

June 27, 2025

Mr. Mitchell Bailey  
Interim Chancellor  
City College of San Francisco  
50 Frida Kahlo Way Box E200  
San Francisco, CA 94112

Dear Mr. Bailey:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, at its meeting June 4-5, 2025, reviewed the Follow-Up Report and related evidentiary materials submitted by City College of San Francisco. The Commission also considered the Peer Review Team Follow-Up Report prepared by the follow-up team that visited the institution on March 28, 2025. The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College has addressed the deficiencies identified by the peer review team during the fall 2023 comprehensive visit and demonstrated compliance with the Standards cited in the Commission's January 16, 2024, Action Letter.

Upon consideration of the information noted above, the Commission acted to **Reaffirm Accreditation** for the remainder of the cycle. The Commission finds that City College of San Francisco has addressed the compliance requirements, corrected deficiencies, and meets **Standards III.D.11, IV.C.7, and IV.C.12**.

The Commission requires that you disseminate the Follow-Up Report, the Peer Review Team Report, and this letter to all campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the College website within seven business days of your receipt. A final copy of the Peer Review Team Report is attached.

The next report from the College will be the Midterm Report<sup>1</sup> due on October 15, 2027. The institution's next comprehensive review will begin with Team ISER Review in the spring term of 2030 and conclude with a Focused Site Visit in the fall term of 2030.

---

<sup>1</sup> Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-up Reports, Special Reports, or Teach-out plans/agreements to the Commission should review the Accreditation Handbook and applicable report templates available on the ACCJC website at <https://accjc.org/accreditation-handbook-and-report-templates/>.

On behalf of the Commission, we wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and thoughtful reflection that City College of San Francisco undertook to respond to these requirements. These efforts confirm that peer review can serve the multiple constituencies of higher education by both ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission's action, please feel free to contact Dr. Mac Powell or the vice president assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,



Mac Powell, MBA, Ph.D.  
President



Kathleen F. Burke, Ed.D.  
Chair

cc: Ms. Kristin Charles, Accreditation Liaison Officer

## **Peer Review Team Follow-Up Report**

City College of San Francisco  
50 Frida Kahlo Way  
San Francisco, CA 94112

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a follow-up visit to City College of San Francisco March 28, 2025. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its June 2025 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Erika Endrijonas, Ph.D.  
Team Chair

## Table of Contents

Peer Review Team Roster .....	1
Purpose of Follow-Up Visit.....	2
Team Analysis of Institution Responses to Compliance Requirements/Deficiencies .....	3

# City College of San Francisco

## Peer Review Team Roster

Erika Endrijonas, Ph.D., Team Chair  
Santa Barbara City College  
Superintendent/President

Dr. Mike Munoz, Vice Chair  
Long Beach City College  
Superintendent/President

### **ACADEMIC MEMBERS**

Dr. Jesse Mills  
Compton College  
Faculty, Political Science

### **ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS**

Dan Troy  
San Diego Community College District  
Vice Chancellor, Finance and Business Services

### **ACCJC STAFF LIAISON**

Nickawanna Shaw  
Vice President

# Purpose of Follow-Up Visit

INSTITUTION: City College of San Francisco

DATES OF VISIT: March 28, 2025

TEAM CHAIR: Erika Endrijonas, Ph.D.

## Purpose of Site Visit

The peer review team conducted its comprehensive peer review of City College of San Francisco from October 2-4, 2023. At its January 10-11, 2024 meeting, the Commission determined noncompliance with Standard III.D.11 (College Requirement 1), Standard IV.C.7 (College Requirement 2), and Standard IV.C.12 (College Requirement 3), and acted to require a Follow-Up Report due no later than March 1, 2025 followed by a visit from a peer review team. Members of the peer review team conducted its follow-up site visit to City College of San Francisco on March 28, 2025.

The purpose of the visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the Institution was accurate, through examination of evidence, and interviews with Institution representatives, to determine if the Institution now meets the Standards noted in the following compliance requirements:

Standard III.D.11 (College Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires the Governing Board consider the College's long-range fiscal implications when making financial decisions in order to assure financial stability.

Standard IV.C.7 (College Requirement 2): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the Governing Board act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws.

Standard IV.C.12 (College Requirement 3): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the Governing Board allow the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference.

During the visit, team members met with four administrators and all Governing Board members, including the Student Trustee in formal meetings, group interviews, and individual interviews. The team thanks the Institution staff for hosting the site visit, coordinating meetings, providing additional documentation, and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

# Team Analysis of Institution Responses to Compliance Requirements/Deficiencies

**Standard III.D.11: In order to meet the Standard, the Team recommends the Governing Board consider the College's long-range fiscal implications when making financial decisions in order to assure financial stability.**

## **Findings and Evidence:**

The Team found evidence that the College has made progress toward improving the transparency and credibility of information related to the budget and fiscal matters. The College has held public forums to communicate and invite feedback on its fiscal position, has conducted a series of workshops with the Governing Board to deepen their understanding of the budget, and is undergoing the work of revising its policies and procedures. Additionally, the College has passed a FY25 budget that is narrowly balanced and, through quarter two, is on pace for a small operating surplus for the year. The College is doing a better job of ensuring that it claims all available revenue from the state and the city of San Francisco. In January, the College approved a revised midyear budget that recognized updated revenues and expenditures.

Further, the Team's discussions with the Trustees indicated an improved level of trust with the College leadership, particularly with regard to the reliability of budget information. These discussions also demonstrated an acknowledgement of the seriousness of the College's fiscal problems and that difficult decisions lay ahead of them; all Trustees indicated they felt they now had the tools to face those decisions. The Board took the initiative to call for a Partnership Resource Team from the state Chancellor's Office to help identify budget solutions. The Trustees demonstrated a much clearer understanding of the roles of the Governing Board and of the College administration during this visit compared to October 2023.

While the College appears to be developing good processes to assess budget issues, the tough decisions the Board must make are still to come. The fiscal issues faced by the College are severe. There is a \$30.7M gap between the College's Hold Harmless funding and the amount it earns through the state funding formula. This means the College will likely face several years without cost-of-living adjustments. The College's footprint across its service area remains large relative to its FTES, as it operates six active sites (a main campus and five centers) and owns two additional sites that have not been in operation for a number of years. The College further faces the loss of over \$8M in site-based funding after the 2026-27 year due to insufficient enrollment. The College has identified significant deferred maintenance costs that have been neglected in recent years. The College currently maintains a reserve smaller than the two months of general fund operating expenditures recommended by the Chancellor's Office, which adds to its challenge.

With hard decisions on the horizon for CCSF, the Team is concerned about the College's ability to remain compliant when faced with difficult financial decisions that are expected in the next few years. The College leadership is expected to present a multiyear plan for fiscal stability as part of the Tentative Budget in June of this year. The Governing Board will need to demonstrate that it can continue to work together as a cohesive unit to make decisions that may be contested by college constituent groups to remain compliant with the requirements of Standard III.D.11.

## **Conclusion:**

The Institution has made sufficient progress to meet Standard III.D.11 based on the information provided in the Follow-Up Report and gathered through interviews during the Follow-Up visit.

**Standard IV.C.7: In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the Governing Board act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws.**

## **Findings and Evidence:**

The team found that the College has taken significant and meaningful action to address deficiencies in this area. In order to address the Commission's previous findings, the Governing Board acted decisively by forming the Board Ad Hoc Committee on Policies. This committee was tasked with reviewing policies to ensure the Governing Board shares a common understanding of their role as a policy Board as well as revising policies where necessary. This committee has already reviewed and revised a significant number of Board policies that the Commission noted they should address: BP 1.02 (Duties and Responsibilities of the Board), BP 1.09 (Agendas), BP 1.23 (Board Self-Evaluation), BP 1.24 (Evaluation of the Chancellor), and BP 1.37 (Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor).

The Governing Board also strengthened adherence to its policies and bylaws through its annual self-evaluation which was conducted in Spring/Summer 2024. The results were discussed at Board retreats in June 2024 and January 2025. During these retreats, the Governing Board focused on fostering Board norms around shared governance and better training/development of its members. Interviews with campus stakeholders and Board members provided evidence of the efficacy of these measures, as individual Governing Board members were familiar with Board policies and shared an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the Governing Board vis-a-vis other campus leaders. Board members recognized the importance of acting with a singular voice and adopting a more collegial culture. Board meetings have become significantly shorter and more cordial. Interviews also demonstrated that Board members recognized their role as one of setting the direction for the College, while allowing the Interim Chancellor operational/administrative control.

Additional evidence of the Governing Board's commitment to addressing this requirement includes their participation at the CCLC annual convention in November 2024 and widespread Board member attendance at the CCLC Effective Trusteeship workshop in January 2025.

## **Conclusion:**

The institution has addressed the requirement, corrected the deficiencies, and meets Standard IV.C.7.

**Standard IV.C.12: In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the Governing Board allow the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference.**

## **Findings and Evidence:**

There has been a significant shift in the relationship between the Governing Board and the Chancellor. In interviews with the Interim Chancellor and current Board members, both sides agreed that the Governing Board was responsible for “determining broad general policies, plans, and procedures,” while the Chancellor was responsible for administering these policies. Board members expressed contrition for past actions and demonstrated a willingness to “stay in their lane.” Some Board members also remarked that when questions about the operations of the College are brought up by constituents, they forward those requests to the Interim Chancellor’s office, rather than placing them on Board agendas. When such issues arise during Board meetings, they are referred to the Interim Chancellor. The Interim Chancellor takes an active role in this relationship, alerting the Board when discussions stray towards operational matters and making administrative recommendations.

Further evidence of this shift in relationship dynamics between the Governing Board and Chancellor can be found in the process for creating the agendas for Board meetings. Interviews during the Visiting Team’s 2023 visit revealed that Board members often bypassed the Chancellor and placed items on Board agendas by communicating directly with the Board President. Currently, the Interim Chancellor consults with the President of the Board, and Board Agendas are mutually agreed upon. Board members can make requests to the Interim Chancellor if they wish to add additional items. The Board president holds regular meetings with the Interim Chancellor, who also checks in with all other Board members on a regular basis.

Perhaps most importantly, the Governing Board reversed course on Summer/Fall resolutions passed in 2023, which directed the Chancellor to re-hire all previously laid off faculty by Summer 2024 by approving tentative, adoptive, and mid-year adjusted budgets for FY 25 that did not include funding for the restoration of these faculty. The Board has since acknowledged that staffing decisions are the purview of the Chancellor’s office and any faculty who have been recalled were done so as part of normal operational processes.

The recent culture shift and adherence to existing Board policies has resulted in a positive Board – Chancellor relationship. The Visiting Team acknowledges the many processes the Board has put in place to continue to strengthen current Board norms, including Board Retreats, professional development, and orientation/onboarding practices. However, concerns remain regarding the permanence of these changes, especially when the looming fiscal issues will require tough decisions.

### **Conclusion:**

The institution has addressed the requirement, corrected the deficiencies, and meets Standard IV.C.12.