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, March 14, 2018, 2:30-5:00p.m.
Ocean Campus, MUB 140

2017-18 Council Members Present: Jacques Arceneaux, Loren Bell, Monica Bosson, Neela Chatterjee, Kimiyoshi Inomata, Thomas Kennedy, Mandy Liang, Alexis Litzky, Danyelle Marshall, Sheila McFarland, Carole Meagher, Madeline Mueller, Marie Osborne, Joseph Reyes, Mike Solow, Fred Teti, Rosario Villasana

2017-18 Council Members Absent: Antonio Martinez, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Louis Schubert, Coni Staff

Other Senate Members Present: Craig Kleinman, Simon Hanson, Andrea Niosi, Lisa Romano

Guests: Cynthia Dewar, Mark Rocha, Cherisa Yarkin

I.   Call to Order, 2:30

II.   Adoption of Agenda
Agenda adopted.

III.   Officers' Reports
President Liang briefly reported that:
- There is a lot of information in the most recent Academic Senate news email.
- 2nd VP Coni Staff can't join due to personal reasons.
- There are extra handouts for the meeting. One is a draft for the upcoming Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Spring 2018 Plenary resolutions. Both President Liang and First Vice President Teti plan to attend the ASCCC Area B Meeting at Santa Rosa Jr. College on Friday, March 23, 2018.
- Anyone that is a committee chair should submit their committee's feedback and suggestions to improve the RRP handbook. The deadline for reporting is Friday, March 23, 2018. Individuals also have an opportunity to submit feedback and suggestions using the survey form sent out by President Liang and Accreditation Liaison Officer Charles on March 5.

First Vice-President Teti provided a written report (Appendix B) and briefly reported that:
- There will be a resolution on April 4th about student eligibility for participation in the graduation ceremony.

Secretary Litzky reported that:
- There is no recording equipment today, so only part of the meeting will be audio recorded and posted for review.

IV. Public Comment

- A Council member reported that a group of San Francisco Supervisors are meeting about whether or not projects in the city are fiscally feasible and responsible for moving forward. The meeting tomorrow (3/15) will discuss moving forward with the lower Balboa reservoir project.
- A Council member acknowledged the walk-out today and described the event as "inspiring."
- 2 faculty members made comments about the limited bookstore hours at the Mission and Chinatown centers.
- A Council member shared their concern about safety in the classroom due to the limited number of people tracking student discipline on campus.

V. Consent Agenda

Resolution 2018.03.14.01A Approval of Minutes: February 28, 2018

Resolved, that the Executive Council approved the minutes for February 28, 2018.

Adopted by consent

Resolution 2018.03.14.01B Approval of Updated Scholarship Committee Description

Whereas, the Scholarship Committee clarified and updated the description of the committee's purpose and goals, and

Whereas, the Scholarship Committee updated the Committee Description Section XI on ACCJC Accreditation Standards (2014) to which the committee contributes; and

Whereas, the Scholarship Committee recommended an updated version of the committee description on January 25, 2018; be it therefore,

Resolved, that the CCSF Academic Senate ratify and approve the new committee description reflecting the updates as presented to the Academic Senate Executive Council on March 14, 2018.

Adopted by consent

VI. Appointments

Resolution 2018.03.14.02 Appointments to Committees and Task Forces
Accreditation Steering
Kathleen White, Child Development & Family Studies (upgrade to full member)

Budget Committee
Tim Killikelly, Social Sciences (new appointment, alternate)
Lisa Romano, NSCD (new appointment, alternate)

Technology Committee
Michele Alaniz, Library & Learning Resources (new appointment)

College Professional Development
Martin Rosales, Institute of International Studies (new appointment)

Moved: Neela Chatterjee; Seconded: Monica Bosson
MCU, Abstentions: None.
Not present: Loren Bell, Danyelle Marshall, Antonio Martinez, Pablo, Marc
Santamaria, Louis Schubert, Mike Solow

VII. **Reports**
   A. **Enrollment Management and Growth Plan**

   Carole Meagher, Co-Chair of the Enrollment Management Committee, provided an update about the current Enrollment Growth Plan. The committee hopes that a more solid plan will be completed by March 30, and eventually it will go out to all constituents for feedback.

   B. **Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee**

   Fred Teti, member of the Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee, provided a brief update from the committee on behalf of Chris Howe, the PD Coordinator. Fred briefly described the current process for distributing money for faculty, and the rationale behind separating the pool of money into 2 semesters. This is to ensure that small departments have access to funds throughout the academic year. Overall, faculty are supposed to receive at least 50% of all travel monies, but it's not an enforceable condition. For the past several years we have just accepted the $75,000 we have been given. Fred also provided an update about how much labor is required for the Faculty Travel Chair. The position currently receives a .1 of reassigned time, but the workload is closer to .2.

   Council members had a number of comments and questions:
   - We won't be able to increase the reassigned time for this year, but we may have an opportunity to increase for the next year. The Chancellor told the Officers that he would like to convene a workgroup to work about reassigned time.
   - A council member suggested that this workgroup should only include faculty members, because this will directly affect the ability of our faculty to keep current in their discipline. These decisions should be faculty driven.
   - There was a suggestion to develop new guidelines for out-of-state travel to expedite the process.

VIII. **Unfinished Business**
   A. **Review of Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes (RRP) Handbook**

   Mandy Liang oriented the council to the chart D3, D4b, D4c, and R3 of the RRP handbook. A few suggestions were made to help make more clear exactly how the Academic Senate committees and Executive Council intervene and interact with the flow of policy creation.

IX. New Business
A. Institutional Learning Outcome 1 Assessment Report and Outcome Revisions

Craig Kleinman, member of the SLO Committee, provided the Council with an update about the ILO 1 assessment report. This included a discussion of the some of the mapping issues from PSLO's to ILO's, and ways to strengthen that mapping.

Resolution 2018.03.14.03   Institutional Learning Outcome #1 Assessment Report

Whereas, this ILO#1 Assessment report is an effect of the institutional
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 ILO#1 Assessment Report

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

Moved: Monica Bosson; Seconded: Carole Meagher
MCU, Abstentions: None.
Not present: Danyelle Marshall, Antonio Martinez, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Louis Schubert

---

Resolution 2018.03.14.04   Revision of Institutional Learning Outcome #1: Critical Thinking and Information Competency

Whereas, the Academic Senate SLO Committee reviewed data and deliberated over the benefits of changing the outcomes phrasing during several fall '17 and spring '18 meetings; and

Whereas, additional feedback was provided by the college community on February 26 and in an outcomes survey; and

Whereas, issues with the mapping of PSLOs to ILO 1 sub-elements indicate that outcomes language edits and simplifications should improve mapping clarity and therefore generate better data;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate recommend the new proposed sub-element wording of

---

ILO #1: Critical Thinking and Information Competency be updated to read

     A. Apply quantitative reasoning to questions or problems.
     B. Locate, evaluate, and use information appropriately.
     C. Use critical or creative reasoning, including diverse perspectives.

Moved: Monica Bosson; Seconded: Carole Meagher
MCU, Abstentions: None.
Not present: Danyelle Marshall, Antonio Martinez, Pablo Rodriguez, Marc Santamaria, Louis Schubert

X.   **Update from Student Development Division.**
       Vice Chancellor of Student Development Trudy Walton was unable to attend.

XI.   **Administration's Report**

President Liang oriented the Council to the latest Administrator Performance Evaluation, received on March 7, 2018 in Collegial Consultation.

There were a number of comments and questions from the Council:
- Is this one committee for all the open positions? The Officers indicated that yes, this is what the Chancellor said in Consultation.
- A suggestion was made to get exactly which positions will be hired in writing.
- A comment was made that this does not meet the spirit of AP 3.04.
- A comment was made that LinkedIn responses will only require a cover letter and a resume, while internal candidates will require additional work. This includes a diversity statement, which is an important part of our hiring process.
- A comment was made the Chancellor is at the top and the bottom of this process, which is not an appropriate approach. How can a faculty member on the Selection committee find a candidate that the Screening committee (which includes only administrators) excludes?
- A comment was made that this is a very corporate way of hiring and feels like an opportunity for the Chancellor to hire his own choices.
- A comment was made that we understand why the Chancellor needs to hire lots of administrators, but that this process is unprecedented.
- A suggestion was made to add the term "desirable" in additional to "minimum qualifications."
- A comment was made that this is a "temporary" procedure to hire for permanent positions.
- Do we have any recourse about this process? President Liang suggested that we listen to the Chancellor today and raise our concerns. It is important for the Chancellor to hear the concerns directly from the Executive Council. One option would be to for the Academic Senate to pass a resolution, but our next meeting is not until April 4 and that might be too late for us to voice our concern. Some of these positions close before our next meeting date. The Council can decide if we want to call a special meeting. We would only need 24-hour notice to call that meeting.
- How does the Chancellor have purview over changing this AP? He has been using the BP language to do this, which is why we need to revise the BP and AP to incorporate the RRP handbook guidelines.

- A comment was made that this process is not necessary if this is for positions that already closed. Another comment was made that the closing date for these positions will change or have already been changed to "Open until Filled."

The Chancellor congratulated the Basketball team for their success this past weekend as State Champions and thanked the Council for their work on Guided Pathways. The Budget Committee has started to convene, and this revenue stream includes an additional 2500 FTES. The AFT negotiations are continuing to develop towards agreement. There is a Board study session on April 21 to go into detail about our IT migration to enable a 100% web-enabled student services for Spring 2019. There is also a study session on the Facilities Masterplan on May 4 to develop a path to build everything in the plan.

There were a number of questions about the proposed Temporary Administrative Selection and Hiring Process:
- A Council member asked about the use of LinkedIn and only requiring a cover letter and resume.
  - The Chancellor said that this was not an attempt to get around the EEOC requirements. What this does is that it expedites this process and allows us to fill more positions.
  - The use of social media is an important way that we can expand the pool.
  - There is no law that forces applicants to send in all this stuff at the outset but is a major hurdle for now.
- Clarification was requested about what paperwork would need to be submitted, who would vet those applications, and how many committees are convened for each of the positions. Is there a screening rubric that will be used to make these screening decisions? The following are the Chancellor's responses:
  - There will be one central committee to select the candidates, and all of those participants will sit on all of the interviews for the candidates.
  - The hiring official for the hire, likely the supervisor, will cull through the applications down to 12 to 20 applicants. Anyone on the committee is welcome to do that but is not required.
  - There will be basic criteria for screening, but we should trust the committee and trust the process.
  - One of the major values to this new process is diversity. When done in a silo, you are not aware of what other hiring committees are doing. And you may not know how those candidates will fit together.
- There has been some confusion about the screening committee.
  - There will be a new version of this coming from Diana correcting and clarifying 2 things:
    - There is not a separate screening and selection committee.
    - The Academic Senate makes all the faculty appointments.
- A question was asked about which Vice Chancellors are on the committee.
  - Only the Vice Chancellors associated with the specific administrative responsibilities.
- A comment was made about how there is some fear about how the faculty hiring process might be streamlined similarly.

- ○ There are huge differences between public agency administrators and 4-year university hiring.
- There was a concern about including interim Vice Chancellors on this committee because they may ultimately favor whatever the Chancellor favors in order to maintain their position in the college.
  - ○ This is about making good judgment calls and giving experts and leaders the appropriate amount of power in the process.
  - ○ The Chancellor acknowledged that this is not perfect, but he is trying to be transparent by bringing this out in public prior to implementing it.
- There was a question about using the same committee for all of the hiring interviews.
  - ○ Just like the Senate does not include every discipline on campus, we should trust our colleagues to make reasonable and helpful decisions.
- How will faculty find enough time to participate?
  - ○ That is an inherent part of the problem with hiring committees. There will be limited meetings, likely 3 meetings total:
    - ■ Screening committee
    - ■ Skype or Phone interview stage
    - ■ 3 live interviews
  - ○ One of the ways we will have to adapt over the next 5 years is only thinking about working 4 days a week for 24 weeks. We are just simply too big to manage this organization with that kind of limited timeframe. No organization can thrive with that little time to convene.
- Has shared governance been the problem you've noticed so far? You're proposing a process where shared governance is now put into a minority.
  - ○ That's not the point – but it has been reported to the Chancellor that this has been the problem.
- Does draft 1 include an evaluation process?
  - ○ Yes – there will be a review of the process in the Fall. This is not a permanent policy, and when it stops we will look-back and assess the merits of the process.

XII. Adjournment, 5:30pm

First Vice President's Report   2018.03.14
TGI∏!

Past Meetings/Events include
• 2018.03.02: Faculty Professional Development Activities Committee
• 2018.03.07: Collegial Consultation
• 2018.03.08: Officers meeting
• 2018.03.08: Trustee Davila
• 2018.03.11: Enrollment Campaigning in the Mission
• 2018.03.12: Education Policies Committee

Upcoming Meetings/Events include
• 2018.03.15: Officers meeting
• 2018.03.21: Collegial Consultation
• 2018.03.22: Officers meeting
• 2018.03.23: Area B Meeting
• Dates TBA: Labor Studies Revitalization, Prerequisite Process, ASCCC MQRTF

Collegial Consultation Notes
• The Chancellor wants a streamlined procedure for hiring administrators. Sound familiar? Parts of it don't sound *too* bad (like shorter interviews) and he has increased the number of faculty reps to 3.
• He also pretty much told the officers that he does not consider our "Plus 1" draft resolutions to be important and so there has been no action taken on them in his Cabinet. Thus, we have no choice but to take our case directly to the Board. Trustee Davila now has copies of our Plus 1 draft resos.

Education Policies Committee Report
• We helped Deanna write Catalog language to describe the new EW symbol.
• Donna Hayes will approach the Registration & Enrollment Committee about allowing students with time-conflict-resolution forms to register during regular registration. (As it is now, students must wait for add/drop even if they have the signatures.)
• We will be proposing that students eligible for graduation in the immediately following summer be allowed to participate in Commencement.
• We made various suggestions to improve BP/AP 2.30, 2.31, and 2.32.
The last two items will be on the Senate's April 4 agenda.

Faculty 'Travel' Update
Nothing new except that all the baggage (Banner entry, out-of-state stuff) has more than doubled the Travel Chair's workload. See item #4 below.

FPDAC Report
The Faculty Travel Chair (Fred) has reported to FPDAC that the FTF process might change, i.e., that the Chancellor is interested in not renewing the guidelines for next next year. Given that FTF might change, FPDAC thought now might be a good time to discuss proposed changes.

The FPDAC is interested in reviewing and redrafting the allocations allowed to faculty through the Faculty Travel Fund. From the Guidelines: "The allocation of funds for travel is based on the value of the trip to the students, the faculty member, the Department, and the College in general." Currently, the general outline for the distribution of allocated funding for faculty to request

reimbursements to cover expenditures for faculty to attend conferences, take classes, claim certain $
membership fees and obtain certification (CTE) fees is as follows: $

Minimum that a department can be allocated for the Fall = $200 + amount based on dept. size $
At the end of the Fall, all encumbered funds are collected together for Spring and are available on $
a first come, first served basis. $
Each faculty member may receive up to $1000 for requests made in the Fall and $400 for requests $
made in the spring. $
The FTF can cover: $
 * Conferences
 * Classes
 * Certain Membership fees (include an essay -benefit of your membership to the college and to
the students)
 * Certification (CTE Faculty) Fees

The FPDAC is interested in discussing the following proposed changes regarding how the FTF
allocations are distributed per semester as well as per department.

1. Eliminate the Fall/Spring differential
It is understood that faculty can claim Fall allocations for a Spring event. However, many of the
conferences occurring in the Spring/Summer do not advertise their event information with
registration costs until after the new calendar year, so faculty cannot apply in the Fall to get the
larger reimbursement.

2. Increase the departmental minimum…
Some small departments receive barely more than the $200 minimum for all their Fall travel
requests. FPDAC is aware that increasing the minimum funding allocated to certain departments
would mean taking funding away from others. However, in a model that allows any/all faculty to
request the same amount of funding regardless of department-specific allocations, this issue may
also be eliminated.

3. …Or just eliminate the Fall departmental allocation
Similarly, there is a an inquiry from the FPDAC as to why FTF is department specific. FPDAC is
following up to determine why this is the case, but the FPDAC would be interested in opening up
a discussion with the Academic Senate to lift this restriction and instead do the one-big-fund first-
come first-served model all year.

4. Pity the Faculty Travel Chair
The Travel Chair's duties have expanded recently. They include Banner entry of all requests,
follow-up with Accounting (i.e., Eric Brainard) when Banner doesn't recognize a traveler's ID #,
scanning out-of-state requisitions, tracking down department chairs for additional signatures and
information, communications with the PD/HR Office, and arranging for vice chancellor and
Board approval. Currently, the FTF Chair is allowed 0.1FTEF reassigned time (for an instructor,
that's the equivalent of 3.5 hrs/wk of non-instructional time). However, the actual time spent on

this position has sometimes exceeded 9 hrs/wk and is close to 7 on average. The request from the FPDAC would be to draft a resolution to increase FTF Chairman position to more accurately reflect the time and effort needed to perform these duties, such as a 0.2FTEF time reassignment.

If there is majority support in the ASEC for the proposed changes, the FPDAC Chair will draft a resolution for the ASEC to review and move forward.

Fred Teti, 1st Vice President