

# City College of San Francisco

---

## Evaluation of Shared Governance



Office of Research, Planning and Grants

October 2004

## Acknowledgements

This study and report was overseen by the members of the College Advisory Council during the 2003/4 academic year. The study coordinator was Dr. Robert Gabriner, Dean of Research, Planning and Grants. The staff working on this report are: Attila Gabor; Kelley Karandjeff; Pamela Mery; and Steven Spurling.

## Table of Contents

Section	Page
Section 1: Background	3
Section 2: Methodology	5
Section 3: Participant Survey Results	9
Section 4: Listening Session Results	11
Section 5: Recommendations for Improvement of College Shared Governance	13
Appendices:	15
Self-Study Reports	16
Shared Governance Participant Survey Results	23
Written Responses to Online Survey	27
Listening Session Summary	37

## Section 1: Background

---

The City College of San Francisco Shared Governance System was developed from a series of conversations the CCSF administration and representatives of the major College constituencies had during the 1992/93 academic year. The resulting agreement was brought before the Board of Trustees as a set of policy recommendations for the operation of the Shared Governance system at City College of San Francisco. The Board approved the policy on governance in September 1993. Accompanying the policy document was an appendix listing the College's Shared Governance committees, their role and function and the membership composition. An office to coordinate the Shared Governance system was established soon after the Board's approval of the new policy. Also included was a provision for the periodic review and evaluation of the work of the College Shared Governance system.

### Structure and Function

The College governance system has three parts:

1. The Collegial Governance system in which the College relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate and its representatives. The membership of the Shared Governance committees in this area include all College constituent organizations but with a plurality of faculty sitting on each of the four major committees—Academic Policies, Curriculum, Student Preparation/Success and Staff Development.
2. The College Advisory systems in which the College obtains advisory recommendations in key operational areas from committees including Information Technology Policy, Communication and Diversity-related issues. The committees report directly to the College Advisory Council composed of representatives from the major College organizations and chaired by the Chancellor.
3. The Planning and Budgeting system which is an integrated system of college-wide planning and budgeting for the College. Included in this system is the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) composed of representatives from each College organization. Additional committees reporting to the PBC include Facilities Review Committee, Program Review Committee, Faculty Position Allocation Committee and Classified Position Allocation Committee.

It is important to note that California's laws and administrative regulations provide that students, classified staff and administrators play an advisory role to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The faculty role is more specific. The provisions say that the College will "rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the faculty in academic and professional matters." Title 5 regulations include 10 specific areas of academic and professional matters, and a provision that other areas may be included if they are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

The City College Shared Governance system is organized in compliance with this Title 5 regulation.

## Shared Governance System Evaluation

The College has performed two evaluations of the Shared Governance system since its inception in September 1993. In Spring 1994, the College conducted a survey of Shared Governance participants. Of the 127 respondents, 85% said working relations among committee members was either good or very good, and 71% rated the quality of work completed as good or very good. Reflecting the early stages of working collaboratively, 57% of the respondents rated trust among the various college groups as good or very good.

A second evaluation of the Shared Governance system in 1997 identified the need to improve the efficiency of moving policies and procedures through the system as well as “real and meaningful participation” in the committees. Other suggestions included delineating the role and functions of the committees and reviewing, and where feasible reducing, the number of committees.

This report summarizes the third and most comprehensive evaluation of the CCSF Shared Governance system. The College Advisory Council began planning for this college-wide process during the 2002/3 academic year, and initiated the evaluation with an announcement to all College faculty, students, classified staff and administrators in August 2003 of the availability of an online survey on Shared Governance.

## Section 2: Methodology

---

Previous evaluations of CCSF Shared Governance system relied solely upon data from a survey distributed to all CCSF committee participants. For this most recent evaluation, the College Advisory Council adopted a multiple-measure approach. Data was collected by a variety of methods to maximize the number of respondents and perspectives. Methods include the following.

1. An online survey of all CCSF participants from the past three years.
2. Listening sessions to gather feedback from both participants and other members of the College community.
3. Use of the College's program review framework. Each major college constituency—faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators—met and discussed a series of common questions and were then asked to produce a report comprising their responses.

Because CCSF is such a large and complex organization, the College Advisory Council adopted an organizational strategy to ensure maximum participation among all College constituencies. The strategy rested on (1) centralized coordination by the College Advisory Council in collaboration with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants, and (2) decentralized responsibility focused upon the College organizations.

One organization from each of the four constituency groups was primarily responsible for leading the review and response to the self-study questions.

**Faculty.** The Academic Senate served as the primary organization working with the Department Chairs Council and AFT 2121.

**Classified Staff.** SEIU 790 served as the primary organization working with the Classified Senate.

**Students.** The Associated Students will be the primary organization working with other student organizations.

**Administrators.** The Administrators Association will be the primary organization working with all academic and classified administrators.

### Questions for the Participant Survey

The Office of Research, Planning and Grants worked directly with the College Advisory Council organizations to identify and develop the questions for the online survey. See Section 3 for a summary of the results of the online survey and the appendix for the full numerical and written data.

## Questions for Self-Study

The common self-study questions were developed by the College Advisory Council in collaboration with the Office of Research, Planning and Grants. Four major concerns became the framework for the self-study questions, including the following.

1. Inclusion of College Constituencies
2. Effectiveness of the Governance System
3. Efficiency of the System
4. Alignment of the Governance System with the College's Goals and Objectives

## Study Questions for College Organizations

Based upon the four major areas of concern, the College Advisory Council developed a series of questions. The organizations were responsible for writing responses to each of the questions, and submitting a written report that would be shared among all the college organizations in advance of a College Advisory Council review. The papers were to be used to inform a discussion about the strengths and any weaknesses of the Shared Governance system and to develop recommendations for improving the Shared Governance System. The study questions are listed below.

### **I. Inclusion of College Constituencies**

- A. Are members of your organization satisfied that their concerns are being heard within the committees of the Shared Governance system?
- B. Are members of your organization kept informed about the work and the accomplishments of the Shared Governance system?

### **2. Effectiveness of the Governance System**

- A. Are members of your organization satisfied that the Shared Governance system is responsive to their concerns?
- B. Are members of your organization satisfied that the committees provide constructive ideas and recommendations to the college?
- C. Are there areas of the governance system that could be made more productive and effective? If yes, what areas need improvement?

### **3. Efficiency of System**

- A. Do the leaders and members of your organization understand how the Shared Governance system produces policies and recommendations for the college? Are the Shared Governance committees well organized? Specifically do the committees,
  1. Follow agendas and disseminate minutes regularly?
  2. Report recommendations and actions to appropriate Shared Governance committees within the system?

3. Follow committee procedures and rules
  4. Maintain a regular meeting schedule with appropriate quorums
- B. Does the Shared Governance Office provide support needed to operate the Shared Governance system? Are there improvements that should be made?

**4. Alignment—Governance System and College Goals and Objectives**

- A. Do the leadership and membership of your organization agree that the Shared Governance system supports the College's goals and objectives?
- B. If yes, what types of evidence support this view within the organization?
- C. If no, what types of evidence support a negative view within your organization?

Council Review

Based upon the data collected from the online survey, the listening sessions and the organizational self-study reports, the College Advisory Council met to review and assess the responses and to identify recommendations that could improve the College's governance system. The final report was to include the following components.

1. A summary of constituent groups' views on the College's Governance System.
2. A collective analysis of the online survey results for Shared Governance committee participants.
3. A set of recommendations for improvement based upon the findings from the survey report and the constituent reports.



## Timeline for Shared Governance Program Review

<b>May 2003</b>	CAC reviews and adopts participant survey and timeline for completion of program review.
<b>August – September 2003</b>	Office of Research, Planning and Grants disseminates and collects responses from participant survey.
<b>September 2003</b>	Listening Session(s) on Shared Governance are held.
<b>September 2003 – January 2004</b>	College organizations address the self-study framework.
<b>March 2004</b>	College organizations hold a Shared Governance retreat to present and discuss findings and develop recommendations.
<b>April 2004</b>	<p>A review of the final report with recommendations by CAC is conducted.</p> <p>Report is forwarded to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.</p>

## The Problem of Student Participation

Student participation in community college governance systems has been an on-going challenge throughout the state since the Community College Reform Act was adopted in 1988. Most of the problems focus upon the quest for consistency among student participants whose schedules and work lives are often in contradiction with the meeting cycles of shared governance systems. Consequently, student participation in system evaluations has been limited. CCSF is no exception. During the first CCSF evaluation of shared governance in 1994, a total of 12 students responded. Anticipating this problem for this evaluation, the Office of Research, Planning and Grants sought to survey student participants in the Shared Governance committees prior to the end of the Spring 2003 semester, sending them a survey to be filled out and sent back to the College. Unfortunately, students failed to respond to this effort.

Given the limited exposure and knowledge that new students have about the College Shared Governance committees, the Associated Students chose not to participate in the online survey or the organizational self-study reports. Students did participate in the Shared Governance Listening Sessions and their concerns are part of the data used to develop the final recommendations for improving the current Shared Governance system.

## Section 3: Participant Survey Results

---

### Profile of Respondents

Of those who responded to the Shared Governance Survey, a majority were full-time employees (77%) who work on the Ocean Avenue campus (61%). Almost two-thirds of respondents were faculty or faculty department chairs (61%) and a similar number had three or more years of experience on a Shared Governance committee (67%). Administrators tended to be on three or more committees while faculty and staff generally served on one or two committees.

### Participation on Shared Governance Committees

While survey respondents generally indicated that their committee(s) meets once a month (52%), a substantial number of respondents report attending meetings two or three times per month (20%). Most respondents attend meetings all the time (64%) or regularly (24%). Over half reported that they receive information on the role and function of the committee, although more often faculty and staff (54% and 60% respectively) than administrators (38%).

### Climate of Shared Governance Committees

Respondents reported that their committee environment encourages honesty among the participants, although administrators were more likely to agree with this statement (96%) than classified staff (78%). Most respondents felt their opinions were valued by the committee (68%), although 9% stated they were uncomfortable expressing opposing views. Almost all respondents (91%) said their opinions were usually or always respected. Participants generally spoke at all or most of their committee meetings (83%).

Of survey respondents, most agreed that committee procedures and objectives were usually or always clear (87% and 88% respectively). Slightly more faculty (95%) than administrators (91%) or classified staff (87%) found their committee work valuable. Finally, many respondents (85%) found that committee work connected to other College decisions and events.

### Participants Survey Comments

Survey respondents were also offered the opportunity to share written comments including general thoughts, specific observations and suggestions for improvement of the Shared Governance system. The following includes common themes within the feedback of faculty, department chairs, classified staff and administrators.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A full listing of all comments can be found in the appendices of this report.

**Committee Formation and Operation.** A number of respondents stated that the process for appointing people to committees appears exclusive in some cases, with a handful of individuals controlling important committees. In turn, individuals believed that committees should be more diverse. Faculty respondents commented that making meetings proved difficult because of scheduling conflicts. Others believed that more students, student development and/or non-teaching faculty should be represented on the committees. Several respondents protested the exclusion of Confidential and Supervisory employees and under-represented classified staff from Shared Governance committees.

Similarly, some remarks focused on the need to improve the process for taking an issue through the Shared Governance system. Many felt that it is inefficient, cumbersome and unclear to many participants.

Finally, some respondents noted the importance of leadership to the efficiency and efficacy of a committee. Those with strong leadership felt productive while others without strong leadership felt wayward and unproductive. Some level of leadership training and development was suggested.

**Information Exchange.** Several respondents expressed the need for the Shared Governance system to make more information available such as minutes, agendas, committee roles and functions and rosters of committee members. Some suggested more frequent updates to the Web site and/or a “one-stop shop” for information exchange.

In the case of the Academic Senate and its related Shared Governance committees, some respondents also commented that the Academic Senate does not ultimately utilize their committee’s work and decisions. While some faculty respondents expressed that the process for communication flowed only one way (from the committees to the Academic Senate), some Academic Senate members shared that they do not receive information from related committees, and thus the Senate finds itself starting from scratch on issues.

Additionally, individuals, classified staff in particular, commented that they would like more notification of opportunities to join Shared Governance committees.

**Community Building.** While many written comments focused on areas for improvement, several statements were made about the valuable community building function the Shared Governance system plays at the College. Some respondents stated that it makes positive connections between different employee groups and students and unites members of the different CCSF campuses. Finally, some respondents commented on the importance of the current administration’s support to the success of the system.

## Section 4: Listening Sessions Results

---

Three listening sessions held during the month of October on the John Adams and Ocean Avenue campuses elicited similar comments to those written by survey respondents. Faculty, administrators, staff and students all attended these listening sessions. The following summarizes their suggestions and recommendations for improving the Shared Governance system.<sup>2</sup>

**Committee Formation and Operation.** Most comments from the listening sessions related to committee formation and operation focused on committee membership. Listening session participants suggested that the system make term limits more clear and enforce those limits to ensure new members are allowed to participate. Further, participants recommended that the system ensure that all committees have adequate and appropriate representation from all constituencies. Some ideas included recruiting students through the classroom, providing release time to noncredit faculty to participate on committees and providing stipends or paying faculty and staff for their participation on Shared Governance committees.

Other recommendations included formalizing the process for Administrative Council engagement in the Shared Governance system and the rewrite policy for participation of faculty on release full-time.

Finally, listening session participants suggested that the system create a set of rules for conduct across all committees and that committee bylaws include language that permits the dissolution of subcommittees that have not met for a specified length of time.

**Information Exchange.** Listening session participants also focused on improving information exchange. Similar to the survey respondent comments, participants requested that major committees produce agendas in advance on the Web, record minutes at their meetings, post minutes to the Web and better communicate about the status of their committees. Some participants focused specifically on increasing communication between faculty and the Shared Governance system. Finally, students suggested that the system include an annual synopsis of activity in the Shared Governance Handbook, which can be used both as a recruitment tool and a means for bringing new student members up to speed.

Additionally, listening session participants suggested that the College provide more information on the Shared Governance system as a whole and regarding the ways in which individuals can get involved by offering FLEX Day sessions, orientations to new employees and information sessions throughout the year. Some participants suggested that the College make the opportunity to join Shared Governance committees part of job announcements and descriptions. Participants also recommended that a specific contact or source for more information be named when announcing committee openings in City Currents or otherwise.

---

<sup>2</sup> A full synopsis of all listening sessions can be found in the appendices of this report.

Finally, some participants suggested that the College offer regular listening sessions on the Shared Governance system to provide an ongoing forum for comments and suggestions for improvement.

**Community-Building.** In order to continue building community and participation through the Shared Governance system, some listening session participants suggested exploring other ways to gather for committee meetings, including video conferencing or providing a shuttle between campuses. Finally, one participant suggested exploring a change of name from *Shared Governance* to *Participatory Governance*.

## Section 5: Recommendations for Improvement of College Shared Governance

---

Each College organization met and reviewed the self-study questions, the data from the online survey and the listening sessions, and then structured their own self-study discussions. Reports from the following organizations were received by the Office of Research, Planning and Grants and distributed to all the other Council representatives including the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Administrators Association and American Federation of Teachers Local 2121.

Based upon the review of each of these reports, the College Advisory Council established two sets of recommendations. The first focuses on improving the current on-going operation of the shared governance system, and the second is new initiatives. Implementation of these recommendations will be addressed by the College Advisory Council beginning in Fall 2004.

### ONGOING EFFORTS

1. Review and clarify the role and function of each shared governance committee and subcommittee including an assessment of whether the issues being addressed by each committee are aligned with role and function.
2. Develop a flowchart that clearly and simply shows how an issue moves through the Shared Governance System. Establish a tracking system<sup>3</sup> for recommendations to ensure that issues move through the system.
3. Enhance the content and look of the College Shared Governance website and promote its use within the College community. The website should include but not be limited to committee flowchart, committee membership rosters, committee member contact information<sup>4</sup>, agendas, and posted minutes.
4. Review and standardize protocols for committee operations. These operations include, but are not limited to, conducting meetings<sup>5</sup>, developing and submitting agendas, minutes, and annual committee reports.
5. Re-establish the annual Shared Governance Report that reflects activities and accomplishments for each committee.
6. Conduct regular reviews to ensure that all committee vacancies are filled in a timely manner. Utilize all College communications, including the College email

---

<sup>3</sup> This system could be keyed to the aforementioned flowchart.

<sup>4</sup> This may include a dedicated email address for student members.

<sup>5</sup> Protocols should include a procedure for modifying the committee's meeting schedule, and a list of the chair's responsibilities.

system and City Currents, to announce committee vacancies and the procedures to serve on a committee.

7. Restore the Shared Governance Coordinator/Office staff assignment to 80% and explore locating the office to a clearly identified, and accessible office to ensure adequate support for updating, gathering, and disseminating information.

## **NEW INITIATIVES**

1. Provide release time for faculty who are chairs and/or committee secretaries of all committees with an exceptionally large work load.
2. Ensure that new committee chairs know their roles and responsibilities. These responsibilities must include mentoring new committee members.
3. Implement the two Shared Governance "Deans' Councils" referred to in the Shared Governance document appendix by combining both councils into one governance body, the Administrators Association, for the purposes of appointment recommendations to the Chancellor and for discussions and recommendations on shared governance issues.
4. Notify immediate supervisor(s) when an employee is appointed to a Shared Governance Committee.
5. To ensure the continuing commitment to promote a college climate that supports the full participation and active engagement of all CCSF constituencies while encouraging respect for differing opinions and ideas, the Chancellor shall distribute an annual letter to all CCSF employees and students inviting their participation in the College governance system and reaffirming the critical importance of the shared governance process at City College of San Francisco.
6. Create an in-house Shared Governance Committee on Public Records and Sunshine/Information to insure that all segments of our "public" internal constituencies have access to information about budgets, programs, plans, contracts, etc.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The College Advisory Council approved this recommendation after the completion of this study and report. The recommendation is the result of a special CCSF sunshine task force comprised of the Chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees and senior administrative staff. This recommendation addresses the concerns of the task force to ensure that information is available to CCSF constituent groups.

## Appendices

---



### Academic Senate

#### I. Inclusion of College Constituencies

- A. *Are members of your organization satisfied that their concerns are being heard within the committees of the Shared Governance system?*

Generally, the faculty are satisfied that they are being heard in the Shared Governance committees.

- B. *Are members of your organization kept informed about the work and the accomplishments of the Shared Governance system?*

The faculty are informed of work and accomplishments of committees in Shared Governance usually through the minutes, many of which are posted in City Currents. The Sept 2003 Survey of Shared Governance, #13 ("Read City Currents") has 51% usually and 25% always read City Currents. Thus 76% of the faculty are at least usually reading the City Currents. However, there was expressed through a few written comments that minutes and agendas were not being posted for committees. This could be resolved with a Shared Governance person whose assigned time is increased. See 3.B. The other way faculty are informed of the work done by Shared Governance committees is through reports (both oral and written) given to the Executive Council of the Academic Senate, whose minutes are always posted in City Currents. The Executive Council has been receiving oral reports for the past ten years. Council has had reports from sub-committees of the Academic Senate, but in the past several years sub-committees in other Shared Governance pipelines have been given the opportunity to report as well. Sometime minutes are either read or distributed to Council during the committee report segment of the agenda when they are sent to the Senate Office.

#### 2. Effectiveness of the Governance System

- A. *Are members of your organization satisfied that the Shared Governance system is responsive to their concerns?*

The Shared Governance system is responsive to faculty concerns this is evidenced by the lack of any comments to the contrary in the written comments to the SG Survey or in the listening session. Generally, the Academic Senate has heard that the faculty opinions are respected, and the committees are sensitive to faculty concerns (also see SG Survey #7).

- B. *Are members of your organization satisfied that the committees provide constructive ideas and recommendations to the college?*

In terms of satisfaction toward offering constructive ideas and recommendations, the SG Survey indicates from #7 (Opinion Respected) that 93% felt that faculty always or usually have their opinion respected. From #5 (Environment that encourages honesty), the faculty feel that the environment of Shared Governance encourages

honesty 92% of the time. Also #6 (Different opinions valued), 64% of faculty feel that differing opinions are being valued.

*C. Are there areas of the governance system that could be made more productive and effective? If yes, what areas need improvement?*

The area of governance that could be made more productive and effective is communication of process. Much of the evidence of this is through the written comments from the 2003 Survey of Shared Governance, listening sessions, and from conversations with faculty.

Many of the comments indicated a lack of availability of minutes from meetings and posting of agendas. This is seen through the recommendations/suggestions from all three listening sessions. An example from the listening session (Oct 2 at Ocean Avenue Campus), "Minutes are taken by some committees, although it is unclear what happens to those minutes, where they should be submitted, and how they are used to ultimately make decisions." A similar theme is repeated in the written comments to the Shared Governance survey, "Minutes and agenda need to be posted for all meetings for all committees. Otherwise, we are all working in a vacuum, and I feel that my time is majorly(sic) wasted." Also, in meeting with full-time/part-time faculty at various sites, they have also indicated that they feel that information through the minutes takes a long time to reach them. A possible solution is for all pipelines to adopt a set of protocols that all committees would follow. See 3.B response for another possible solution.

The other area of concern is the perceived inefficiency of the appointment process. An example of this is through the written comments from the SG Survey, "The process for appointing people to committees is not clear to people who are in the loop." Although the Academic Senate has an open committee appointment procedure that has been used for a very long time, some people are not aware of it. The Senate has in response tried to explain the process in as many venues as possible (i.e. Plenary sessions, and at Council meetings). Also the letter that is sent to people who are requesting appointment has been modified to explain the process.

### **3. Efficiency of System**

*A. Do the leaders and members of your organization understand how the Shared Governance system produces policies and recommendations for the college? Are the Shared Governance committees well organized? Specifically do the committees,*  
*1. Follow agendas and disseminate minutes regularly?*

From the SG Survey, Question #4a (Meeting Regularity) and Question #4b. (Attendance at Meetings), 71% of the meetings occur once a month or 2 to 3 per month and that 88% attend either all the time or regularly. Since most of the faculty attend the meetings regularly and they have indicated (71%) that the meetings are at least occurring once a month, then most of committees are meeting regularly. In terms of agenda, the SG Survey does not address this specifically, but from written responses such as "...In the past the chairperson of the committee I serve on regularly failed to provide an agenda in advance." The Recommendation/Suggestions from the John Adams Listening Session includes, "Request that major committees produce agendas in advance on the Web." The

Academic Senate over the past five years has had reports of this problem, but it has been isolated to a few committees. Since the survey was not designed to evaluate a specific committee, but rather overall perspective, perhaps comments are more relevant to the functioning of specific committees.

2. *Report recommendations and actions to appropriate Shared Governance committees within the system?*

Recommendations and actions seem to be referred properly to other committees.

3. *Follow committee procedures and rules*

From SG Survey #8 (Procedure Clear), faculty feel 92% that the procedures used by the committee are usually/always clear. Also SG survey #9 (Objectives Clear), faculty feel 90% that the objectives are usually/always clear. Also, 74% of faculty feel that the information on the role and function was provided or wasn't needed. The Academic Senate over the past five years has had reports of this aberrations but these were isolated to a few committees. Since the survey was not designed to evaluate a specific committee, but rather overall perspective, perhaps comments are more relevant to the functioning of specific committees.

4. *Maintain a regular meeting schedule with appropriate quorums*

Generally, from SG Survey, written responses to SG Survey, and Listening Session, faculty seem to have not indicated any problem about the meeting regularly with a quorum. Again, the Academic Senate over the past five years has had reports of this problem, but it has been isolated to a few committees. Since the survey was not designed to evaluate a specific committee, but rather overall perspective, perhaps comments are more relevant to the functioning of specific committees.

B. *Does the Shared Governance office provide support needed to operate the Shared Governance system? Are there improvements that should be made?*

A qualified yes. From the standpoint of maintaining the Master Planning Calendar, producing a Shared Governance Handbook & Brochure, and keeping a master list of membership of all Shared Governance Committees, these are being done well. However, there are areas that need improvement: increasing the assigned time for the Shared Governance Coordinator in doing Shared Governance work, and release time for faculty who are either chairs or secretaries for committees.

As indicated above, there is great need to have a Shared Governance Coordinator with more time devoted to support of the Shared Governance system. Historically, the Shared Governance Coordinator had an office was located in the Chancellor's area, reported directly to the Chancellor, and was assigned to devote 80% of his/her time to Shared Governance and 20% to support other projects in the Chancellor's Office.

Currently the Shared Governance Coordinator is located in the Research and Planning Office, reports to the Director of Research and Planning, and is assigned to spend 50% of his/her time on Shared Governance and 50% on

Research/Planning projects. In practice, due to the heavy workload in the Research/Planning office, time allotted for Shared Governance support is often very limited. There are even weeks when the Shared Governance Coordinator has no time allotted for Shared Governance support.

Academic Senate recommends that the Shared Governance Coordinator position be restored to its original 80% and that for this period of time each week, a location near the Chancellor's office be designated as the Shared Governance Office, and that the Shared Governance Coordinator's time be focused on coordination and support for the Shared Governance system. Activities such as collecting and posting meeting dates, meeting minutes, and annual reports for all committees should be a top priority to ensure that the college community is kept fully informed about Shared Governance issues and activities. Also there need to be someone who can keep track of the current chairs of each Shared Governance Committee and its membership. It is often difficult to contact the committee chair as they change. A one-stop location would be helpful to faculty and others in helping direct people to issues/concerns about a specific committee or issue. A person who would be responsible to contact the chairs of the committee at least once a year or maybe once a semester would be beneficial in helping direct people to the right committee and make contact with the committee periodically. All of the above requires more workload for the current Shared Governance Coordinator. Ultimately, a full-time coordinator for Shared Governance may be needed.

In order to compensate for the anticipated loss in the Research Office staff time, it is understood that the Office of Research and Planning be given staff support necessary to complete the high priority projects and reports in a timely fashion.

The other issue is that in order to produce minutes and agendas, faculty who are assigned as a chair or secretary of a committee need to get re-assigned time. For faculty whether teaching credit or non-credit, it is difficult to find time to attend the meetings, but adding the additional task of chairing or taking minutes requires more effort.

#### **4. Alignment--Governance System and College Goals and Objectives**

- A. *Do the leadership and membership of your organization agree that the Shared Governance system supports the College's goals and objectives?*

Yes

- B. *If yes, what types of evidence support this view within the organization?*

From the SG Survey #11 (Committee Work Interconnected to other College Decisions and Events), 83% of faculty feel that there is always or usually an interconnection to other College Decisions and Events from the Shared Governance.

- C. *If no, what types of evidence support a negative view within your organization?*

## Classified Senate's Response (Classified Staff Section Only)

At our November 2003 meeting, Classified Senate discussed the classified staff section of responses. The most frequent complaint was that Supervisory/Confidential Employees are being excluded from Shared Governance. We felt that this assertion was based on misinformation about the process, from the initial step of expressing interest/name submission, to actually serving on a Shared Governance Committee. We also discussed the contradiction, to state exclusion from participating in Shared Governance, when responses to the online survey, were contingent on employees currently serving or had served on a committee in the past.

Classified Senate proposed the following actions, to improve and clarify procedures for classified staff's participation in Shared Governance.

- Publish- utilizing current publications like City Currents, announcing current vacancies on the various committees and how to apply, to serve on a committee.
- Also reference the Shared Governance website for more detail information.
- Classified Website – Setup a page regarding FAQ, regarding the Shared Governance process, clarifying how to apply, serving on a committee, general policy information etc...
- Regular reviews – Appointing staff will conduct reviews of the committees' composition to determine vacancies. Therefore, maintaining the representation of classified staff on committees.

Some members related problems from their supervisors/managers, in being released to serve on a particular committee, thus discouraging the classified employee from participating on a Shared Governance Committee. Classified Senate supports the procedure of sending a letter to the supervisor, notifying them, that their employee has been appointed to a committee. The administration should reinforce, district wide, the importance for all constituent groups to be represented on Shared Governance committees.

They were also other comments regarding procedural/policy questions - are there term limits, how are the chairs appointed, who takes minutes etc . . . Attila Gabor referred us to the Shared Governance Website, where answers, to these type questions can be found. Classified Senate felt when the call to fill vacancies occur, referencing to the Shared Governance website for further information, should be done at the same time.

## Administrators' Association

Overall, the survey data indicate that administrators responded favorably to questions regarding Shared Governance. During a work session focused on the Self Study Questions and subsequent discussions, members of the Administrators' Association raised a few issues not necessarily captured in the survey data, building upon issues raised during the Shared Governance listening sessions. We outline these concerns below and offer recommendations where possible. In some cases, we recognize that some of the recommendations we have made may already be in place; if that is the case, then increased communication and training may be necessary.

1. The Administrators' Association recommends that it become an official entity within the Shared Governance system backed by documentation to that effect. We believe that this will promote greater engagement, communication, and consultation among administrators and the College community. This recommendation emerged through discussing a request from the Chancellor for the Administrators' Association to consider taking on a more formal role in Shared Governance based in large part on feedback received during the Shared Governance listening sessions.
2. It is not clear to Shared Governance committee members when an issue must undergo approval by Shared Governance rather than simply falling within the purview of the administration to deliberate and implement. If administrators were to have a role within Shared Governance as a formal, collective entity, they may be able to help clarify when a particular issue requires Shared Governance review. (This concern relates to item 1 above.)
3. There is a need for more guidance to the Shared Governance committees regarding the process and structure of Shared Governance once an issue is under consideration. We recommend developing a flowchart that outlines how an issue would ideally move through the system when being approved. We also need a process for utilizing the flowchart each time an issue arises given that circumstances are inevitably unique; this process would determine which Shared Governance bodies need to review and act on a given issue.
4. The role of each Shared Governance committee needs clarification, both with respect to the scope of their domain (e.g., what issues are they expected to address?) and with respect to how they should operate (e.g., when should they be reactive and when should they be proactive?). It may be helpful to undertake an audit of committees to see what they have been working on in a given year and how they came to discuss those issues (i.e., where the issue was generated) to determine whether their areas of focus are appropriate and how well aligned their work is to the areas they are expected to cover. This may help better define where and how they should focus their efforts. Given that committees are required to submit annual reports, these reports could serve as the vehicles for reviewing their activities and helping to define each committee's scope.
5. Participants in this Shared Governance work session indicated that there is a need for tracking recommendations that are formulated by committees. Specifically, recommendations should be documented and tracked centrally by the Shared Governance Office so that their status can be checked and so that they can be moved forward in the event that they appear to be "stuck" within any given committee. We recommend creating a form for the committee chair(s) to complete that notifies the Shared Governance Office that a recommendation has been made or acted upon. The chair(s) would submit that form to the Shared Governance Office, and the coordinator of that office would log the information. In addition, we recommend that committees adhere to the requirement that they submit annual reports and that a mechanism for reviewing these reports be developed.
6. Administrators need a better sense of whom they represent on the committees. That is, should they be representing their own area(s), the administration as a whole, or the Chancellor? (The recommendation proposed in item 1 may help alleviate this concern.)

*On February 17, 2004, these recommendations were approved unanimously by 24 voting administrators*

## AFT 2121

Shared Governance might better be called shared information committees and discussion groups. Information sharing certainly has its uses; and when a consensus is reached on issues of concern, decisions that come out of Shared Governance committees are sometimes implemented. However, experience demonstrates that the administration is usually the dominant group among the committees - and the administration holds veto power, in a sense, over decisions made by Shared Governance committees.

AFT 2121 feels that the union should be more represented on Shared Governance committees. Presently, AFT 2121 is represented only on the Health and Safety Committee and on the Planning and Budget Council through the Academic Senate. AFT 2121 would like to have the opportunity to be formally represented on various other committees, as is often the case at many other colleges. Among these additional committees are the Parking Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Faculty Position Allocation Committee.

Faculty members have expressed varied reactions when asked about Shared Governance committees. Faculty members on the Health and Safety Committee have expressed positive feelings, citing the seriousness of the committee, respect for differing opinions and good responses from administration to the committee's concerns. This committee, apparently, meets its mandate, operates in a professional and congenial manner and gets the work done. On the other hand, we have also heard complaints, at times, that administrators on some other committees sometimes treat faculty dismissively, and of faculty feeling intimidated on these committees, especially in the case of untenured or part-time faculty members. (Unfortunately, we do not have more detailed information about this).

AFT believes that Shared Governance should be a concept that opens up dialogue to all members of the college and should not be limited to the concept of committee involvement. Many faculty members are so involved in various other activities that it is difficult or impossible to be a committee member, yet they wish to be able to contribute. Other faculty members have commented that in order for the governance system to be more productive and powerful, committees would probably need to be equipped with more clout. Operating a committee efficiently and democratically takes a lot of time and energy, and people need to feel empowered to do it.

The Shared Governance system could ensure greater inclusion of college constituencies by publicizing a chart of the various committees that are functioning, the make up of the committees with a contact number or e-mail address, and an update on recent issues or tasks the committee has been involved with.

Allan Fisher (for AFT 2121)

## Results from Shared Governance Participant Survey

---

### DEMOGRAPHICS

<b>Full/Part time</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>
Full Time	77%	108
Part Time	4%	6
No Response	19%	26
<b>Campus</b>		
Alemanay	1%	2
Chinatown	1%	1
Downtown	3%	4
Evans	1%	2
Gough	5%	7
John Adams	6%	8
Mission	3%	4
SouthEast	1%	1
Phelan	61%	86
No Response	18%	15
<b>Position</b>		
Admin	17%	24
Dept Chair	9%	13
Faculty	52%	73
Staff	16%	23
No Response	5%	7

	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Dept Chair</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Overall Total</b>
<b>2. Years on Governance Committees</b>						
2 to 3 Yrs	4%	8%	18%	35%	0%	<b>16%</b>
LessThan 2 Yrs	8%	8%	16%	9%	14%	<b>13%</b>
MoreThan 3 Yrs	88%	69%	66%	52%	57%	<b>67%</b>
No Response	0%	15%	0%	4%	29%	<b>4%</b>
<b>3. Number of Committees</b>						
1	8%	31%	38%	35%	29%	<b>31%</b>
2	25%	38%	38%	30%	14%	<b>34%</b>
3	21%	0%	12%	26%	0%	<b>14%</b>
4	8%	15%	7%	4%	0%	<b>7%</b>
5 or more	38%	8%	3%	0%	29%	<b>10%</b>
No Response	0%	8%	1%	4%	29%	<b>4%</b>



	Admin	Dept Chair	Faculty	Staff	No Response	Overall Total
<b>4a. Meeting Regularity</b>						
Once per week	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	<b>1%</b>
2 to 3 per month	13%	15%	29%	4%	14%	<b>20%</b>
Once a month	67%	54%	42%	74%	29%	<b>52%</b>
Two to three times a semester	4%	8%	12%	9%	0%	<b>9%</b>
Two to three times a year	13%	15%	12%	0%	14%	<b>11%</b>
Once a year or less	4%	0%	3%	9%	0%	<b>4%</b>
No Response	0%	8%	1%	4%	29%	<b>4%</b>
<b>4b. Attendance at Meetings</b>						
All The Time	63%	54%	70%	57%	43%	<b>64%</b>
Regularly	29%	38%	18%	30%	29%	<b>24%</b>
Occasionally	4%	0%	11%	4%	0%	<b>7%</b>
No Response	4%	8%	1%	9%	29%	<b>5%</b>
<b>4c. Information on Role and Function</b>						
Yes	38%	58%	60%	55%	40%	54%
No	31%	0%	16%	32%	20%	20%
Don't Recall	4%	17%	10%	5%	20%	9%
Orientation Not Required	27%	25%	14%	9%	20%	17%
<b>5. Environment that encourages honesty</b>						
Never	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Rarely	0%	0%	4%	13%	0%	4%
Usually	33%	38%	44%	61%	43%	44%
Always	63%	54%	48%	17%	29%	45%
No Response	0%	8%	4%	9%	29%	6%
<b>6. Different opinions valued</b>						
Uncomfortable w/ Expressing Opposing Views	4%	8%	11%	9%	0%	9%
Don't Recall	13%	8%	10%	0%	14%	9%
Yes, valued	75%	69%	64%	74%	57%	68%
No, not valued	0%	0%	1%	4%	0%	1%
Other	8%	0%	10%	4%	0%	7%
No Response	0%	15%	4%	9%	29%	6%
<b>7. Opinions Respected</b>						
Never	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Rarely	0%	0%	3%	4%	0%	2%
Usually	46%	54%	48%	65%	57%	51%
Always	50%	38%	45%	22%	14%	40%
No Response	0%	8%	4%	9%	29%	6%

<b>8. Procedure Clear</b>						
Rarely	8%	0%	7%	13%	14%	8%
Usually	50%	69%	55%	57%	57%	56%
Always	38%	23%	37%	22%	0%	31%
No Response	4%	8%	1%	9%	29%	5%
	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Dept Chair</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Overall Total</b>
<b>9. Objectives Clear</b>						
Never	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Rarely	4%	0%	8%	13%	0%	7%
Usually	50%	62%	60%	65%	43%	59%
Always	38%	31%	30%	13%	29%	29%
No Response	4%	8%	1%	9%	29%	5%
<b>10. Committee Work Valuable</b>						
Rarely	4%	0%	3%	4%	0%	3%
Usually	33%	46%	33%	35%	29%	34%
Always	58%	46%	62%	52%	29%	56%
No Response	4%	8%	3%	9%	43%	6%
<b>11. Committee Work Interconnected to other College Decisions and Events</b>						
Never	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Rarely	8%	0%	14%	9%	0%	10%
Usually	50%	46%	38%	48%	29%	42%
Always	38%	46%	45%	35%	43%	42%
No Response	4%	8%	1%	9%	29%	5%
<b>12. Speak Regularly at Meetings</b>						
SpeakAtLeastOnce	58%	46%	56%	43%	43%	53%
SpeakAtMostMeetings	29%	38%	26%	39%	29%	30%
SpeakOccasionally	8%	8%	10%	9%	0%	9%
AlmostNeverSpeak	4%	0%	7%	0%	0%	4%
No Response	0%	8%	1%	9%	29%	4%
<b>13. Read City Currents?</b>						
Never	21%	0%	1%	4%	0%	5%
Rarely	21%	15%	22%	30%	43%	24%
Usually	54%	62%	51%	26%	14%	46%
Always	4%	23%	25%	35%	14%	22%
No Response	0%	0%	1%	4%	29%	3%

<b>14. Use Website</b>						
DidNotKnow	29%	8%	40%	17%	29%	31%
DidNotUse	25%	15%	15%	9%	0%	15%
Rarely	29%	38%	29%	48%	43%	34%
Occasionally	8%	23%	15%	13%	0%	14%
Often	8%	15%	0%	13%	0%	5%
No Response	0%	0%	1%	0%	29%	2%

## Written Responses to Online Survey Shared Governance Program Review: Faculty, Department Chairs, Classified Staff and Administrators

---

*This report is a compilation of the written responses to the online survey on CCSF Shared Governance conducted in September 2003. Survey participants were asked to provide general comments, specific observations and suggestions for improvement of the Shared Governance system. The report contains four sections comprising the written responses from faculty (full and part-time); department chairs; classified staff; and administrators. Students were asked to fill out the survey in May 2003 but the Office of Research, Planning and Grants did not receive any responses.*

### Faculty

The process for appointing people to committees is not clear to people who are not in the loop. During the tenure review process. I applied several times to be on the same committee. I was never informed about the status of my application nor were my written and/or phone messages answered. It seems to be one of those "old City College" processes; Byzantine secret and totally useless except to those in the "OCCC" (Old City College Club). I think CCSF would benefit from a more open selection process a clearer and perhaps uniform application process and a uniform notification process. I don't really think this is done on purpose to exclude certain individuals. I think it is a result of habit and incompetence and it ends up excluding people who could make a good contribution if given half a chance. (faculty FT)

Minutes and agenda need to be posted for all meetings for all committees. Otherwise, we are all working in a vacuum, and I feel that my time is majorly wasted. (faculty FT)

The committee I'm referring to has difficulty adhering to parliamentary procedures and consequently has trouble getting through its agenda. There is an atmosphere of disrespect for the time and opinions of the members, who are elected to their positions. The concept of plurality of opinions is one which is only gradually dawning on some members of the leadership of this committee. It does not seem to have occurred to some that running a meeting is an acquired skill, like driving a car or playing the piano. Improvement is being made, but it is glacially slow. Meetings are far too long-- two and one half hours every two weeks. Because the meetings are not well run, certain members with emphatic opinions, willingness to interrupt, and love of the sound of their voices too often get to dominate. By contrast, the other committee, which has an important role in approving the college's future academic direction, is run like a well-oiled clock. Everyone gets to speak, opinions are respected, and therefore it is a pleasure to attend them. The difference is in the quality of the leadership, and the fact that the latter committee has actual deadlines to meet. (faculty)

The Shared Governance system is incredibly thick and too often controlled by a few people, some of whom run and retard the Academic Policies Comm. These same people sustain their subjectivity by slowing down an already slow system and keeping SF 30 years behind on several levels. Besides, quite often the Chancellor and the Board can do whatever they want anyway. (faculty FT)

I have just applied to be on another Shared Governance committee. I believe there is a marked tendency on the part of the academic senate to appoint a small circle of faculty to the important

committees, and use the lesser known faculty for the less important committees. I have seen this happen too many times. (faculty FT)

I have participated in a sub-committee of a Shared Governance committee. I'd like to have more communication done between the main Shared Governance committee and its sub-committees on a regularly basis. We send copies of minutes but have rarely been informed about what is carried (or not) to the Academic Senate. Our committee usually has to dig through websites and people to find out what happened. I think there could be more "top to bottom" communication. (faculty FT)

As a member of the Curriculum Committee, which is established in accordance with State regulations as well as College ones, I feel that I serve on one of the most important committees in the College. I feel that this committee is taken with the utmost seriousness by Faculty and Administration and I have no complaints whatsoever. In general, the effectiveness of Shared Governance is very heavily dependent on the attitude of Administration thereunto. The present Chancellor has set an example of collegiality for his staff, and the College benefits therefrom. Long may this continue. (faculty)

The size of our institution has its problems. The SG committees seem to enhance opportunity for faculty to get involved and have a voice in the organization and offerings of CCSF. An improvement in the committees that I have served would be to have the minutes from previous meetings available to members before the next meeting. Sometimes no minutes were available at all. (faculty FT)

The department should give faculty release time to attend committee meetings. It is not so in one department even though we are expected to participate. (Faculty FT)

Student Development is underrepresented in Shared Governance, in both committees and issues addressed. As counseling faculty, my concerns are often not even on the radar. Shared Governance should be shared - there is a small group of people who control the agenda, down to whom gets assigned to committees. People who have differing points of view or opinions are not allowed to participate. (faculty FT)

It has proven difficult to recruit and retain active student members of the committee and thus opportunities are lost for valuable input and collaboration with the students. Classified staff members provide valuable support both in the committee and by helping with activities of the committee in their roles within their departments. It is difficult to schedule meetings at a time when faculty are not teaching. Faculty members want to attend but often cannot due to their schedules. Having faculty members whose department is closely related to the activities of the committee makes a big difference in getting the work done. (faculty PT)

If administrators are at meetings to promote an agenda, then faculty and staff have to be vocal if they do not agree. Unfortunately, votes are rarely taken at these meetings, rather decisions are made on the basis of consensus which may be vague or misunderstood. Important decisions should be made on the basis of a vote. (FT)

The existence of the Parking & Transportation Committee is a farce. The committee does good work and is run very well, but the recommendations of the committee are only politely listened to and rarely followed up on. The administration (i.e. Chancellor) never consults with the P&T committee, but instead makes his own uninformed P&T decisions. In addition, those decisions are usually completely opposite to the recommendations of the committee. Folks on the

committee have been thinking about P&T issues for many many years and have good information and do good thinking. I am completely for Shared Governance, but recommendations by Shared Governance committees must have some authority. Why even have Shared Governance if the committees don't have any affect on the College? This is just a waste of everyone's time. (faculty FT)

Unfortunately, when our recommendations are passed on to the next level, the chair of that committee frequently ignores, overrides, makes unilateral decisions about these recommendations even when they are confirmed by that committee. Since the chancellor also does this, shared" is not always possible. (faculty FT)

I am the co-chair of a committee, appointed last year. It has been difficult to find out the composition of the committee and how to go about getting more people to volunteer. I know I cannot appoint, but we want a fully functioning committee and I have encouraged people to apply. Most of these people reported frustration and getting a run-around. Since committees are composed of admins, faculty, classified, and students, there has not been a reliable, centrally located one-stop shop to find information about who is on the committee. Instead I've had to go to four separate entities to find out who they have appointed. Only the admin side was able to tell me right away. And finding out who to contact was a challenge also and often involved several phone calls. I think I have the faculty Academic Senate appointments up-to-date now, but classified and students are not. One classified person has told me that she tried to volunteer through the classified union and was told it was full. It's not to my knowledge. The website has been out-of-date for so long I stopped going there. (faculty FT)

Administrators are inhibited at meetings by the practice of speaking with one voice. Faculty welcome classified and student participation and most faculty would like to see more of both. I think it is normal for some to speak up more than others. That's just pecking order behavior as in any species. It's not a failure of the system. (faculty)

1. There is a disproportionated number of student development faculty to instructional faculty.
2. Assignment of committee members are too often from an old boy's/girl's" network rather than being open.
3. Some committees are too dominate over others. (faculty FT)

I have been a member of the Academic Policies Committee for about 3 years and it is my observation that sometimes our work and recommendations are not fully utilized by the Executive Committee of Academic Senate. Indeed, the Exec. Committee sometimes begins a discussion as if the work coming to them from AP didn't even exist. I feel that ALL Shared Governance committees' formal work should be distributed in advance to Exec. Committee when it is on the agenda and the members of Exec. Comm. should be prepared to use the work of these committees before launching out in different directions. (faculty FT)

I have dropped out of all committees because of health problems and a general feeling that my contributions are not needed. (faculty FT)

To provide for a greater diversity of opinions and participation, membership in all committees should be open and available to faculty and staff and not just to a few who are appointed by those currently serving. Otherwise, true change will come at a glacial pace at CCSF and time is a luxury we don't have. (faculty)

The Noncredit Issues Committee is hampered by the fact that most of its members are noncredit instructors. They teach longer hours and therefore scheduling meetings that all can attend is more difficult than for other committees. (faculty)

The real problem is that the chair and the people in charge do what they want to do. They plan their work and go with it. We are just an appendage that they have to put up with. If it was not because of regulations we would not be even invited. It is therefore just a useless formality. (faculty)

Shared Governance is a strong point of CCSF. IT works well. (faculty)

In my opinion, the Shared Governance process has been given more authority than what is beneficial to the College. Having spoken to members of other community colleges about this topic, many expressed disbelief in regards to CCSF Academic Senate's role. The process is overwrought and burdensome to those of us who are attempting to complete our assigned tasks. Moreover, the few of us non-teaching faculty often times get pushed out of the system in which we are supposed to be equal partners. This kind of politics lies in contrast to the true concept of shared governance. (faculty)

I have some suggestions concerning the committee on which I served most recently (Spring 2003), the Student Complaint Committee. Guidelines for this committee are not always clear. We probably needed tech support for our most recent case, which involved many students. I also felt that the guidelines are too circular. (FT)

I would like to know which committee allowed the Chancellor to unilaterally allow students to park in faculty parking spaces during the first three weeks of the semester. Having students in faculty parking spaces exacerbated an already acute parking problem on the Ocean Campus and created an environment that made faculty feel unwelcomed or unvalued on campus. Whichever committees that should be interacting with the Chancellor on the parking issue should remind the Chancellor that parking regulations should be enforced AT ALL TIMES or faculty will not be able to come to work. (faculty)

I was a part timer for many years before I realized the significance of Shared Governance committees and how they all fit in to the total picture of City College. I think that some people still find it difficult to understand the interconnectedness. It's only when you serve on a committee that you begin to understand the system. (faculty)

To be honest, it seems that the only people who talked on the committees I was on, were the people directly involved in implementing the decisions made from the committee because they knew most about the issues being put forward. (faculty PT)

International Education Committee has not functioned adequately for a couple of years. It needs leadership. If and when it met, people worked well together. (faculty FT)

I think it is important to make certain that each new committee member receives information on the role and functions of the committee plus a listing of all the committee members. This was not done on my committee. (faculty FT)

I am very impressed with the level of motivation and dedication on the part of the committee members that I have met in my two committees. I am a new member and both committees have made me feel welcome. Since all of the committees do valuable work, it would be very

interesting for the different groups to share information about their projects and studies with each other. It would also be productive to have a general meeting with all of the groups. Thank you for your time and attention. (faculty PT)

I find that participation on Shared Governance Committees is difficult for full-time non-credit faculty who teach 25 hours at a campus. Most meeting times are geared towards those who teach fewer hours, have more flexible schedules and are at Ocean Avenue. (FT)

My experience with Shared Governance has been deeply disturbing. In the past the chairperson of the committee I serve on regularly failed to provide an agenda in advance. We would come to the meeting not knowing the agenda and then often be given a sheaf of handouts. As many people sat overwhelmed, the chair would smugly interpret all this material (which almost never showed the multiple sides to issues but would present things so that they only supported and conformed with what she wanted to have happen). After things left this committee they would go to the Senate Exec but without any committee report, outline, or summary of any kind. The chair would attend the senate meeting and then further broker information and ideas, even further shaping policies and proposals to conform to what she wanted. I do not call that kind of process Shared Governance. We now have a new chair of the committee. We'll see if things are different.. (faculty FT)

Student Grade & File Committee: Excellent spirit of sincere consideration of both sides of any grade appeal; clearly established procedures followed in all cases; a general feeling of fairness and respect for all participants. Main problem: lack of student and faculty members. Student Complaint Committee: severe problems with basic structure of this committee and lack of clear procedures to follow. I was the faculty member, working with a variety of administrators, on a number of student complaints. While I found all administrators congenial work partners and respectful of my role, there was no clear format to follow. General problem observed with both committees: In pursuing various complaints we encountered structural problems within specific departments which concerned us, but we had no one to refer these concerns to. Often we added general comments to decisions asking the department chair and dean to consider some broader issues, but these had no force behind them. Department chairs and deans take widely varying amounts of supervision of their faculty members. Most appear to be more protective of the feelings and/or rights of faculty than concerned about students' access to or adequacy of information or faculty. This is part of a general problem of weak supervision of full-time faculty members. I am a full-time faculty member and AFT member who is fully committed to faculty rights; however, I am also concerned about faculty members and departments with harsh grading policies and the lack of office hours, clear grading policies, syllabi, and means of contacting instructors. I would like to see broader outreach by the Academic Senate (or another body) to bring more faculty members into these committees, and especially by the AS (or the Shared Governance supervisors, on their behalf) informing students of the opportunities and advantages to them of serving on Shared Governance Committees. (faculty FT)

There should be some mechanism by which Governance Committee chairs are rewarded for their work, and incentives to get them to post rosters, meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes to the Shared Governance website. (faculty FT)

## Department Chairs

Shared Governance is alive and well at CCSF - especially under Chancellor Day. Prior to Chancellor Day, Shared Governance was usually defined as the Administration making unilateral decisions and sharing those decisions with faculty/staff. These days there is real



Shared Governance operating as it was meant to be -- getting input and building consensus - and even deferring to the opinions/decisions of the faculty in those areas of AB1725 in which the faculty are given priority in decision making. It is unfortunate that one or two Trustees are intent on micromanaging and on raising doubts about the Shared Governance process - out of ignorance it would appear. (chair)

I serve on the executive council of the Academic Senate. We often will not see the formal recommendations that should have been sent to us from other Shared Governance committees, especially from Academic Policies (I've never even seen the minutes of an Academic Policies committee meeting). This means that we often will start fresh into an issue, hearing only in general terms what has been done before. If the decisions of AP do not make any difference, then they shouldn't waste their time making any decisions or recommendations in the first place. (chair)

It has taken me a few years to understand and appreciate how Shared Governance is intended to work. At first this system seemed to be a burden to me ... but it now seems to be a really good thing. It would be good if more people clearly understood the process of moving a proposal through Shared Governance. It really doesn't take that long to go through the process and the input from colleagues often refines and improves the original proposal. Would like to see more minutes and agenda posted on the Shared Governance website. When I have inquired about this, am told that many committees don't submit these materials to the Shared Governance office. Would like to find a way to improve compliance so that it is easier to find out what each committee is working on by going to the website. If everyone posted minutes and agenda we would build an amazing archive and people thinking about applying for appointment to a committee could research the work of committees before they apply. Maybe it would be good to link to the e-mail list archives of the different committees as well? Am sensitive to the need for confidentiality.. but lists like the TLTR list are very public (though this list is not linked on the Shared Governance website under the TLTR section)... would like to review more of those lists and have them posted as archives. Also would like to find a way to assess people's experience with each Shared Governance committee they have served on. (chair)

Shared Governance is much too cumbersome at CCSF & is typically used by a few loose canons to gum up the works. (chair)

It seems that a small group of people control Shared Governance --especially the powerful committees. They tend to choose faculty of like mind when filling vacancies on committees. "New blood" has a hard time getting appointed. The process for how faculty are chosen is not publicized. We are told to send in our names and then months later (or in some cases NEVER) receive a response. How are these decisions made? Some colleagues have been appointed to committees and then never notified; they have found out months later from another committee member. (chair)

I had to dig out the most current brochure of the Shared Governance System that I have (2001-2002) to see what the Shared Governance committees are. It lists the main ones - not sure if the subcommittees, if any, of these are also considered part of the Shared Governance system, although I assume they would be. It probably would have been a good idea to list them in this survey. I bet there are a lot of people who still don't know what they are or don't remember. (chair)

I'd like to see a clear link to the Title V and Ed Code section that describe Shared Governance law. (chair)

While my experiences have been generally good, I know of other faculty members who have had a difficult/impossible time getting committee appointments. This may be an area of concern not covered by this survey. (chair)

## Classified Staff

I have enjoyed my experience working on committees at CCSF and it has helped me to better understand the functioning of the school. However, I would like to have periodic information or updates about which committees have openings for classified positions. Also some information on the subject of the process for filling classified position openings would be appreciated. (staff)

It is my experience that there are a number of non-voting members in the committee that I am on that attend and share their input but no clear distinction is made between the official members and the non-committee members. To my knowledge, the non-voting members do not vote on matters when the occasion arises. (staff)

I think that while I'm generally treated as a peer and in a respectful manner by members of other constituent groups, I understand it's not always that way for other classified staff. I feel as if those committees that have similar agendas and need to work together often are unable or do not communicate as they should. I sometimes (dependent on the particular committee) feel that despite our best efforts, it's impossible to implement the ideas of the committee. Overall, I like the concept of Shared Governance and I wish more classified staff and students would participate. (staff)

Shared Governance is great. It introduces students to the democratic process of decision making, it helps the college community to participate in the college's decision making and also foster collegiality amongst various constituent groups of the college. (staff)

Shared Governance committees exclude Confidential and Supervisory employees, and I don't see why. I am referred to Classified union 790 when I've been interested in volunteering for a committee, only to be ignored or told they don't handle requests for unrepresented classified. Well, we exist, there's more than 2 dozen of us, and I don't see why we are discouraged from Shared Governance. (staff)

Two to three years ago I volunteered for the Scheduled Maintenance Subcommittee. The committee has not met. On the Shared Governance web-site, Vester Flanagan is listed as the chair. It is not my call to disband a committee. But let's not deceive ourselves into thinking that we have Shared Governance in a particular area when in fact we do not. (staff)

I worry that many classified staff do not feel comfortable attending or contributing to Shared Governance meetings. I ascribe this both to imagined and real pressure to conform to dominant views and not rock the boat. Staff do not speak enough and despite being "on the front line" in many issues their viewpoints are not encouraged. This means staff stay silent. I am sometimes annoyed that student participants who may not be contributing particularly thoughtfully are given false deference. I am not sure this misleading feedback is valuable to their growth. Although I understand that we lack substantial student participation in the system and that we want to encourage students to participate. I wish there were a way for students to be encouraged and "elderled" in a way that would not be paternalistic but would encourage more meaningful participation. (staff)

When new members join there should be an orientation-(paperwork), about the goals/purpose of the particular Shared Governance committee. What the current issues are and any other prior history of the committee, that would be relevant to new member, to enable them to participate fully. (staff)

Unrepresented classified are not allowed to be voting members of any committee. This means that a large number of persons will never be full participants in decision making by the District. (staff)

Committee agenda should be communicated to the members at least 3 days before each meeting. Committee minutes should be communicated to the members at least 3 days before the next meeting. (staff)

### Administrators

Overall, we need a better orientation to the purpose of Shared Governance (i.e., overviews of all the committees and their individual purposes), the process of Shared Governance, and the expectations of Shared Governance and one's role on committees. There is too much mystery surrounding the system. (admin)

I have a generally positive attitude about the SG system. Even when it is not at its best (unclear agenda, fuzzy issues, lapses in rules of order,) it is still so much better than things were before we had Shared Governance. More people are involved in decision-making, more viewpoints are considered, and more people are therefore willing to contribute to the College team. One area that needs improvement/reconsideration is the role of the Academic Senate when it receives recommendations from the committees that report to it. It sometimes seems as though the Senate may not have been well-informed about the deliberations that went into a recommendation, and as a result the Senate might make changes without giving the recommending committee an adequate opportunity to explain its thinking. Some of my committee colleagues have voiced concerns about the Senate re-doing the work of its committees. I don't know if this is a real issue or one of perception (admin)

While Shared Governance is a fact of life since AB 1725, there is clearly a lack of clarity in defining the responsibility of Shared Governance and what clearly are administrative responsibilities. The entire Shared Governance system" is cumbersome and should be reviewed for effectiveness. (admin)

Shared Governance committees are effective if the principals involved are honest and earnest. I can remember serving on one committee, and a member could not understand my request. Fortunately, Marguerite Versher was present to enlighten this member. So.....it is always helpful to have a member of Dean Gabriner's staff present to analyze, synthesize, and direct the business of key committees. (admin)

The Shared Governance process has provided an opportunity for certificated and classified personnel to work together in an environment that fosters respect and requires participants to listen to each other. While sometimes cumbersome, the process provides an opportunity to build community and share the vision, goals and responsibility for the institution. (admin)

There is a continuing problem of getting college organizations to keep their appointments of representatives up to date. There is a long lag time especially with the academic senate

appointees. As a general view, it is my opinion that there are too many committees and sub-committees, especially in the Academic Policy Committee domain. There should be some consolidation of committee work to make things more efficient. (admin)

The exact process for taking an issue through Shared Governance is frequently unclear. The domains of committees are not clearly established and the relationship of one committee to another, as well as the hierarchy of the Shared Governance structure, is frequently unclear. The process for determining which committee or committees must deal with an issue is not clear or consistent. At times, it appears that when the resolution of an issue in one Shared Governance forum is not satisfactory to certain key stakeholders the issue is referred to additional Shared Governance processes. While the DCC is not formally considered a Shared Governance entity, it exerts a significant influence on many issues that go beyond the theoretical parameters of an employee organization. While this is not necessarily bad or inappropriate, the role and responsibilities of this body in the Shared Governance process should be clarified and systematized. While administrators are well represented on most Shared Governance committees, many significant decisions are made in consultation processes between senior administrators and key leaders of Shared Governance organizations. Shared Governance is inherently inefficient and that is an unavoidable byproduct of a system that we all value. However, the problems noted above make it unnecessarily inefficient and laborious at CCSF and correcting this should be a major priority in this review of Shared Governance. On the positive side, it is clear that Shared Governance is truly embraced and valued by all campus constituencies. The faculty have a strong and appropriate role in all matters established in AB 1725. The administration respects and fosters that role. It is unfortunate that more faculty do not participate. More important, there is no systematic process for nurturing/developing faculty leadership for Shared Governance and all too frequently Shared Governance participation reverts to the usual suspects." New committee members frequently find themselves in the middle of complex issues with long histories and they need mentoring and assistance that fosters their independent participation. This may also be true of some classified staff and some administrators. The College has developed a healthy and productive relationship between the domains of employee representative groups (i.e. unions and associations) and the Shared Governance system and processes. This is a very significant accomplishment. (admin)

I am usually involved in Task Forces to resolve specific issues. They are not really in the Shared Governance system, but have representatives from all Shared Governance groups. This ability needs to continue, especially for projects of limited or specified duration and for quick response time. (admin)

I believe the system we have in place has served the institution very well. Our system works better than other community colleges and everyone looks to SFCCCD as a model. Sometimes we forget that and we need use opportunities like this to reassess and at the same time value what we have worked so hard to create. (admin)

Lack of information about what decisions have been made by Shared Governance committees. (admin)

I believe that the Shared Governance system actively discriminates and discourages the participation of unrepresented classified managers, supervisors and confidential employees. The most egregious example of this is the disenfranchisement of unrepresented employees. Specifically, they are NOT allowed to vote. So why would, or how could they fully participate in the process? The discrimination takes many, many forms; from overburdened work schedules that do not allow the unrepresented to participate because they are too busy or exhausted, to an air of outright intimidation that implies the Shared Governance process is for organized

bargaining and organized unrepresented groups only. A very clear example of this process is this survey. It begins by asking what Position one occupies. The available radio buttons are: Administration, Department chair, Faculty, Classified staff, and Student. These are all organized bargaining and organized non-bargaining units. There is no radio button for Unrepresented Classified Manager, Supervisor or Confidential. Therefore, my group is clearly not recognized in the system or in this survey. Furthermore, I was not able to answer several of the questions properly because they are all written as though one was allowed to participate in the process. For example in question #2, "Never" is not available as an option. The question assumes that any respondent has participated in the process. "Never" as a response would allow this institution to ask the question why has this person not participated? Are we as an institution reaching out to all the people? This is another example of how entrenched the process of active exclusion of unrepresented employees is at the college. The system is inequitable and the system needs to be corrected. (admin)

Role and purpose of the committees need to be reviewed and updated and shared. Structure needs to be made clear. (admin)

### **No Identity**

I think the non-inclusion of unrepresented classified managers, supervisors and confidential in the Shared Governance process is a violation of ab 1725.

## Listening Sessions Summary

---

(A) = Administrator, (C) = Classified Staff, (F) = Faculty, (S) = Student

John Adams Campus

October 2, 2003

1 – 2 p.m.

### Comments/Questions:

- The College community does not maintain the high level of energy and enthusiasm for the S.G. system previously present; people feel more confident in the governance system and the Chancellor's leadership; however, faculty and staff still have a role to play in the S.G. process [F]
- People are less clear about the role of S.G. given the relative success with which projects are implemented and decisions are made; strategic planning and the budget crisis have taken precedent over S.G. [C]
- CCSF's S.G. system seems to be working well in comparison to other College's systems [F]
- Individuals on campuses (other than Ocean) frequently feel isolated from the S.G. process, are unaware of decisions that have been made and by who, or feel that meetings focus heavily on the Ocean Avenue Campus; there is no central place to go to receive updates or information [A/F]
- Representing a campus on a committee can bring great attention to that campus in the S.G. process [F]
- The workload for noncredit instructors can be prohibitive in participating on a S.G. committee [F]
- Some people stay on committees year after year; blocking the participation of others [A]
- Some S.G. committees arrange the phasing in and out of members such that committees have continuity and historical memory; S.G. members should also serve as the liaison between his/her constituent(s) and the committee, bringing issues to the table rather than discussing one's own opinion [A/C]
- S.G. should better promote itself and highlight and take credit for successful measures the system has facilitated [C]

### Recommendations/Suggestions:

- Increase communication between faculty and Shared Governance (S.G.) system [F]
- Better communicate about the status of each committee (e.g., functioning, meeting, suspended operations, etc.) [C]
- Provide more information on the S.G. system as a whole and regarding the ways in which individuals can get involved; offer a FLEX Day session, orientations to new employees, information sessions throughout the year, etc. [C/F]
- Offer listening sessions on the S.G. system regularly to provide a forum for comment and suggestions for improvement [A]
- Stipend or pay faculty and staff for their participation on S.G. committees [F]
- Make term limits more clear; enforce those limits to ensure new members are allowed to participate [F]

Ocean Avenue Campus

October 2, 2003

4 – 6 p.m.

**Comments/Questions:**

- Minutes are taken by some committees, although it is unclear what happens to those minutes, where they should be submitted, and how they are used to ultimately make decisions [F]
- Posting and use of minutes can vary depending on the purpose and power of the committee [A]
- Communication about committee meeting agendas, minutes, and decisions is spotty and unsystematic [A]
- Lag time occurs between the production and the posting of some minutes as they must get approved by those present at the meeting during which the minutes were recorded [F]
- Reading material necessary for committee participation is delivered at the last minute [F]
  
- Committees should go through a regular review/evaluation of their progress internally as well as seek the feedback of the College community on their operations [F]
  
- Faculty on release full-time should be able to participate in the S.G. system; currently, they are shut out from participating and voting despite paying dues as members of AFT 2121 and having a history of working with students in the classroom [F]
- Title V dictates certain regulations for the committees, including the issue of faculty on release full-time not participating in the Academic Senate; these individuals can be appointed as a resource to a committee, but cannot chair and cannot vote [F]
- Classified staff appear not to have leadership roles on S.G. committees and elections for leadership of committees seem not to occur [C]
- Classified staff are recommended to committees and then the union makes appointments based on those recommendations; faculty and administrators do not have veto power [C]
- Frequently, administrators do not want to take leadership of a committee; sometimes, Title V dictates leadership [A]
- People aren't clear about the terms for each constituent group outlined in Title V; the S.G. system needs to make every effort to better communicate these terms so people know the role and responsibilities of their committee [F]
  
- Committee members have confusion about terms of service; are there any and how are they enforced? [F]
- Members generally have a 2-year term limit, at which time they are notified that their service is at its end and either given the opportunity to renew or step down [A]
- Some committees cannot get member to serve, particularly when it comes to student and classified participation [A]
- Classified participation depends on supervisor's willingness to let that staff member attend meetings; College leadership has encouraged all supervisors to permit the attendance of classified staff [A]
- Participation of noncredit faculty is a challenge given that they have a larger workload than credit faculty [F]
- Meeting on campuses other than Ocean can be problematic for those coming from the main campus [F]

- Other groups throughout the state call the system “Participatory Governance,” rather than “Shared Governance” [F]
- Different groups have varying bylaws and ways of operating [F]

### **Recommendations/Suggestions:**

- Request that major committees produce agendas in advance on the Web, record minutes at their meetings, and post minutes to the Web [A]
- Ensure that all committees have adequate and appropriate representation from all constituencies [A]
- Determine a compromise for faculty on release full-time for participating on committees as voting members [C/F]
- Rewrite policy for participation of faculty on release full-time [F]
- Make options about term limits and S.G. participation more clear [F]
- Provide release time to noncredit faculty to participate on committees [F]
- Explore other ways to gather for S.G. meetings, including video conferencing or providing a shuttle between campuses [F]
- Explore change of name to Participatory Governance [F]
- Create a set of rules for conduct across all committees [F]

Ocean Avenue Campus

October 29, 2003

4 – 6 p.m.

### **Comments/Questions:**

- The process for engaging in S.G. sometimes seems mysterious [F]
- City Current posts open S.G. committee positions when available [F]
- Classified staff join a committee through the following process; a staff shares with the Classified Senate that s/he would like to join a committee; the Classified Senate makes a recommendation to SEIU and then s/he is appointed by SEIU [C]
- The S.G. system seems to have evolved since its inception from a top down, administrative driven system [C]
- S.G. is much more democratic than it was in the beginning and the way in which the system was established allows for this; for example, the S.G. Coordinator is a classified staff [C]
- It is unclear if there is a good connection between the priorities of S.G. committees and the extended self study; chairpersons of the committees seem to push their own agendas; communication between the different working parts of a committee (chair, members, resource people) is not always good [C]
- Getting things done in a timely way can be difficult when going through the S.G. process; getting approval from a S.G. committee can feel superficial if doing work on the side and engaging that committee only for its “stamp of approval”
- Some S.G. committees do have short deadlines and make decisions in timely ways [C]
- Students are an invaluable part of the process and should be more present; how can students be more involved? [F/C]
- The nature of the community college population makes participation in S.G. challenging as many students are juggling work, school, child care, etc.; although recent work with the Executive Council and A.S. members has begun to address this issue [A]
- It is important to remember that students are new to the process [C]



- Student recruitment can be tough; there aren't ways to communicate with students about what they are getting into or what the committee has done in the past [S]
- Recruitment needs to/can happen in the classroom, e.g., making announcements in classes, faculty recruiting students for and supporting students in participation in S.G. committees [F]
- Establishing a student S.G. coordinator has made a huge difference in interfacing with students [F]
- In an effort to legitimize the process, people should have to go through the S.G. system before going to the Board of Trustees with an issue [F]
- The Board notification process has actually been revised to include a S.G. review [A]
- We must balance encouraging people to go through the S.G. system and feeling like they can approach the board [A]
- The involvement of the Administrative Council in the S.G. system needs resolution; the Administrative Council took a pass at formal participation in the system at its inception; now the Chancellor appoints individuals to different committees, and would like the Council to be included in the system in such a way that its made these decisions [A]
- The Administrative Council will be considering this issue at its next meeting and determining what format or model is best for their participation [A]
- SEIU would like to see written and publicized that classified staff can and should participate in the S.G. system [C]
- CAC has produced a resolution stating this [A]
- Some supervisors make it difficult for staff to participate, not letting them go during meeting times or making more work while they are away [C]
- Faculty also struggle with this issue; they have to participate on their own time without pay, and sometimes, their department will schedule them to teach a class when a committee they have been appointed to meets [F]
- The same faculty get involved with S.G. committees time and again; would like to see more faculty participating [F]
- It appears as though a significant portion of the faculty are participating [F]
- Publication of what happens in S.G. committees is inconsistent across committees; as committees represent a larger constituency, they should be better about reporting out decisions and actions [C]
- Web site changes have been made to accommodate the concern of reporting out on committee actions and decisions [C]
- Subcommittees need to be reminded of their role and function (e.g., they are not policy making bodies) [F]
- Subcommittees are frequently formed to work on a specific project and should dissolve once the project ends [F]
- Some subcommittees and committees haven't met in years because they presume another committee is taking care of the issue, however, they are not allowed to dissolve
- Confusion exists over how and when BUGs meet [F]
- BUGs operate outside the S.G. system [F]

**Recommendations/Suggestions:**

- Provide a contact or source for more information when announcing S.G. committee openings in City Currents or otherwise [F]
- Recruit students through the classroom [F]
- Include an annual synopsis in the S.G. Handbook for students' review [S]
- Determine way in which the Administrative Council engages in the S.G. system [A]
- Make the opportunity to participate on S.G. committees part of job announcements and descriptions [C]
- Continue to actively support the participation of classified staff (and faculty) in S.G. [C/F]
- Make a statement in committee bylaws that if a subcommittee has not met for a specified length of time that it should be dissolved
- Align BUGs with the Projects Committee

**Additional Submissions****Comments/Questions:**

- From several conversations with several individuals, there seems to be a perception that a very small number of the same faculty run the powerful and influential S.G. committees; the feeling is that it is hard for a newcomer to break into these types of limited membership committees [F]
- There is not enough new energy in the S.G. system; many faculty perceive it as a closed club and this prohibits growth of new ideas and innovations from different segments of the college community [F]

**Recommendations/Suggestions:**

- Limit the number of committees on which a faculty can participate, unless there are not enough other volunteers [F]
- "Term out" members if others volunteer [F]