



The Academic Senate

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

50 Frida Kahlo Way, 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 Process • Others as agreed

CCSF Academic Senate Executive Council Minutes and [Sound Recording](#)

Wednesday, 2020 October 14, 2:30-5:00pm

Location: Zoom meeting <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96406746184>

Phone info: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 * Meeting ID: 964 0674 6184

Council Members Present: Octavio Alvarez, Abigail Bornstein, Steven Brown, Amy Diaz-Infante, Nixora Ferman, Ben Finateri, Katia Fuchs, Simon Hanson, Nicole Oest, Gregory Keech, Fanny Law, Stephanie Macaller, Jeanette Male, Michele McKenzie, Sherie Miraglia, Madeline Mueller, Joe Reyes, Pablo Rodriguez, Mitra Sapienza, Lou Schubert, Kevin Sherman, Michele Sieglitz, Michelle Simotas, Chad Stephenson, Marie Varelas, Katryn Wiese, Christina Yanuaria

Council Members Absent: Douglas Owyang, Coni Staff

Other Senate Members Present: Wynd Kaufman, Frederick Teti, Jennifer Kienzle, Karl Westerberg, Alexis Litzky, Monica Bosson, Darlene Alioto, Janey Skinner, Kathleen White

Guests: Mandy Liang, Cynthia Dewar, Cherisa Yarkin

- I. Call to Order 2:33
- II. Adoption of Agenda
Agenda Adopted.
- III. Public Comment
 - AFT 2121 is organizing events for community, connection and healing. Registration is open here, with limited capacity: <https://bit.ly/3lEr6el>.
 - The Enrollment Management committee, after some leadership changes, had their first meeting October 1st, long after the multi-year enrollment plan had been passed around. There is concern since the committee has not been given meaningful data and time to analyze it.

- The college catalogue has many images of art, none of which are City College of San Francisco art. Recommendation is made that our website and catalogue or any other CCSF publication, should have CCSF art incorporated and should have acknowledgement of the artists.
- STEAM building advisory committee has encouraged architects and Kistcehl groups to redirect their attention to creating a STEAM complex, with the Science building. Both buildings will be involved with all of the departments associated with STEAM. We all need to support this to ensure that this connection happens.
- Thanks to President Hanson for his public comment about the budget inconsistencies at the Board of Trustees meeting. Ratios of employees and students and building usage is not being considered in the current budget conversations and needs to be, along with looking at programs.
- In-person registration is happening at the MUB with plans to extend the service to Chinatown and Mission centers. Consultation about the process for this with constituencies did not take place with enough time prior to implementation; Non-credit registration discussions and/or workgroups within Student Affairs need to include the academic departments.
- Rosenberg library will be offering curbside pick up beginning October 19th; not yet accessible for the centers. Students can make requests through the library website and set a pick-up appointment.
<https://sites.google.com/mail.ccsf.edu/virtualcampus/academic-support/library>

IV. Reports

A. Officer reports

■ President Hanson

- a) Local Area B meeting this week;
- b) State Plenary is Nov. 5-7th and seven of our Senate members will be attending. Send any feedback about [resolutions being considered](#) to President Hanson by November 5th.
- c) a revised [Fall 2020 grading guide](#) is available for students and to anyone who advises students about withdrawing and/or taking P/NP grading options;
- d) Budget Enrollment Plan (separated from the Midterm Report) must be approved by the Board before December and then submitted to the ACCJC. It will be presented to the Academic Senate on October 28th; if we are going to have any formal input, we need to codify that input before the October 28th meeting. There is frustration because process has been requested, but the

metrics used currently do not reflect consultation with all constituents.

- e) Faculty evaluation process for this semester is still being debated between AFT and administration; a note in the chat reflects that faculty evals will resume as normal. Check with AFT for any inquiries about these negotiations.
- f) Travel budget has been approved; Senate leadership is readjusting travel procedures to reflect restrictions as a result of the pandemic.
- g) Topics with ongoing discussion between Senate leadership and administration: cross-listed courses, auto-populating syllabi to reflect accreditation standards; 4 administrative hiring processes proceed with some adjustments in timeline.
- h) Open Senate office hours will be available soon.
- First Vice President Law
 - a) Attended in-person registration for non-credit registration at the Ocean campus; looking forward to expansion to some of our centers.
 - b) Classes are going and students are making progress, however, some students are leaving San Francisco because they are feeling isolated. We should all take a pause and find our energy back as we all cope with being isolated.
 - c) We have a continued commitment to equity, no matter who the students are and what their goals are. Project Shine is back thanks to the Dean of ESL; there is a hope that I-BEST will also regain funding to support students.
 - d) Thankful to all committee chairs; kudos for all of their hard work and leadership.
- Second Vice President Wiese
 - a) Breakout sessions to check in with one another for just a few moments. No requirements except that all meeting attendees have 4 minutes to introduce themselves and chat.
- Secretary Sapienza
 - a) New Fall grading guidance is revised from last semester; information there has been vetted through Student Affairs, Admissions and Records, Articulation and Office of Student Equity. The UC/CSU articulation agreements are much more detailed for transfer than they were last semester, so make sure to let students know that their decisions have different

implications than in Fall.

- b) Join Juan Fernandez, our Queer Resource Center coordinator, at the "Queerceañera," the QRC Open House from 5-6:30 via Zoom, this evening, if you can.

B. Committee on Committees report

- See committee appointments below.

C. Call for Exemplary Programs Award Nominees

D. DCC Report

- Registration issues were presented to the Chancellor and Student Affairs leadership by a small subgroup of Department chairs. They have promised to include these chairs in future conversations.
- Language regarding the City Online section notes to differentiate between modes of remote courses is an ongoing focus.
- Faculty Evaluations bring concern to chairs, the largest being concern about interrupting the tenure review process. Chairs are recommended to move forward with that process.
- Department chair access to the campus is vital to complete scheduling, purchasing, and other chair responsibilities including accessing Argos and work requiring VPN access.
- DCC leadership were told that the chairs would be consulted in the mid-level administrative reorganization; we have yet to hear anything yet, but have reiterated to Chancellor Vurdien that the chairs impacted by those decisions should be included in the process or reorganization decisions.

V. [Consent Agenda](#)

- A. Approval of [Minutes from 2020, Sept. 30](#)

Resolution 2020.10.14.5A	Approval of Minutes: September 30, 2020
Resolved, that the Executive Council approved the minutes for September 30, 2020	
Adopted by consent.	

B. Committee appointments

Resolution 2020.10.14.5B Appointments to Committees, Task Forces, Work Group Appointments

Career Technical Education Committee

- Darouny Somsanith, Health Education
- Patricia Miller, Theater Arts

Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable

- Jessica Masters, Computer Science
- Darouny Somsanith, Health Education
- Claudia Da Silva, CNIT
- Alexandria Leyton, English

Works of Art Committee

- Tulin Good, ESL
- Daya Dennehy, ESL
- Maia Scott, DSPS
- Stephanie Levin, ESL

Registration and Enrollment Committee

- Susan Boudewyn, Licensed Vocational Nursing, new appointment as member

SMEE (Success in Math, ESL, and English)

- Mary Bravewoman, Math, new appointment as member

ASEC Constitution Workgroup

- Katia Fuchs
- Simon Hanson
- Fanny Law
- Alexis Litzky
- Mitra Sapienza
- Fred Teti

Award and Recognition Workgroup

- Joe Reyes
- Fanny Law

Adopted by acclimation.

VI. Old Business

A. Online Instruction Ongoing Discussion: Distance Education coordinator presents [Guidance for Live Remote Teaching](#)

- Office of Online Learning department is working on 1) Steps to Teach Online, 2) Researching and Demoing new LTIs for Canvas, 3) Building a Peer Online Course Review (POCR) team, 4) ongoing support for all faculty, 5) IOTL and AOTL trainings in progress, and 5) guidance for live and remote teaching (another term for synchronous teaching).
 - Live and remote teaching data (from 113 faculty) was presented showing most faculty are using Zoom for teaching for portions of every scheduled class and the largest challenge faculty are facing when using Zoom was student participation.
 - Three areas of guidance being addressed in the Office of Online Learning is the schedule, regulations and pedagogy.
 - A priority in the Guide for Remote Teaching (link above) is maintaining and protecting student privacy. This document has been reviewed by DLAC.
 - Future topics for ASEC: academic integrity in proctoring, Peer Online Course Review (POCR) and continuing support for faculty.
 - The Senate needs to have input about the future, beyond pandemic, about faculty who may want to remain remote.
 - Senate leadership is working with the Office of Online Learning to create language that is accessible and clear for students to be able to understand what types of courses they are registering for. Please let your Senate officers know if you have thoughts or feedback on this topic.

B. [Resolution about Equity Values at CCSF](#)

- Comments are still coming in and being applied either directly on the document or through track comments; at this point over 25

people--ranging from classified staff, faculty, and administrators-- have responded directly to the document; it has been sent to AVC Star who agreed to present the resolution to the Diversity Committee; no response has been received from that committee.

- Please continue to send feedback or amendments to Mitra Sapienza, msapienz@ccsf.edu.
- This item is tabled until students have a chance to give feedback and will be reviewed at the October 28th ASEC meeting. It is vital that students give input to this resolution.

C. ILO 3 Assessment resolution

- SLOC considered and adapted some of the wording recommendations from ASEC from the last meeting.
 - The first “Be it resolved” changed from “Examine” to “Explain” and the inclusion of “and/or” replacing “and”
 - The second resolved changed “Interact” to “Engage” and the last clause was changed from “Engage effectively in diverse social and cultural settings” to “Engage effectively with others in diverse and/or cultural settings.”

Resolution 2020.10.14.6C

Recommend change of wording for ILO 3a and 3c

Whereas Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), rooted in the Mission of the College, define and identify the knowledge, behaviors, and skills the College would like students to acquire and develop throughout their CCSF educational experiences;

Whereas the Institutional Assessment Plan specifies that Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) shall be assessed on a regular basis through a process with broad faculty participation coordinated by the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Coordinators and the Academic Senate’s Student Learning Outcome Committee (SLOC);

Whereas the Institutional Assessment Plan further states that in the assessment process, ILOs are continually reviewed and refined;

Whereas the process for approval of ILOs established in the Institutional Assessment Plan and past practice is that upon recommendation from the SLOC, the Academic Senate Executive Council agrees upon the language for ILOs, which are then reviewed by the Planning Committee of the Participatory Governance Council (PGC), the full

PGC and the Board of Trustees for finalization;

Whereas the ILO 3 Assessment Report prepared in 2019-2020 and approved by the SLOC on September 4, 2020 found that the current wording of ILO 3a does not match current Curriculum Committee standards for outcomes due to the phrase, “Demonstrate an understanding”;

Whereas the SLOC desires to maintain the same sense of ILO 3a and the same mappings while using language that aligns with current Curriculum Committee standards;

Whereas the SLOC found no problems with the current wording of ILO 3b as it meets the current standards of the Curriculum Committee and maps to an adequate number of programs;

Whereas the above-referenced ILO 3 Assessment Report found that the current wording of ILO 3c, due to the use of the verb “collaborate,” excessively limited the number of possible mappings to this sub-element of the ILO, with only 40 programs out of 356 programs in the CCSF catalog in Fall 2019 accurately mapped to this sub-element;

Whereas the SLOC desires to broaden the concept of positive interpersonal interaction in diverse social and cultural settings in ILO 3c to capture educational experiences that are not specifically collaborative but do enhance cultural, social and environmental awareness;

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate recommend the wording of ILO 3a be changed from “Demonstrate an understanding of the history and values of diverse cultures” to “Explain the history and/or values of diverse cultures”; and be it further

Resolved that the Academic Senate recommend the wording of ILO 3c be changed from “Collaborate effectively in diverse social and cultural settings to engage effectively with others in diverse social and/or cultural settings.”

Moved: Katryn Wiese; **Seconded:** Steven Brown

Adopted by Acclimation.

- Last meeting, the workgroup was created. This workgroup is open and tasked with not making direct changes, but creating a process and defining a plan and timeline.

E. [Video Conferencing Technology at Public Meetings](#)

- The language of this resolution is to qualify principles of how best to conduct meetings remotely.
- Research has been conducted to see if there are other groups, ASCCC or other colleges that have set these guidelines, but information on this is very limited.
- Uncertainty about whether the intent of the document is clear. Accessibility of meetings should be defined; we tend to mirror SFUSD and we may be able to learn through their experiences.
- One suggestion was that we might be mimicking the Board of Supervisors practices.
- Best practices in pandemic may not be established yet since we are all still learning about how to maneuver public, remote meetings.
- When giving public comment at Board meetings, one can not see anyone or any reactions. If we are face-to-face, everyone can see one another and you can tell whether people are listening or not. As is it's unclear how many people are even in a meeting. Even in playback through the recording, one can only see a few people and not all of the people on the call.
- This is a violation of the Brown Act if people who are in the meeting could be using the chat to converse with one another; if the attendees can't see the chat, then neither should those running the meeting.

Resolution 2020.10.14.6E	Public Meetings and the use of Videoconferencing Technology
---------------------------------	--

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated all public business be conducted through videoconference technologies; and

Whereas the ability of the community and general public to participate in open meetings has been altered by the use of such technology; and

Whereas the intent of any public meeting is to include broad input from the

community;

Therefore be it resolved that the CCSF Academic Senate urges the San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD) to strive for inclusive and easily accessible meetings recommend the adoption of the following principles for the San Francisco Community College District in any public meeting conducted via video conference:

1. The presence of all persons (sometimes called panelists) officially participating in the meeting should be clearly communicated to all those attending at all times during the meeting.
2. The presence of all other persons attending the meeting audience should be clearly communicated to all those attending at all times during the meeting.
3. If new participants, whether official participants or not join or leave during the course of the meeting all those attending should be made explicitly aware of such changes.
4. Any votes or actions taken in open session should be immediately reported in a clear record (oral or visual) of showing the tally of the voting and exactly what actions will be taken as a result.
5. Accessory communication tools such as chat functions that are not accessible to the general public attending the meeting should not be used to debate, deliberate, or conduct official business. Any such use of these tools that does influence the business of the meeting should be clearly entered into the official record of the meeting at the time of deliberation and before any actions are taken.
6. Every effort should be taken to ensure reasonable accommodation for members of the public wishing to give public comment. This includes announcing the amount of people attempting to make public comments and a clear process for addressing their presence.

Moved: Steven Brown; **Seconded:** Lou Schubert

Motion Carries, Abstentions: Christina Yanuaria

Not present: Douglas Owyang, Coni Staff

F. Roles and Responsibilities handbook ongoing discussion

- Tabled; no discussion.

VII. New Business

A. Program Review ([information](#) and [action](#)) update from the program review committee and assignment of shared work for reviewing and preparing college feedback from the last program reviews

- This year is the last annual plan for the 3-year cycle.
- New considerations have been added to address the pandemic in these reviews.
- In Fall 2020 the Program Review committee has created a new process to review program reviews by assigning many members of the ASEC to each read and review one program review and fill out a google form that highlights the triumphs, challenges and the health of the program. In addition, the form will ask for feedback on the process.
 - A recommendation was made to present this plan to the Department Chair Council.
 - Does program review connect to budget? Response to inquiry is that technically program review and the budget should be interconnected and program review would inform budgetary discussions, both for annual and long-term budget choices. The challenge with this is with the timing and deadlines for program review which adds to the disjointedness, as well as who is reading and incorporating the information.
 - Emphasis is made on how the timing of funding requests and notifications of funding allocations come way too late in the process. Perhaps adjusting to a process that other colleges use: program review committee offers staggered times to meet with departments to determine what departmental priorities are in funding requests.

B. [Academic Freedom](#) consideration of adopting an adapted statement from the University of Chicago about Academic Freedom

- This item is about free speech on campus and the request is to adopt a slightly modified version of the University of Chicago resolution from 2014, which has also been accepted by 40-50 schools, i.e.

Princeton, Columbia, Georgetown, UNC. This is particularly about protecting students, with faculty also in mind as secondary.

- The principle here is freedom of inquiry and speech and maintaining core first amendments rights.
- Our AFT contract (8C #1) describes a broader application of academic freedom.
- This resolution was copied from FIRE (Foundation for Individual Rights in Education)
- An inquiry about what is lacking in the existing CCSF statement on Academic freedom that necessitates this additional resolution. Response is that this is a national level statement; other schools have adopted this and it puts us in the company of other schools which would give us further protections.
- Where does this resolution state that students are free from faculty positions on issues or subject matter that is covered in the classroom? Response: this is a free speech resolution, not as focused on academic freedom. Academic freedom doesn't mean you can talk about anything you want in class, but that it has to pertain to your content. This resolution highlights having the freedom to express feelings and ideas with impunity while also maintaining protections for students from indoctrination.
- There are instances at CCSF where there have been disruptions caused inside classrooms related to hate speech and the faculty then have no support as a result of claims of freedom of speech. We must consider racist statements that rely on plausible deniability; faculty must question what they value, and in this resolution, the institution is suggesting that above all of other values, speech is protected. This does not address the nuance that is needed to take a more firm stance on protecting equity. Response: this isn't about the content; this is about having the freedom to express ourselves.
- This is a very important issue and it's not something that CCSF should sign on because other colleges are signing on; their student body may not be the same as our students. We need a more nuanced response and to challenge the status quo. There is a lot at stake here and requires a deeper discussion.
- A request was made to see what the ASCCC's resolutions related to this topic, includes.
- Tabled to discuss at the next meeting with copy and content edits.

C. [Fall Plenary resolutions](#)

- Draft resolutions for the Senate fall Plenary session have been published. Feedback and any written comments or input can be sent to eshanson@ccsf.edu.

VIII. Adjournment, 5:10pm.