Committee Update**

President Liang provided an update to the Council about the proposed consolidation of categorical programs. The report in our packets is not totally accurate because they did not consult with the appropriate stakeholders, which is not a surprise.

The Governor's new budget includes a question about the consolidation of categorical programs. A SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, and Threat) analysis was conducted by a workgroup created by the Student Success Advisory Committee. Strengths of consolidation included unified measures, less reporting, and potential for clearer processes for students to get help. Weaknesses included funding diversions, lack of data to support consolidation, and lack of infrastructure to support competing priorities. Opportunities identified are an opportunity to view disaggregated data through an equity lens, setting clear guidelines and priorities for funding, and to integrate Integrated Plan for success outcomes in a thoughtful and intentional manner. Threats included the vulnerability of marginalized populations receiving less support, loss of focus on students support,

the undoing of valuable work done in these programs. President Liang shared some of the recommendations, including a survey available for everyone to complete providing feedback about the consolidation.

Comments from the Council:

- A Council member shared their concern that this feels like such a large change is hard to know how to submit a comment. It is very hard to understand the scope of this proposal. President Liang affirmed this feeling, and let the Council know that the Committee also has a lot of unanswered questions that make it difficult to make a decision.

## **VIII. Unfinished Business**

### **A. Guided Pathways Plan**

Alexis Litzky, the Guided Pathways Liaison, briefly talked about the Guided Pathways Workplan. This is the second time it has come to the Senate, and the next step is to approve the Workplan for submission.

There were a few concerns, primarily about the ability to reject the implementation of Pathways if we decide after the 18 months of funding we do not want to implement pathways. Litzky highlighted the inherent connections between a Guided Pathways framework and AB19, and the implementation of the Promise program across the state. Litzky also mentioned that this phase of the Workplan really focuses on inquiry as the primary purpose and that if we don't want any of the additional money, we don't have to ask for disbursement, but putting language in this Workplan about that may jeopardize other forms of funding (i.e. AB19) in the future.

#### **Resolution 2018.02.28.03 Recommendation of the Guided Pathways Plan**

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate continues to engage in and support a more robust college-wide dialogue about Guided Pathways as a framework to increase students' successful completion of their educational goals and close achievement gaps, and

WHEREAS, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is placing increasing emphasis on Guided Pathways and is investing \$150 million statewide to support Guided Pathways at California community colleges. City College of San Francisco's allocation will be \$1,829,005 over a five-year period. The Guided Pathways framework is based on four pillars: clarify the path, enter the path, stay on the path, and ensure learning, and

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate recommended the Guided Pathways Self-Assessment which served as a learning tool for the College to reflect on its scale of adoption at the inquiry, design, and implementation stages of work; be it therefore,

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate approve the CCSF's Guided Pathways Action Plan, Implementation Timeline, and Allocation Summary as presented to the Executive Council on February 28, 2018;

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend the CCSF's Guided Pathways Action Plan, Implementation Timeline, and Allocation Summary as presented to

the Executive Council on February 28, 2018 to the District.

**Moved: Carole Meagher; Seconded: Fred Teti**

**MC, No votes: Danyelle Marshall, Louis Schubert. Abstentions: Loren Bell.**

**Not present: Verónica Feliu, Madeline Mueller, Pablo Rodriguez**

## **B. Review of Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes (RRP) Handbooks**

President Liang oriented the Council to the RRP handbook, and 4 specific sections (D1, R1, D2, R2).

There were several questions and comments from the Council:

- This is important to help educate the newly formed Budget Committee because at the meeting yesterday there was apparently some administrators who don't know about this process.
- There was a call to maintain this process to protect our programs from the new administrators and prevent them from going around the process.
- There was a suggestion to add something to D1 about the estimated cost for various support staff positions to help departments make accurate program review requests.
- There was a suggestion to include more faculty voice in the program review process to help make decisions moving forward.
- There was a suggestion to include the various plans that inform program review decisions (i.e. the Education Masterplan).
- There was a comment that it's unclear in these charts who exactly makes the decision, and where the gatekeepers are.
- There was a comment about how this cycle gets out of alignment. For example, hiring decisions are hard to follow because our hiring process is so time consuming.
- There was a comment that this should be a dialogue - program reviews should be honest about what they want. We should have a dialogue about how that locks up with the Board goals, but it is difficult to get to a place where this dialogue can happen in a meaningful way.
- The RRP must make explicit that references to college-wide committees include certain Academic Senate committees, not just PGC committees nor the Chancellor's ad hoc groups.
- There was a comment that there seems to be some confusion about who the final authorities are on some of the decisions made at the executive level, and that the timelines for this are rather lengthy and cumbersome.
- There was a question about how this information is shared with new employees.
- There was a comment that the communication feedback cycle seems somewhat broken, there is not a clear way that programs find out if they had their requests denied.
- There was a question about whether or not this will be automated. There was a discussion about the desire to use a software to streamline the program review process and automatically communicate decisions back to departments in a timely manner but the inability to do it now. CurricUNET cannot handle all of this, and we simply don't have the tools.
- There was a discussion about how this was generated and initiated by the Academic Senate. A question was asked about forming a committee to work on it. President Liang reminded the Council that she and Kristin Charles are working on it, and then they will bring the new version to the Senate for approval. Anyone interested in working with them is welcome.

## **IX. New Business**

### **A. Report from the Chancellor**

Chancellor Rocha addressed the Council about the “Big 5” issues coming up:

1. The development of the 2018-19 budget. The Budget Committee has been charged and will meet regularly to do the important work of recommending a budget for adoption by the Board in June.
2. Enrollment and the Path to 32,000 FTES. The task is to present to the Board at the end of the semester an assessment of whether or not we have a credible path to 32,000.
3. IT migration. The full completion of the migration to Banner/Ellucian baseline so that by the Spring of 2019 we can enable fully web-based student services. This will make counseling even more important and meet with students that need help with retention and moving through programs.
4. Facilities Masterplan Reboot. We are moving through a conversation with the City about the Balboa Reservoir, and we will be able to get a significant amount of workforce and student housing. We also need to present to the Board the priorities for the Facilities plans, with the intent of going to the voters in 2020 for a funding bond.
5. Collective bargaining agreements. The goal with AFT is to get faculty salaries up to the median of the Bay 10.

The Council had a number of comments and questions:

- There was a concern about the difficulty of hiring enough faculty right now, and the inability of Human Resources to help get things through. It appears to be almost impossible to get it done by June. Chancellor said he will follow up with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources.
- There was a comment made about the closing of buildings and not having any advance notice. Chancellor said he will follow up with the Vice Chancellor of Facilities.
- There was a question about how it’s determined if something moves from an “interim” to a permanent position, particularly for administrative positions where there is high turnover. Chancellor said that the administration is working to fill the permanent positions.

## **X. Discussion with Trustee Mandelman**

Trustee Mandelman briefly introduced himself to the Council. He highlighted his perception on the ways the Board has evolved over the years to become more supportive of CCSF. There was a robust discussion that included a number of comments from the Council:

- A question was asked about the standards for planning at CCSF, because there is not a strong tradition of planning. This is based on the incoming use of the College Brain Trust, which comes after a series of other consultant-produced documents that have had limited value and effect such as the Education Masterplan.
- A comment was made about the dangers of becoming insular within the administrative ranks, and ignoring the on-the-ground experiences of the teaching faculty. Getting to 32,000 is not going to work if we don’t have the day-to-day functioning of the college, such as hiring enough faculty.

## **XI. Adjournment, 5:05pm**

## First Vice President's Report

2018.02.28

### Another Fortnight in the Walled Garden

#### Past Meetings/Events include

- 2018.02.15: Officers meeting, including Board President Davila
- 2018.02.20: Agenda Review
- 2018.02.21: Mini-Officers meeting
- 2018.02.21: Collegial Consultation
- 2018.02.23: Faculty Association meeting with Cynthia Dewar
- 2018.02.26: ILO 1 Assessment presentation
- 2018.02.26: ACUE presentation
- 2018.02.27: Student Grade & File Review meeting
- 2018.02.28: Mini-Officers meeting

#### Upcoming Meetings/Events include

- 2018.03.02: Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee
- 2018.03.07: Collegial Consultation
- 2018.03.08: Officers meeting, hopefully featuring Trustee Davila
- 2018.03.11: Enrollment Campaigning in the Mission
- 2018.03.12: Education Policies Committee

#### Collegial Consultation Notes

- Plus 1s: The Chancellor says he has taken our official and draft resolutions “under advisement”. And General Counsel Bruckman is doing research. The Cabinet will discuss them on Tuesday 2/27.
- Travel: The Chancellor does not want to continue operating under the Faculty Travel Guidelines. He wants a new procedure budgeted through the Senate. Faculty who apply for funding well in advance would get \$\$\$ while faculty applying on short notice would get only \$ or even Ø.
- Administrator Evaluations: The Chancellor confirmed that *any* employee may submit an evaluation of *any* administrator. However, at this time, the evaluatee’s supervisor would know the employee’s name.

#### Faculty ‘Travel’ Update

A new requirement of sorts from the Vice Chancellors: Always write the city and state (or country) name on the “Located At” line. The VCs don’t want to have to look up where your conferences are. It matters because travel to Paris, FR and to Portland, OR are okay but Paris and Portland, TX are not.

#### Senate Elections

I encourage everyone who is eligible to run for next year’s Executive Council! Hasn’t it been fun? I mean that. Really!

#### Impressions from the ACUE Presentation

The people were amiable enough. However, they belong to the culture that faults faculty for our students’ lack of preparation. For example, one exemplary success strategy highlighted was preparing “skeletal notes” for the students to flesh out. Fine—but should not our students have learned note-taking skills in high school? I agree that instructors should accept some of the college success burden but I do wish the promoters’ rhetoric were less punitive.

Fred Teti, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President